

### What is the D in DOM (Differential Object Marking)?

Animacy and referentiality are widely perceived to be the two main factors in triggering Differential Object Marking (DOM) in Romance and beyond (Rohlf's (1971), Roegiest (1979), Zamboni (1993), cf Serzant and Witzlack-Makarevich (2018)). Furthermore, special categories such as personal pronouns and Proper nouns in the form of names and titles have also been shown to trigger DOM more regularly than lexical common nouns (Nocentini (1992:228), Sornicola (1997:77, 1998:422)). While animacy of the object noun is a lexical constant (De Swart and De Hoop (2006:601-607)), referentiality in terms of definiteness and specificity is subject to microparametric variation as the functional category D(eterminer) can be realised in different ways (Crisma and Longobardi (forthcoming)). This paper proposes a formal microparametric analysis of DOM in Western varieties of Romance (*ad*) where the D parameter is argued to be a determinant in the object marking of lexical nouns, personal pronouns and Proper nouns where grammatical and semantic distinctions in Person, Number and Divinity may also trigger DOM (Silverstein (1976), Aissen (2003)). All such factors may be traced back to Medieval Romance where referentiality of the object is a key DOM-factor before its generalisation to all human/animate nouns as in Spanish (Heusinger (2008)) and also to Latin where preposition AD has selectional restrictions on D which seem to have survived in Modern Romance and created intermediary types of DOM.

In the nominal domain, *ad* as used in DOM may be analysed as K(ase) which is merged above the DP (Bruge and Brugger (1994), cf Lamontagne and Travis (1987)), and its use varies between Spanish and Italian dialects (Iemmolo (2007), Cicotti (2013)) in that while animate (human and non-human) objects are optionally marked by *ad* only if non-specific in Spanish (1a), Italian dialects have optionality or even ungrammaticality if the human object is indefinite (1b-c), non-specific (1d) and non-individual (plural) (1e-g), and some Italian dialects even show DOM on definite inanimate objects marked by demonstratives (1h-i):

- 1a) *necesita (a) una enfermera*  
 need-PRES.3SG AD a nurse  
*que pas-e la mañana con ella*  
 REL.PRO spend-PRES.SUBJ.3SG ART morningwith her  
 'She needs a(ny) nurse to spend the morning with her.' (Spanish) (Leonetti (2004:80))
- 1b) *ammazz-aru (\*a) un cristianu a Giurgenti*  
 kill-PRET.3PL AD a person at Gargento  
 'They killed a person in Gargento.' (Sicilian) (Iemmolo (2007:5))
- 1c) *anti pigau (\*a) una picciocca*  
 have-3PL snatch.PERF.PTCP AD a girl  
 'They snatched a girl.' (Sardinian) (Iemmolo (2007:8))
- 1d) *cercave (\*a) nu crestiene ca sape lesca u Bbarese*  
 search-IMPERF.1SG AD a person REL.PRO know read ART Barese  
 'I was looking for a(ny) person who can read Barese.' (Barese) (Andriani 2015, 66)
- 1e) *arrubb-aru (a) i so cuscini*  
 snatch-PRET.3PL AD ART.PL his cousin-PL  
 'They snatched his cousins.' (Sicilian) (Iemmolo (2007:5))
- 1f) *app-u bi-u (a) is pippiusu*  
 have-1SG see-PERF.PTCP AD ART.PL child.PL  
 'I saw the children.' (Sardinian) (Iemmolo (2007:8))
- 1g) *io serv-o (\*a) uomini e donne*  
 I serve-PRES.1SG AD men and women  
 'I serve men and women.' (Neapolitan) (Fiorentino (2003:127))
- 1h) *te dewe (a) kkwiste*  
 you owe.PRES.1SG AD this  
 'I owe you this.' (Colobraro, in Basilicata) (Manzini and Savoia (2005:509))
- 1i) *miette a kkweiste*  
 put.IMPERATIVE.2SG AD this  
 'Put this one.' (Gorgoglione, in Basilicata) (Manzini and Savoia (2005:508))

Furthermore, while it is widely noted that personal pronouns and Proper nouns are regularly if not obligatorily marked by *ad* in Spanish and Italian dialects (Guardiano (2000:12), Fabregas (2013:9)), DOM is triggered preferentially on first/second person and/or singular pronouns in various Italian dialects (2a-b) and Portuguese (2c) or if it denotes divinity (2d) or authority (2e) in Portuguese (Aldon and della Costanza (2013)):

- 2a) *'camenu a m'mi / a t'ti / (\*a) issu*  
 call.PRES.3PL AD me AD you.SG AD him  
 'They call me/you/him.' (Borbona, in Lazio) (Manzini and Savoia (2005:505ff))
- 2b) *ji cam-o a t'te / a v'vo / (a) (k)kul'lu*  
 I call-PRES.SG AD you.SG AD you.PL AD him  
 'I call you (singular)/you (plural)/him.' (Canosa Sannita, in Umbria) (Manzini and Savoia (2005:505))

- 2c) João viu a mim / \*a nós / \*a ele  
 João see.PRET.3SG AD me / AD us / AD him  
 ‘João saw me/us/him.’ (European/Brazilian Portuguese) (Kliffner (1995:109))
- 2d) deve-mos am-ar a Deus / (a) João  
 must-PRES.1PL love-INF AD God AD João  
 ‘We must love God/João.’ (European/Brazilian Portuguese) (Roegiest (1979:38), Schwenter (2014:238))
- 2e) tem que respeit-ar a-o chefe/presidente  
 have.PRES.3SG COMP respect-INF AD-ART boss/president  
 ‘He has to respect his boss/president.’ (European Portuguese) (Kliffner (1995:109))

