Historical-Comparative Variation of Romance Differential Object Marking

The use of Romance ad as a marker of Differential Object Marking (DOM) where ad regularly marks certain types of objects is an important phenomenon in Romance languages, especially Spanish which displays DOM more extensively than any other Romance variety (see Fabregas 2013 for a recent overview, and Bossong 1991 for a comparative and typological analysis of Spanish DOM). However, DOM is by no means restricted to Spanish as it is widely attested in all Romance varieties across time and space which renders it a pan-Romance phenomenon (Rolhfs 1971, 312; Roegiest 1979, 37; Nocentini 1985, 303; Zamboni 1993, 787-788). Furthermore, while the licensing factors for Romance DOM are well detailed and investigated, there are only superficial comparative analyses which have already revealed significant microvariations (see Meier 1948; Roegiest 1979; Aldon/della Costanza 2012 for comparisons of DOM in Spanish and Portuguese, Escandell-Vidal 2007; 2009; Pineda 2012 for comparisons between Spanish and Catalán, and Fiorentino 2003; Iemmolo 2007; Ciccotti 2013 for Italo-Romance DOM in relation to Spanish). Such microvariations suggest the possibility of parameterizing Romance DOM in terms of its licensing factors which could enhance not only our understanding of DOM in Spanish and other varieties of Romance but also the theoretical implications of DOM as a Case-marking phenomenon (Malchukov 2008) which, based on the microvariations in Romance, indicate that Case-marking can be highly variable and sensitive to the verbal and nominal properties of the grammatical object relation (Serzant/Witzlack-Makarevich 2018). This has important ramifications for formal parametric syntax too as the historical-comparative distribution of Romance DOM shows that while the grammaticalization of ad is categorically the same throughout Romance, it is subject to different analogical pressures which have yielded subtly different forms of DOM.

This paper proposes a comparative analysis and formal typology of DOM in Western Romance and the various licensing factors which underlie it, and there are four sections: section 1 proposes a formal analysis of Romance DOM where its licensing factors are structurally embedded into the cartographic structures of the Romance nominal and clausal domains and it is argued here that different functional

---

1 This paper is a reworked version of several old papers of mine which were delivered at different conferences in the past, namely Going Romance 2013 (University of Amsterdam), Diachrony of Differential Object Marking 2017 (Institut Nationale des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Paris), Ohio State University Congress in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics 2018 (Ohio State University), Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages 2018 (University of York, Toronto) and Microvariations in Romance Differential Object Marking 2018 (Institut Nationale des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Paris). My heartfelt thanks to the audiences and organisers who gave me the opportunity to receive expert feedback and gain a much better understanding of this topic. I would also like to thank my mentors in Romance linguistics and theoretical syntax, Professor Nigel Vincent, Professor Giuseppe Longobardi and Professor Ian Roberts for advising me on this most fascinating topic, as well as Professor Chris Pountain and Professor Ian Mackenzie for reviewing earlier drafts of this and other papers. My colleagues at the University of York have also given me a big helping hand, namely Dr Monica Irimia for her expertise and tireless enthusiasm in this shared obsession of ours. Lastly, I must acknowledge my old Spanish teacher at Sherborne School (UK), Mr Craig Bryson, for introducing me to personal a in Summer 2002. I would not have an academic career in Romance linguistics if he had not corrected me on veo (‘a) Juan ‘I see John’ and (‘a) mí me parece… ‘To me it seems…” in my homework assignments.

2 In addition to ad which is used as a DOM-marker in almost all branches of Western Romance (Rolhfs 1971), pe is used as a DOM-marker in Romanian (Mardale 2002), though its different etymology suggests that it is a separate phenomenon and its shared properties with ad may well be incidental in line with the universal cross-linguistic properties of DOM (Bossong 1991). In this paper, I focus solely on Romance ad and leave Romanian pe for much more qualified scholars.
categories have different selectional properties with regards to ad which constitute the effects of DOM as seen in Romance and beyond; section 2 compares the distribution of ad as a marker of DOM in different Romance varieties and three formal types of DOM are established on a scale of strength (strong-intermediate-weak), as Romance DOM is significantly more robust in certain varieties (e.g. Spanish) than in others and its comparative microvariations are here captured systematically with appeal to the formal parameters of DOM; section 3 analyses the possible motivations behind each licensing factor of Romance DOM which, on grounds of its comparative discrepancies, may be argued to be independently triggered both synchronically and diachronically, and in light of the Latin origins of (proto-)Romance DOM (Sornicola 1997; 1998) different mechanisms are here identified for each licensing factor which not only accounts for the microvariations in Romance DOM but also for the layeredness and variability in its diachronic formation; section 4 contains a theoretical discussion on Romance DOM within contemporary parametric theory (Biberauer 2008) and it is concluded that in order to capture the microvariations in Romance DOM, it is necessary to combine formal parameters with non-syntactic factors which speaks for a much more probabilistic syntax-semantics interface than is envisaged in Minimalism (Chomsky 1995).

