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Abstract

In this thesis, I review and investigate differential object marking in Copala Triqui, which uses the word *man* to overtly mark accusative case. Overt case marking is optional in some contexts and required in others. I describe the current literature on the topic and summarize the findings of other researchers on the optionality of *man*. Additionally, I examine another way to analyze differential object marking according to the qualities of the object only ("local") or the relationship between the subject and object ("global"). The labels of local and global can be applied to existing analyses. The animacy, personhood, and pronominal status of subjects and objects have the biggest effect on the optionality of *man*. I identify nine types of subjects and objects according to those categories. These categories can be used to identify if there is existing data for each combination of subjects and objects. For those missing data points, I suggest example sentences to be used in elicitation. The optionality of *man* is a question of continuing research, and the findings of this paper can serve as a guide to future researchers about the outstanding questions and missing data points.
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1. Introduction

This paper aims to achieve three goals regarding syntactic study of differential object marking (DOM) in Copala Triqui. First, I will do a brief review of the development of our academic understanding of DOM in Copala Triqui.

Bárány and Kalin (2020) provide an account of DOM as a phenomenon in which objects of a sentence either receive overt case marking or are not overtly marked at all. There are several potential motivations for overt case marking, including DOM as a method to distinguish between the subject and object to reduce ambiguity. Current research suggests that factors related to animacy and/or personhood are the main motivation for disambiguation in Copala Triqui.

Within this account Bárány and Kalin (2020) describe DOM as a method of disambiguation between the subject and object that can occur on a ‘local’ or ‘global’ scale. Local motivations for DOM only consider the qualities of the object, such as the animacy or if the object is a pronoun. In contrast, global motivations consider the relationship between the subject and object, including their relative animacy.

I will analyze the existing accounts of DOM in Copala Triqui provided by Hollenbach (1984), Hollenbach (1992), and Broadwell (2022), labeling these accounts as either local or global motivations for DOM.

Finally, I will provide some recommendations for future research into the complexities of differential object marking Copala Triqui.

2. Background Information

Copala Triqui (TRC) is a Mexican language belonging to the Otomanguean language group. Within this larger classification, the language belongs to the Trique subgroup, containing Copala Triqui, Chicahuaxtla Triqui (TRS), and San Martín Itunyoso Triqui (TRQ). While the languages are distinct, there is a certain level of lexical similarity between them. There is a 78% lexical similarity between Chicahuaxtla Triqui and Copala Triqui (Ethnologue, 2023). Furthermore, San Martín Itunyoso Triqui has an 84% lexical similarity to Copala Triqui (Ethnologue, 2023).

According to Ethnologue (2023), there are approximately 30,000 native Copala Triqui speakers worldwide. The majority of the speakers are located in Oaxaca, Mexico. Outside of Mexico, there are considerable populations of native speakers in Albany, New York and California.

Copala Triqui uses Latin script for the writing system; however, the language is primarily spoken. In this paper, I follow the same spelling conventions as Broadwell (2022), who uses the popular orthography developed for Triqui speakers (based on the practical orthography developed by Barbara and Bruce Hollenbach). These conventions include <x> = [ʃ], <xr> = [ʂ], <ch> = [tʃ], <chr> = [tʂ], <c> = [k] (when appearing before front vowels), <qu> = [k] (when appearing before back vowels), <v> = [β], <j> = [h], and <Vn> = a nasalized vowel.

Copala Triqui is a tonal language, featuring five tones: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Tone 1 is the lowest and tone 5 is the highest. Additionally, it has three tone sequences, marked with 13, 31, and 32 (Hollenbach, 1992, p 181). All examples in this paper include tone if marked in the original
citations. If the example does not have tone, then the original author who wrote and glossed the example chose not to include marked tone.

Sentences in the language can appear in VSO order (1a) and SVO order (1b). However, both Hollenbach (1992) and Broadwell (2022) assume that the VSO order is underlying.

(1) a. guun³ gwaa⁴ tanuu³ a³² [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 200]
    com:become John soldier dec
    ‘John became a soldier.’

    b. tanuu³ guun³ gwaa⁴ a³²
    soldier com:become John dec
    ‘John became a soldier.’

Copala Triqui is a language that utilizes overt differential object marking (DOM). Some objects are marked by the word *man*. Neither Chicahuaxtla Triqui (TRS) nor San Martín Itunyoso Triqui (TRQ) have DOM.

