

Monica Alexandrina Irimia

The vast (descriptive and theoretical) literature on *differential object marking* (DOM) has revealed pervasive splits in the morpho-syntactic encoding of direct objects (Moravcsik 1978, Comrie 1979, 1981, Givón 1984, Croft 1988, 1990, Bossong 1991, 1998, Lazard 2001, Aissen 2003, de Swart 2007, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011, López 2012, Bárány 2018, a.o.). A typical example is the Romanian prepositional accusative (oblique DOM) - in (1a) the human object *nimeni* ('nobody') is ungrammatical without the (locative) DOM preposition, while the inanimate in (1b) cannot be preceded by same preposition:

(1) ROMANIAN (ROMANCE) PREPOSITIONAL ACCUSATIVE

- a) Nu am văzut *(pe) nimeni.
 not have.1 seen LOC=DOM nobody
 'I haven't seen anybody/ I saw nobody.'
- b) Nu am văzut (*pe) nimic.
 not have.1 seen LOC=DOM nothing
 'I haven't seen anything/I saw nothing.'

A salient, although less discussed property of (oblique) DOM are the co-occurrence restrictions it gives rise to. For example, across Romance, (oblique) DOM has been shown to block the presence of a variety of categories such as dative clitics, clitic doubled datives, instantiations of the pronominal SE marker, etc. (Mendikoetxea 2008, Ormazabal and Romero 2007, 2013a, b, 2019, et. subseq; Cornilescu 2020, Tigău 2020, Dobrovie Sorin 2020, a.o.). However, even in the initial, pioneering observations, it became immediately clear that such co-occurrence restrictions are not uniform. This presentation explores the landscape of these phenomena, mainly using (standard and leísta) Spanish and standard Romanian. Even a limited set of data reveals numerous puzzles, some of which novel. On the theoretical side, one conclusion is that the traditional split Agree/Case does not seem to sufficient to derive these facts. Many parameters come into play (Irimia 2020), such as positional restrictions, the specific DOM sub-type, etc., supporting a dynamic interaction system (Deal 2020).