Main claims

- Past participle agreement (PPA) ≠ feature checking/valuation
- PPA = Differential Object Marking (DOM)
- PPAGreement marker = DOMarker spelled out on the participle
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1. PPA: data

(1) Pierre a construit(*e) la maison lui-même.
   Pierre has built the house himself
   'Pierre built the house himself.'

(2) (La maison,) Pierre l'a construit-e lui-même.
   The house Pierre it has built-PPA himself
   '(As for the house,) Pierre built it himself.'

2. Standard analysis

Kayne (1989, 1993), Belletti (2001), Friedemann & Siloni (1997); Rizzi & Guasti (2002), among many others:

- On its way to the finite verb, the pronominal direct object passes via an AgrP position above the participle.
- PPA is a reflex of the establishment of a feature checking/valuation mechanism between the participle and the pronoun in specAgrP.
3. Present analysis

- The PP Agreement marker is a DOMarker.
- It is base-generated within the direct object.
- The direct object splits during the derivation.
- One part is spelled out by a clitic, one part is stranded and spelled out on the participle.

4. DOM in a nutshell

- DOM: crosslinguistically diverse patterns in which direct objects whose referents are high on a certain semantic scale are morphologically differentiated from direct objects whose referents are lower on this same scale (Aissen 2003: 436; Bosson 1991, 1998; Lazard 1984, 2001: 879).
- Substantive content of the semantic scale: definiteness/specificity, animacy, topicality, gender, person, number features (Heusinger & al. 2008).
- Other DOM triggers: aspect, mood or tense of the predicate. Or combination thereof.

Turkish: specificity

(3) (Ben) kitab-ı oku-du-m.
   I book-ACC read-PST-1SG
   ‘I read the book.’

(4) (Ben) bir kitab-ı oku-du-m.
   I a book-ACC read-PST-1SG
   ‘I read a certain book.’

(5) (Ben) bir kitap(*-ı) oku-du-m.
   I a book read-PST-1SG
   ‘I read a book.’
   Turkish, Kornfilt (2008: 81, her (1))

(6) personal pronoun > proper name > definite NP > indefinite specific NP > non-specific NP

   differentially marked direct objects

   non-differentially marked direct objects
Hebrew: definiteness

(7) Ha-seret her’a ’et-ha-milxama.
the-movie showed ACC-the-war
‘The movie showed the war.’

(8) Ha-seret her’a (*’et-*)milxama.
the movie showed (ACC-)war
‘The movie showed a war.’

Aissen (2003: 453, her (25a,b))

almost all accusative languages have DOM (Jäger 2007:102).

But French is said not to have DOM (Bossong 1998: 219-220, 229)

However...

5. DOM in French

Just like Turkish -ı in (3) and (4), the PP Agreement marker in French appears iff the direct object is specific (Obenauer 1994).


(9) Dis-moi combien de fautes tu as fait / fait-es.
Tell me how many of mistakes you have made / made-PPA
‘Tell me how many mistakes you made.’
Obenauer (1994: 173, his 16)

In a context in which the specific interpretation of the direct object is excluded, PPA is odd.

(10) Jusqu’à combien de fautes ont-ils fait(*es), vos élèves?
Until to how many of mistakes have they made your pupils
‘Up to how many mistakes have they made, your students?’
Rizzi (2001: his (50a))

6. Analysis: DOM from a nanosyntactic perspective

6.1 Theoretical background

Nanosyntax (Starke 2005, 2009; Caha 2009; Pantcheva 2011; a.o.)

Study of the fine-grained structure of lexical items.
Morphemes are not the primitive units of words.
Morphemes consist of smaller entities, the features.
Each feature projects a syntactic layer.
Morphemes are the realization of hierarchical structures composed of syntactic layers.

(11) Pierre lis\textit{-ai-}t \textit{un livre}.
Pierre read-PAST.IMPF-3.SG a book
'Pierre was reading a book.'