3. Introduction to differential object marking

Differential object marking is a linguistic phenomenon to describe overt or unmarked case for direct objects of sentences. In some instances, the case is morphologically marked, and other times, objects are not overtly marked. Within this phenomenon, linguists research what motivates the divide between the overt and unmarked case. In *Case, Agreement, and their Interactions: New Perspectives on Differential Argument Marking*, Bárány and Kalin (2020) write the introduction for a body of work aimed at discussing the various theoretical motivations for DOM. These include a combination of factors such as animacy, definiteness, affectedness, and information structure (p. 2).

Silverstein (1976), Croft (1988), Comrie (1989), and others describe a scale of prominence among direct objects using the concepts of animacy and personhood (cited in Bárány & Kalin, 2020, p. 2). An object of higher prominence is generally more animate and more definite. The hierarchy is in order from more prominent to less prominent, (2):

(2)

1. first and second person pronouns,
2. third person pronouns,
3. names,
4. humans,
5. animate objects, and
6. inanimate objects.

Bárány and Kalin (2020) note that the more prominent objects are more likely to receive overt case marking and describe two explanations for overtly marking prominent objects within a
functional approach to DOM. (Within these explanations, the subject of a sentence is assumed to already be more prominent than the object.) One explanation is that overt case marking reduces ambiguity in the situation that the object may be more animate and/or definite than the subject. This disambiguation can occur due to the relationship between subject and object (“global”) or solely due to the nature of the object itself (“local”). The second explanation is that case marking “serves to identify certain semantic roles”, and a prominent object is more often marked because it is also more often significantly affected by semantics in the sentence (Bárány & Kalin, 2020, p. 6).

4. Overview and Analysis

For a brief history of some linguistic research on the subject, Hollenbach (1984) mentions man in her dissertation when discussing pronouns, using the example (3). She writes that “…noun phrases with pronoun heads cannot serve as direct object; they must be expressed instead with” man, meaning ‘to’ (p. 191).

(3) cene’e xana man zo’ a [Hollenbach, 1984, p. 191]
saw woman to 3:m:s dec ‘The woman saw him.’

This analysis does not explain in detail the possibility of man as a case marker. Instead, the noun phrase with a pronoun head is placed within a prepositional phrase.

Later, Hollenbach (1992) amends this analysis and label every instance of man to mean ‘body’. The author notes that man can be optionally used to mark a personal object as demonstrated in the contrast between (4a) and (4b).

(4) a. neje3 noj3 man3 gwaa4 a [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 187]
    con:sense 3:f:s body John dec ‘She sees John.’

    b. neje3 zoj3 gwaa4 a32 [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 187]
    con:sense 3:m:s John dec ‘He sees John.’

She furthermore notes that man is required for a pronominal object (5).

(5) ticawij13 nij4 man3 zoj3 a32 [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 188]
    pot:kill 1:pl body his dec ‘We will kill him.’

Requiring overt differential object marking for a pronominal object is a local example of DOM, in which the characters of the object only serve as motivation for overt marking. Hollenbach makes no differentiation between first, second, or third person pronouns. Furthermore, she makes
no attempt to explain the optionality of *man* through relative animacy comparisons of the subject and object.

Additionally, there is no distinctive labeling between *man* as an accusative and other parts of speech (6).

    money con:give 3:m:s body John q
    ‘Does he give money to John?’

In the paper “The emergence of accusative case in Copala Triqui”, Broadwell (2022) argues that there are three different ways that the word *man* is used in Copala Triqui. These are homophones and only distinguished by syntactic differences in usage. *Man* can be used as a noun, meaning ‘body’ (7), as a preposition (8), and as an accusative case marker (9). The prepositional *man* is also referred to as dative *man*.

(7) **A’ngaj** man **Juán.** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 2]
    hurt body Juan
    ‘Juan’s body hurts.’

(8) **Rqué so’ sa’anj man gringo** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 2]
    give 3:m:s money dat gringo
    ‘He gave money to the gringo.’

(9) **Racuí Juán man no’** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 1]
    help Juan acc 3:f:s
    ‘Juan helped her.’

Broadwell (2022) distinguishes between the homophonous uses of *man* using four tests: ability to be pied-piped, ability to be stranded, ability to be omitted in extraction, and optionality in-situ.