The roles of D in the marking of definite/specific/individual nouns (1) and in the marking of first/second person and/or singular pronouns and divinity/authority (2) are indeed attested in Medieval Romance (Meier (1947:244-245), Zorraquino (1976:559-565)) and may be traced back to Latin AD as an allative preposition ‘to(wards)’ (Adams and de Melo (2016)) which, in addition to selecting human/animate objects in thematic roles such as ‘recipient/beneficiary/experiencer’ (Blake (2001:33)), also selects referential objects regardless of animacy as AD denotes ‘destination/direction’ whose object is regularly definite (3a), specific (3b) and individual (3c):

- 3a) et respe-xit Dominus ad Abel et ad munera eius  
 and look.back-PERF.3SG Lord AD Abel and AD gifts his  
 ‘... and the Lord looked back at Abel and his gifts.’ (Latin Bible *Genesis* 4:4)
- 3b) patri-ae quoque vell-e-t ad oras respic-ere  
 fatherland-GEN.SG also want-IMPERF.SUBJ-3SG AD shore-ACC.PL look.back-INF  
 ‘... she also wanted to look back at the shores of her homeland...’ (Ovid *Metamorphosis* 11.546)
- 3c) vere-or ne... nunc ad Caecilian-am fabula-m spect-e-t  
 fear-PRES.1SG COMP now AD Caecilius-ACC.SG play-ACC.SG watch-PRES.SUBJ-3SG  
 ‘I fear that he may now watch the play of Caecilius.’ (Cicero *ad Atticum* 1.16.6)

Moreover, in the Christian and Medieval eras *ad* is regularly used in invocations where the object is a Proper noun denoting either divinity (4a-b) or authority (4c), which also seems to anticipate Romance (2):

- 4a) de profund-is clama-v-i ad te, Domin-e  
 From depth-ABL.PL shout-PERF-1SG AD you Lord  
 ‘From the depths of my heart, I called you, my Lord’ (*Psalmi* 129)
- 4b) Moyses ora-bat ad Dominum  
 Moses pray-IMPERF.3SG AD Lord  
 ‘Moses was praying to the Lord.’ (*Libri Maccabaorum* 2.10)
- 4c) venia-m... ad Domino poposce-bat  
 mercy-ACC.SG AD Lord demand-IMPERF.3SG  
 ‘She was begging the Lord for mercy.’ (*Chronicon Salernitanum* 11)

The D-parameter, therefore, can be seen to be at work in the historical-comparative distribution of Western Romance DOM where the selectional restrictions of *ad* seems to have created certain feature syncretisms in the marking of sub-types of objects, namely referential objects (1, 3) and divine/authoritative Proper nouns (2, 4). (Select) References:

- Aldon, J-P. and Della Costanza, M. (2013): ‘DOM en portugués: Proceso propio o influencia del español? Estudio preliminar’, in Rovira, C. and Schlumpf, S.(eds), *Acta Romanica Basiliensia (ARBA 24), Traspasando fronteras: Selección de trabajos presentados en el X Encuentro Hispano-Suizo de Filólogos Noveles*, Basilea, UniBasel, pp. 71-88; Andriani, L.(2015): ‘Semantic and Syntactic Properties of the Prepositional Accusative in Barese’, *Linguistica Atlantica* 34(2):61-78; Bruge, L. and Brugger, G. (1994): ‘On the accusative “A” in Spanish’, *Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Venice*, 4.1:3- 44; Crisma, P. and Longobardi, G. (forthcoming): ‘The parametric space associated with D’, in Armoskaite, S. and Miltschko, M. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Determiners*, Oxford: Oxford University Press; Fiorentino, G. (2003): ‘Prepositional objects in Neapolitan’, in: Fiorentino, G.(ed), *Romance Objects: Transitivity in Romance Languages*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, pp. 117-151; Guardiano, C. (2000): ‘Note sull’oggetto diretto preposizionale in siciliano’, in *L’Italia Dialettale*, Volume 61, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, pp.7-42; Iemmolo, G. (2007): ‘La marcatura differenziale dell’oggetto in siciliano: un’analisi contrastiva’, in *Actes du XXV Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, Innsbruck, pp. 341-350; Leonetti, M. (2004): ‘Specificity and differential object marking in Spanish’, *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 3:75-114; Manzini, R. And Savoia, L. (2005): *I dialetti italiani: sintassi delle varietà italiane e romance: l’oggetto – l’ausiliare (prima parte)*, Volume 2, Edizioni dell’Orso; Seržant, Ilja/Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena (2018): *Diachrony of differential argument marking*, Language Science Press; Sornicola, R. (1997): ‘L’oggetto preposizionale in siciliano antico e in napoletano antico: considerazioni su un problema di tipologia diacronica’. *Italienische Studien* 18:66-80; Sornicola, R. (1998): ‘Processi di convergenza nella formazione di un tipo sintattico: la genesi ibrida dell’oggetto preposizionale’, in: *Les nouvelles ambitions de la linguistique diachronique, Actes du XXIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Vol. 2, pp. 419-427.