Caha (2009)'s case sequence:

- Individual case features project a structural layer
- Case morphemes spell out one or more of these layers at once

Example: partial declension of Russian \textit{muzéj} 'museum'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>muzéj-ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>muzéj-ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>muzéj-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>muzéj-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) a. NOMP $\rightarrow$ -ø

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NOMP} \\
\text{NOM}
\end{array}
\]

b. ACCP $\rightarrow$ -ø

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ACCP} \\
\text{ACC} \\
\text{NOMP} \\
\text{NOM}
\end{array}
\]

c. GENP $\rightarrow$ -a

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{GENP} \\
\text{GEN} \\
\text{ACCP} \\
\text{ACC} \\
\text{NOMP} \\
\text{NOM}
\end{array}
\]

d. DAT $\rightarrow$ -u

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DAT} \\
\text{GENP} \\
\text{GEN} \\
\text{ACCP} \\
\text{ACC} \\
\text{NOMP} \\
\text{NOM}
\end{array}
\]
6.2 DOM in general

- We have seen that in DOM system, two types of direct objects are distinguished.
- Proposal: Caha's ACC-layer must be split (Rocquet 2013: 168-179)

Turkish non-specific / Hebrew indefinite DOs          Turkish specific / Hebrew definite DOs

5.2 DOM in French

- The pronominal direct object is merged in the complement of VP. If it refers to a specific referent, the ACC2P layer is merged on top of the ACC1P constituent.
- In the course of the derivation, the lower part of the structure raises. It is spelled out by the clitic l’.
- The higher layer, ACC2P is stranded in situ and spelled out on the participle in V (cf. Caha 2009's Peeling Theory).
- The highest accusative layer is merged when the direct object refers to a specific entity.
Recall Cardinaletti & Starke (1994/1999)'s decomposition of pronouns:

C&S (1994: 94): pronouns are base-generated in their strong form. The structurally smaller form are obtained via Erase a, i.e deletion of the upper part of the structure.

Proposal: the upper part of the structure is not erased, it is stranded and spelled out on the embedding category, i.e on the participle.

5.3. DOM in Spanish

In Standard Spanish, the presence of the DOMarker a is required if the direct object is animate and specific (Heusinger & Kaiser 2003: 41-42).

(11) Vi *(a) la / una mujer. (Standard Spanish)
see.past-1.sg DOM the a woman
‘I saw the / a woman.’

In certain Spanish dialects (esp. in South America), the presence of a is only definiteness-and specificity-driven (Heusinger and Kaiser 2003: 41-42).

(12) Vio a las sierras . (Puerto Rican Spanish)
saw.past-3.sg DOM the mountains
‘(S)he saw the mountains’ (H&K 2003: 42, their (1a), (2a))

The absence of a leads to a non-specific interpretation (Leonetti 1999: 867). Hence, only a-less arguments may appear in existential-construction.

(13) Había (*a) unas / todas las mujeres en la plaza.
there.was some / all the women in the place
7. Support for the analysis: object agreement in Hungarian

7.1 Introduction

Recall the proposal about French PPA:

Pierre a construit

➢ The patterns of object agreement and the morphology of pronouns in Hungarian provide support for this proposal.
➢ Observation: morphologically complete pronouns do not trigger agreement on the finite verb morphologically incomplete pronoun trigger agreement on the finite verb.
➢ Proposal: the morpheme missing in incomplete pronoun is the agreement marker on the finite verb

7.2 Data: object agreement in Hungarian

In Hungarian, when a finite verbs takes a definite full direct objects DP or 3rd person pronominal direct objects, it is suffixed by an object marker (or by a portmanteau morpheme spelling out both object and subject agreement. I leave this aside here).

(14) (Ti) ismer-i-tek a lány-t / Őt / Őket.
YouPL know-DEF-2.PL the girl-ACC him / them
‘You know the girl / him / them.’

(15) (Ti) ismer-tek egy lány-t.
YouPL know-2.PL a girl-ACC
‘You know a girl.’

When a finite verb takes a 1st or 2nd person pronominal direct object, it is not suffixed by an object marker.

(16) (Mi) ismer-ünk téged / titetek.
we know-1PL.INDEF youSG / youPL
‘We know youSG / youPL.’

(17) (Ti) ismer-tek engem / minket.
youPL know-2.PL.INDEF me / us
‘You know me/us.’
7.3 Morphology of Hungarian pronouns

- While 1st and 2nd person personal pronouns contain two sets of phi-features, their 3rd person counterparts only contain one.

(18) en-g-em ; té-g-ed ; mi-nk-et ; ti-tet-ct
1.SG-g-1.SG; 2.SG-g-2.SG; 1.PL-1.PL-ACC ; 2.PL-2.PL-ACC
‘me’ ‘youSG’ ‘us’ ‘youPL’

(19) Ő-t ; Ő-K-et
DEF.SG-ACC ; DEF.SG-PL-ACC
him them

→ This suggest that 3rd person pronominal direct objects lack a morpheme

7.4 Analysis

- The data presented above suggests the following correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>morpheme missing in a pronoun</th>
<th>object marking on the finite verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no morpheme missing in a pronoun</td>
<td>no object marking on the finite verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Further support for this correlation: dative (and all other oblique) personal pronouns of all persons, and crucially 3rd person ones, are morphologically complete and do not trigger object marking on the finite verb.