Two important tests involve what Broadwell calls ‘filler-gap construction’. In these constructions, wh-questions, relative clauses, and other linguistic features motivate the movement of certain noun or prepositional phrases within a clause or sentence. Stranding occurs in filler-gap constructions when a linguistic item from a noun or prepositional phrase is left behind, or ‘stranded’ while the rest of the phrase moves to the beginning of the clause. Pied-piping is a similar syntactic phenomenon in which a constituent in a filler-gap brings its entire accompanying phrase to the new location in the clause.

One distinguishing characteristic of the accusative *man* is that it is not obligatory to use the case marker in the NP of every accusative context. Broadwell calls this optional *man* ‘in-situ.’ In (10), the accusative case marker can be either overtly marked or omitted, and the sentence is grammatical.

(10) **Racuí Juáná man/Ø** **María** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 4]
    help Juana acc/Ø Maria
‘Juana helped Maria.’

In summary of the interactions, the preposition *man* can be both pied-piped and stranded. It can optionally be omitted in extraction but is not optional in-situ. The noun ‘body’ *man* can be pied-piped and can be stranded for some speakers. However, the noun can be neither omitted in extracted or in-situ. In contrast, the accusative *man* cannot be pied-piped or stranded in a filler-gap construction, but the case marker is option in-situ and must be omitted in extraction.

Previous examples from Hollenbach (1984) and Hollenbach (1992) can be re-glossed to reflect the three homophous uses of *man*. Example (4’a) has a human name object, and the *man* ‘body’ is re-glossed to be accusative. (5’) contains a third person pronominal object, and the *man* is also re-glossed to be accusative. (6’) contains a ditransitive verb and can be re-glossed to distinguish *man* as a dative preposition. Another significant point is that Hollenbach does not identify animacy of the subject or object as a potential variable to affect the optionality of *man*.

(4’a) a. *neje³ noj³ man³ gwaa⁴ a* [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 187]  
    con:sense 3:f:s acc John dec  
    ‘She sees John.’

(5’) *ticawij¹³ ni⁴ man³ zoj³ a⁳²* [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 188]  
    pot:kill l:pl acc his dec  
    ‘We will kill him.’

(6’) *sajan⁴ oj³ zoj³ man³ gwaa⁴ naj³* [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 255]  
    money con:give 3:m:s dat John q  
    ‘Does he give money to John?’

The variables affecting the presence the accusative *man* is a point of continuing research. The main question is to determine the conditions that govern the situations in which *man* is required or allowed to be omitted.

Broadwell (2022) theorizes that accusative *man* is optional except in the case of an animate pronominal object (local) and in the case of an extracted subject that is equal or lower in animacy than the object (global) (p. 8). He theorizes that the accusative marker is required in relative clause in which there could be an ambiguous reading of the subject and object (due to their relative animacy).

An ambiguous reading of a sentence could occur with extraction during questions or when the animacy of the subject is “equal or lower than that of the object” (p. 4). A comparison between (11a) and (11b) demonstrates how *man* can potentially clarify ambiguity.

(11) [Broadwell, 2022, p. 11]  
    a. *Nij so' tigij xe'g man [chuvee se chan' [___] man Mariá.]bo3*
They kicked the dog that bit Maria.

They kicked the dog that Maria bit.

(11a) is an example of subject extraction in a relative clause. The first *man* before the relative clause serves to designate ‘the dog’ as the object of the entire sentence. However, within the clause, the second *man* designates ‘Maria’ as the object of the clause. This second *man* is incredibly important when comparing (11a) and (11b) because it is the only difference between the two sentences that differentiates the two clauses as either subject or object extraction.

There are some inconclusive cases in which “some speakers report that omission of the accusative is ‘confusing’” (p. 6). These cases arise when the subject and object are equal in animacy, and either can be interpreted as the subject. Examples (12) and (13) involve a non-human animate subject (‘dog’) and an animate human object (‘Maria’). The object is more prominent than the subject, which would provide a global motivation for DOM based on the relative animacy.

(12) Chan’ chuvee man Maria [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]
    bite dog acc Maria ‘The dog bit Maria.’

(13) ?Chan’ chuvee Maria [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]
    bite dog Maria ‘The dog bit Maria.’

Another inconclusive case arises between an inanimate subject and object as seen in (14) and (15). There is an equal level of animacy (being no animacy), but some speakers find the omission of *man* to be confusing. Broadwell (2022) notes that some speakers “prefer to use the accusative in cases where the subject’s animacy is equal to or lower than the object’s animacy” (p. 6).

(14) Tucuxra’ ra’a chruun man xruj [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]
    break branch tree acc pot ‘The tree branch broke the pot.’

(15) ?Tucuxra’ ra’a chruun xruj [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]
    break branch tree pot ‘The tree branch broke the pot.’
This is interesting when compared to (10). The subject and object are both equal in animacy (being animate named humans ‘Juan’ and ‘Maria’), and Broadwell (2022) notes that man is optional.

(10) Racuíj Juaná man/Ø Mariá [Broadwell, 2022, p. 4]
    help Juana acc/Ø Maria
    ‘Juana helped Maria.’

This means that relative global animacy when comparing the subject and object is not the only factor for some speakers to determine the optionality of man. If the relative animacy were the only factor, man should always be optional in sentence with equally animate (or inanimate) subjects and objects like in (14) and (15). Perhaps personhood may also play a more important role than previously noted in Copala Triqui research. Sentences with named human subjects and objects may not be as ambiguous for Triqui speakers.

To reiterate, man is required for animate pronominal objects. However, for inanimate and non-human pronominal objects, Broadwell (2022) notes that accusative man is optional, as seen in (16).

    Maria cook meat and I:s eat acc/Ø it
    ‘Maria cooked meat and I ate it.’

Broadwell (2022) appears to be making a local assessment of the optionality of man, that it’s optionality depends solely on qualities of the object (being inanimate and non-human pronominals). However, based on this example, it is impossible to make a local or global assessment. Perhaps there is a local motivation that applies, and man is optional across the board for all inanimate and non-human pronominal objects. However, the optionality could instead be based on the relative animacy of the subject and object. In (16), the subject ‘Maria’ is an animate human, and is more prominent than the inanimate, non-human pronominal object. Based on Broadwell (2022)’s observations that speakers consider the relative animacy of the subject and object, the object (an inanimate non-human, ‘meat’) could be optionally marked because it is less prominent than the subject (a named human, ‘Maria’).

5. Data and Suggestions for Future Elicitation

Using the guidelines from Bárány and Kalin (2020) as a baseline, I have identified nine types of subjects and objects. This is a system that more precisely labels the various intersecting factors that may affect DOM in Copala Triqui. The types of subjects and objects include:

- first person pronominals,
- second person pronominals,
• third person animate pronominals,
• third person inanimate pronominals,
• named humans,
• named non-humans,
• human words (like boy or grandmother),
• animate non-humans, and
• inanimate non-humans.

Using the chart (17), we can visualize all the possible combinations of these nine types of subject and objects, 81 in total. Each box in the chart corresponds to a numbered example below. I used examples from Hollenbach (1984), Hollenbach (1992), and Broadwell (2022) to populate the chart with data that has already been collected for the different combinations. I found examples for 18 different combinations, and these are marked in the chart using (^). Given that I only consulted three sources to identify examples, it is likely that there are additional, relevant data points that could be added to the chart.

There are 63 combinations for which I could not find an example in the data. This indicates that a lack of information regarding all the inter-related factors that may affect DOM. For these combinations, I have written examples in English that researchers can use in future Copala Triqui elicitation. Once there is data for the entire chart, we can make further conclusions about the most important factors and the relationship between factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>1 Pro</th>
<th>2 Pro</th>
<th>3 (A) Pro</th>
<th>3 (I) Pro</th>
<th>Named Human</th>
<th>Named Non-Human</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>(A) Non-human</th>
<th>(I) Non-human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (A) Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td>36^</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38^</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40^</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42^</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (I) Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td>45^</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Human</td>
<td></td>
<td>54^</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56^</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58^</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61^</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Non-Human</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) non-human</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83^</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87^</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) non-human</td>
<td></td>
<td>90^</td>
<td>91^</td>
<td>92^</td>
<td>93^</td>
<td>94^</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96^</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(18) First person pronominal subject/First person pronominal object
a. I hit myself.
b. I help myself.

(19) Second person pronominal subject/First person pronominal object
a. You helped me.
b. You kicked me.

(20) Third person animate pronominal subject/First person pronominal object
a. She kicked me.
b. He sees me.
c. It (the dog) bit me.

(21) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/First person pronominal object
a. It (the branch) hurt me.
b. It (the pot) hit me.

(22) Named human subject/First person pronominal object
a. Juan sees me.
b. Juan found me.