(20) ēn-nek-em ; te-nek-ed ; Ő-nek-i
1.SG-DAT-1.SG; 2.SG-g-2.SG; DEF.SG-DAT-DEF.SG
‘to me’ ‘to you’ ‘to him’

mi-nek-ünk ; ti-tet-tek ; Ő-nek-ík
‘to us’ ‘to you’ ‘to them’

(21) (Ti) ad-tok egy rózsá-t Ő-neki
To.him give-2PL.INDEF a rose-ACC to him
‘YouPL give-2PL a rose to him.’

- **Proposal:** the object marker occurring on finite verbs taking a 3rd person pronominal direct object originates as part of the structure of the direct object pronoun.

- **Morphological evidence:** the morpheme we would expect to find within 3rd person pronominal direct objects has the same form as that referencing the object on the verb:

(22) Ő-nek-i ; *Ő-i-t
DEF.SG-DAT-DEF.SG ; DEF.SG-DEF.SG-ACC
‘to him’ ‘him’

(23) (Ti) ismer-i-tet Őt
YouPL know-DEF-2.PL him
“You know the girl / him

### Conclusion

- Spanish *a* = PPAgr marker in French = DOMarker - *t* in Turkish and - *et* in Hebrew
  = object marker on Hungarian finite verbs = spell-out of the upper structural layer(s) of the direct object
- French PPA is the spell-out of a differential object marker on a participle
- No need of mechanism such as feature checking/valuation
- Simpler system: (i) unifies PPA and DOM, (ii) only uses independently needed mechanisms: Merge, subextraction and spell-out.

### 8. Remaining issues about French PPA

Until now, I have glossed over the following facts

- Gender plays a role in French PPA, i.e DOM
- Aspect plays a role in French PPA, i.e DOM
- The definiteness hierarchy plays a role in French PPA, i.e DOM

#### 8.1 Gender

- Another condition for the occurrence of the PPAgreement marker, i.e the DOMarker, is that the direct object refer to a feminine entity (plural marker is never audible).

(24) (La maison,) Pierre l'a *construit-e* lui-même.

  The house Pierre it has built-PPA himself

  '(As for the house,) Pierre built it himself.'

(25) (Le bateau,) Pierre l'a construit(*e) lui-même.

  The boat Pierre it has built himself

  '(As for the boat,) Pierre built it himself.'

- But gender and other features plays a role in DOM in other languages as well:
  - Russian animacy-driven DOM system only applies to masculine nouns. That is, animacy is not a sufficient condition for DOM to appear, the direct object must also be of masculine gender.
    - In Cappadocian, DOM targets masculine and feminine nouns but not neuter ones (Janse 2004: 5).
  - Aissen (2003: 456) points out that “in Yiddish, DOM is restricted to humans, but does not cover the entire category. Among common nouns, overt case-marking is restricted to eight common nouns [masculine and feminine], most of which denote individuals worthy of respect (father, mother, teacher,...).
  - Number seems to play a role in Palauan DOM (Georgopoulos 1991: 24-36)

- How to formalize this? Does it indicate that the ACC2P-layer actually corresponds to several layers: specificity, gender, number...?
8.2 Aspect

◆ In French, another condition for the occurrence of the DOMarker is the presence of a past participle. This goes hand-in-hand with perfective aspect in French. Thus, we can reformulate: another condition for the occurrence of the DOMarker is the presence of perfective aspect.

◆ Aspect (as well as mood and tense) play a role in DOM in other languages as well, e.g. in Finnish (Aikhenvald 2008: 583; Aissen 2003: fn 3, fn 29; Heusinger et al. 2008: 1), Uzbek (Heusinger et al. 2008: 12) and Mordvin (Georgi 2010).

8.3 Full DPs vs pronouns

◆ As seen above, in Hungarian, Hebrew, Turkish and Spanish, DOM also takes place with full DPs.

◆ In Modern French, however, PPA does not occur with (non-wh-) full DPs (but note that this used to be the case a couple of centuries ago, cf. Ay lettres écrit-es (Grevisse 1969)

◆ In Portuguese as well, DOM is restricted to pronouns (Bossong 1998: 223). Kanuri (Cristofaro 2013: 73)?

➢ DOM/PPA in French is driven by specificity, gender, aspect and form (DP vs pronoun).
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