(23) Named non-human subject/First person pronominal object
a. Fido (dog name) bit me.
b. Fido helps me.

(24) Human subject/First person pronominal object
a. The woman sees me.
b. My grandma finds me.

(25) Animate non-human subject/First person pronominal object
a. The dog bit me.
b. The rabbit killed me.

(26) Inanimate non-human subject/First person pronominal object
a. The branch hurt me.
b. The pot hit me.

(27) First person pronominal subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. I see you.
b. I kick you.

(28) Second person pronominal subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. You kick yourself.
b. You see yourself.

(29) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. She killed you.
b. He helped you.

(30) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. It (the branch) hit you.
b. It (the branch) hurt you.

(31) Named human subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. Juan sees you.
b. Juan bites you.

(32) Named non-human subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. Fido bit you.
b. Fido found you.

(33) Human subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. The boy found you.
b. The sister bites you.

(34) Animate non-human subject/ Second person pronominal object

a. The dog finds you.
b. The rabbit bites you.

(35) Inanimate non-human subject/ Second person pronominal object
a. The branch hits you.
b. The food killed you.

(36) First person pronominal subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. ticawij13 nij4 man3 zoj3 a32 [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 188]  
   pot:kill 1:pl acc his dec  
   ‘We will kill him.’
b. I killed him.
c. I see her.

(37) Second person pronominal subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. You like her.
b. You kicked him.
c. You kicked it (the fox).

(38) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. neje3 zoj3 majan13 zoj3 a32 [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 188]  
   con:sense 3:m:s self 3:m:s dec  
   ‘He sees himself.’
b. ticawij 3 zoj3 man3 majan13 zoj3 a32 [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 188]  
   com:kill 3:m:s body self 3:m:s dec  
   ‘He killed himself.’
c. He kicked her.
d. She visits him.
e. He sees it (the dog).

(39) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. It (the branch) hit it (the rabbit).
b. It (the illness) killed it (the fox).
c. It (the oven) cooked it (the food).
d. It (the illness) killed her.

(40) Named human subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. Racuíj Juán man no’ [Broadwell, 2022, p. 1]  
   help Juan acc 3:f:s  
   ‘Juan helped her.’
b. Maria sees it (the butterfly).
(41) Named non-human subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. Fido (a dog) bites her.
b. Fido (a dog) kills it (a skunk).

(42) Human subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. **cene’e xana man zo’ a** [Hollenbach, 1984, p. 191]
   saw woman to 3:m:s dec
   ‘The woman saw him.’
b. The boyfriend loves her.

(43) Animate non-human subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. The skunk eats it (the fox).
b. The dog hurts her.

(44) Inanimate non-human subject/ Third person animate pronominal object

a. The handsaw hurts her.
b. The branch hits him.

(45) First person pronounal subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. **Mariá ri’yanj nee ne’ ūnj chá man/Ø yo’.** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 7]
   Maria cook meat and 1:s eat acc/Ø it
   ‘Maria cooked meat and I ate it.’
b. I made it (the necklace).
c. I broke it (the oven).

(46) Second person pronounal subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. You find it (the shoe).
b. You harvest it (the corn).

(47) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. She eats it (the rice).
b. It (the dog) bites it (the shoe).
c. He sells it (the necklace).
(48) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. It (the handsaw) breaks it (the wheel).
b. It (the branch) hits it (the pot).

(49) Named human subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. Maria sees it (the lamp)
b. Juan likes it (the house).

(50) Named non-human subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. Fido eats it (the rice).
b. Fido breaks it (the pot).

(51) Human subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. The grandma sells it (the corn).
b. The father-in-law drinks it (the water).

(52) Animate non-human subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. The skunk eats it (the tortilla).
b. The fox breaks it (the pot).

(53) Inanimate non-human subject/ Third person inanimate pronominal object

a. The oven cooks it (the tortilla).
b. The handsaw breaks it (the wheel).

(54) First person pronominal subject/ Named human object

a. **Narqué 'unj man Becky man nii no’** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 2]
  return 1:s acc Becky dat mother 3:f:s
  ‘I returned Becky to her mother.’
b. I like Maria.
c. I visit Juan.

(55) Second person pronominal subject/ Named human object

a. You like Maria.
b. You killed Juan.
(56) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Named human object

con:sense 3:f:s acc John dec
‘She sees John.’

con:sense 3:m:s John dec
‘He sees John.’

(57) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Named human object

a. It (the branch) hit Maria.
b. It (illness) killed Maria.

(58) Named human subject/ Named human object

a. **Racuíj Juaná man/Ø** **Mariá** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 4]
help Juana acc/Ø Maria
‘Juana helped Maria.’

(59) Named non-human subject/ Named human object

a. Fido bit Maria.
b. Fido sees Juan.

(60) Human subject/ Named human object

a. The older sister sees Maria.
b. The boyfriend helps Juan.

(61) Animate non-human subject/ Named human object

a. **Chan’ chuvee man** **Mariá** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]
bite dog acc Maria
‘The dog bit Maria.’
b. **?Chan’ chuvee Maria** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]
bite dog Maria
‘The dog bit Maria.’

(62) Inanimate non-human subject/ Named human object

a. The illness kills Maria.
b. The wheel hit Juan.

(63) First person pronominal subject/ Named non-human object

a. I bought Fido.
b. We like Fido.

(64) Second person pronominal subject/ Named non-human object

a. You bought Fido.
b. You like Fido.

(65) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Named non-human object

a. She likes Fido.
b. He killed Fido.
c. They find Fido.

(66) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Named non-human object

a. It (the branch) hit Fido.
b. It (the illness) killed Fido.

(67) Named human subject/ Named non-human object

a. Maria sees Fido.
b. Juan finds Fido.

(68) Named non-human subject/ Named non-human object

a. Fido sees Spot.
b. Spot bites Fido.

(69) Human subject/ Named non-human object

a. The girl sees Spot.
b. The godfather kicks Fido.

(70) Animate non-human subject/ Named non-human object

a. The hummingbird sees Spot.
b. The fox helps Spot.
(71) Inanimate non-human subject/ Named non-human object

a. The handsaw hurt Fido.
b. The illness killed Spot.

(72) First person pronominal subject/ Human object

a. I see the grandma.
b. We find the boy.

(73) Second person pronominal subject/ Human object

a. You find the girlfriend.
b. You kick the older sister.

(74) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Human object

a. She sees the godfather.
b. He helps the father-in-law.

(75) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Human object

a. It (the illness) kills the boy.
b. It (the handsaw) hurt the woman.

(76) Named human subject/ Human object

a. Maria sees the man.
b. Juan helps the woman.

(77) Named non-human subject/ Human object

a. Fido sees the boy.
b. Spot helps the grandma.

(78) Human subject/ Human object

a. The boy sees the girl.
b. The girlfriend helps the father-in-law.

(79) Animate non-human subject/ Human object

a. The fox bites the boy.
b. The skunk sees the woman.

(80) Inanimate non-human subject/ Human object

a. The handsaw hurt the woman.
b. The branch hit the man.

(81) First person pronominal subject/ Animate non-human object

a. I see the dog.
b. We kick the skunk.

(82) Second person pronominal subject/ Animate non-human object

a. You help the fox.
b. You kill the skunk.

(83) Third person animate pronominal subject/ Animate non-human object

a. Nij so' tígüí xe' man [chuvee se chan' Mariá [___].]³\mⅣc
   3:m:pl kick acc dog rel bite Maria [gap]
   ‘They kicked the dog that Maria bit.’ [Broadwell, 2022, p. 11]
b. He finds the butterfly.

(84) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/ Animate non-human object

a. It (the illness) killed the fox.
b. It (the branch) hit the racoon.

(85) Named human subject/ Animate non-human object

a. Maria sees the dog.
b. Juan bites the skunk.

(86) Named non-human subject/ Animate non-human object

a. Spot sees the hummingbird.
b. Fido finds the ant.

(87) Human subject/ Animate non-human object

a. cajnej⁵ xu³ cua² *an¹ tucu³ ya³² catuun³¹ tajnaj³²
   com:take:away grandmother rabbit waist ghost
right:now dec
‘Our grandmother took the rabbit off of the middle of the middle of the scarecrow just then.’

b. The boy sees the bird.
c. The woman kills the deer.

(88) Animate non-human subject/Animate non-human object

a. The fox bites the bird.
b. The deer sees the dog.

(89) Inanimate non-human subject/Animate non-human object

a. It (the illness) kills the bird.
b. It (the branch) hit the fox.

(90) First person pronominal subject/Inanimate non-human object

a. ‘unj\textsuperscript{1} ci’ya\textsuperscript{3} we\textsuperscript{*3} a\textsuperscript{32} [Hollenbach, 1984, p. 317]
   1:s made house dec
   'I built the house.'
b. I broke the wheel.

(91) Second person pronominal subject/Inanimate non-human object

a. ci’ya\textsuperscript{3} zo\textsuperscript{1} we\textsuperscript{*3} a\textsuperscript{32} [Hollenbach, 1984, p. 275]
   made 2:s house dec
   'You built the house.'
b. You broke the wheel.
c. You cook the food.

(92) Third person animate pronominal subject/Inanimate non-human object

a. ranj\textsuperscript{5} noj\textsuperscript{3} nuu\textsuperscript{5} a\textsuperscript{32} [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 187]
   con:buy she corn dec
   'She buys corn.'
b. He cooks food.
c. It (the dog) bites the shoe.

(93) Third person inanimate pronominal subject/Inanimate non-human object
a. **guun**³ **nucuaj**¹³ **quij**³² **yoj**³ / **cachen**⁴ **yoh**³ **riaan**³²

   com:become strong mountain that com:pass it:inan face

   `The mountain was strong enough; it surpassed the water.'

b. It (the branch) broke the pot.

c. It (the oven) cooked the food.

(94) Named human subject/ Inanimate non-human object

a. **Mariá ri’yanj nee ne'unj chá man/Ø yo'.** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 7]

   Maria cook meat and 1:s eat acc/Ø it

   `Maria cooked meat and I ate it.'

b. **tu’vej⁵ gwaaj³ rujwi'ja³** [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 187]

   con:sell John charcoal dec

   `John sells charcoal.'

(95) Named non-human subject/ Inanimate non-human object

a. Fido eats the tortilla.

b. Spot finds the shoe.

(96) Human subject/ Inanimate non-human object

a. **quirii**³² **cha**³ **na**¹ **naa**³¹ **a**³² [Hollenbach, 1992, p. 187]

   com:take:out woman cornfield dec

   `The woman harvested the cornfield.

b. The boy breaks the necklace.

c. The girl wears the necklace.

(97) Animate non-human subject/ Inanimate non-human object

a. The fox bites the shoe.

b. The dog breaks the pot.

(98) Inanimate non-human subject/ Inanimate non-human object

a. **Tucuxra' ra'a chruun man xruj** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]

   break branch tree acc pot

   `The tree branch broke the pot.'

b. ?**Tucuxra' ra'a chruun xruj** [Broadwell, 2022, p. 6]

   break branch tree pot

   `The tree branch broke the pot.'
6. Conclusion

In this paper, I provided an overview of the history of research on the accusative marker man in Copala Triqui through the examination of works by Hollenbach (1984), Hollenbach (1992), and Broadwell (2022). Furthermore, the work of these authors was recontextualized within the framework described by Bárány and Kalin (2020) regarding how animacy and personhood can trigger DOM. I applied the concepts of global and local motivations to the current explanations for DOM to expound upon a different angle for interpreting results.

I have also identified two important recommendations for future research on this topic. The first area is to investigate the optionality of man with non-human subjects and objects of equal animacy. For example, attention should be paid to the interactions between animals or inanimate objects. If DOM is required to make these constructions less confusing, this would be a deviation from the hierarchy in (2). Personhood is more prominent on the scale and more likely to be overtly marked.

The second area of research is the potential optionality of overt case for inanimate and non-human pronominal objects. Based on the examples available to me, we cannot decisively conclude if this optionality would be triggered by local or global motivations. Future research should include elicitation to provide examples of inanimate subjects paired with inanimate pronominal objects.

These areas of further research cannot be completed without the collection of more data. I identified nine types of subjects and objects which may influence DOM. Using the chart (17), I visualized all the possible combinations of the nine subject and object types. This chart allowed me to analyze which combinations already have relevant data and which are lacking. Furthermore, I proposed suggested elicitation sentences for the missing data points. Once we have an array of sample sentences for every combination, we will have a more robust account of which factors are most important in differential object in Copala Triqui.
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Abbreviations
1 = first person
3 = third person
acc = accusative
com = completitive
con = continuative
dat = dative
dec = declarative
f = feminine
inan = inanimate
m = masculine
pl = plural
pot = potential
q = question particle/marker
rel = relative
s = singular