1 Differential Object Marking: Nominal and Verbal Parameters

Detailed analyses of DOM in Romance and beyond reveal numerous licensing factors which may be broadly divided into nominal and verbal (Seržant and Witzlack-Makarevich 2018), and both types of parameters project hierarchies of markedness where non-canonical categories are morphologically marked in comparison to unmarked canonical ones (Bossong 1991,160; Aissen 2003, 436; von Heusinger and Kaiser 2005, 38). As both nominal and verbal parameters of DOM are complex and multivariate, they are analysed separately in this section.

1.1 Nominal Differential Object Marking: Animacy and Referentiality

It is well established that animacy and referentiality of the nominal object argument are the two main nominal factors in the licensing of Romance DOM (Rolhfs 1971, 312-313; Roegiest 1979, 37; Nocentini 1985, 299), and these properties have been fine-grained in the literature to produce the following scales on which higher categories are more likely to be marked than lower ones:

Animacy scale (Silverstein 1976, 176; Aissen 2003, 438; Croft 2003, 130):

1) Human > Animate > Inanimate

Definiteness scale (Lazard 1984, 283; Aissen 2003, 438; Croft 2003, 132):

2) Personal Pronoun > Proper name > Definite NP > Indefinite specific NP > Non-specific NP

Furthermore, nominal attributes such as person, number and category also display different propensities for DOM which are illustrated as follows:4

Person scale (Silverstein 1976, 169; Dixon 1979, 85):

3) 1st person > 2nd person > 3rd person

---

3 While this paper recognises the microvariations in Romance DOM, it is beyond the scope of this paper (if not practically impossible) to document DOM in all extant Romance varieties and compare them in detail. This comparative analysis, therefore, seeks to identify the macrotypes of DOM in Romance leaving plenty of room for (many) more forms of microvariation in individual, and especially underdocumented, varieties. I thank Dr Mark Hoff and Dr Alice Corr for pointing this out to me.

4 Romance noun phrases also exhibit distinctions of grammatical gender, though there is, as far as I know, no evidence for DOM in relation to gender, which is hence excluded from this discussion.

5 It has been pointed out to me that the person hierarchy correlates with animacy, as 1st/2nd person pronouns are necessarily human/animate whereas 3rd person pronouns may not be.
Number scale (Silverstein 1976, 169; Kliffer 1995, 96-97):
4) Singular > Dual > Plural

Noun types (Dixon 1979, 85; Laca 1995, 88-89; Croft 2003, 130):
5) Pronouns > Proper Names > Common Nouns

In sum, the nominal parameter of Romance DOM may be summarised thus (Dixon 1979, 85; Lazard 1984, 283; Heusinger 2003, 5; Laca 2006, 438):
6) 1st Person Pronoun > 2nd Person Pronoun > 3rd Person Pronoun > Proper Nouns > Human Common Nouns > Animate Common Nouns > Inanimate Common Noun

While lexical semantic features such as animacy (1) and categorial features (3-5) are inherent properties of the object noun which remain generally constant (Bossong 1991, 158-163; De Swart/De Hoop 2006, 601-607), referentiality (2) is a discursive-pragmatic property which is determined morphologically and contextually (Seržant/Witzlack-Makarevich 2018, 5-12). Furthermore, a distinction has been made between definiteness and specificity in that while the former can be indicated by determiners, the latter is largely inferred from discourse and pragmatics:

7a) encontré a un abogado que
    find-PRET.1SG AD a lawyer REL.PRO
    no cobr-a l-os ojo-s de la cara
    NEG charge-PRES.3SG ART-PL eye-PL from ART face

    ‘I found a lawyer who does not charge an arm and a leg.’

7b) qui-sier-a encontrar un abogado que
    want-IMPERF.SUBJ-1SG find.INF a lawyer REL.PRO
    no cobr-a l-os ojo-s de la cara
    NEG charge-IMPERF.SUBJ-3SG ART-PL eye-PL from ART face

    ‘I would want to find a lawyer who would not charge an arm and a leg.’
    (Kliffer 1995, 102-103)

In this minimal pair (7a-b), although the object is headed by the same indefinite article (un abogado ‘a lawyer’), the object marked by ad (a un abogado (7a)) presupposes the existence of such a lawyer which warrants the use of the indicative in the modifying relative clause (… que no cobra…) whereas the unmarked object (Ø un abogado (7b)) is hypothetical and hence non-specific, as indicated by the use of the subjunctive in the modifying relative clause (… que no cobrara…). Specificity, therefore, plays a subtle yet significant role in Romance DOM (Leonetti 2004).

Moreover, it has been pointed out that determiners are essential for DOM in Romance in that ad is generally banned from marking bare nouns and is permitted mainly in the presence of determiners in the D(eterminer)P(hrase) above the lexical N(oun)P(hrase) (Leonetti 2004, 82-84; Guardiano 2010, 109), which suggests that ad is merged in a functional head above D in the extended projection of the NP which may be equated with K(ase) as it functions as a Case-marker for marking nominal arguments (Brugge/Brugger 1994; cf Travis/Lamontagne 1986). Moreover, nominal categories such as pronouns and proper nouns can be further decomposed in the D-layer as the former indicate general phi-features such as Person and Number (Postal 1969) and proper nouns are inherently specific in referring to unique referents (Longobardi 1994, 621-628; Croft 2003, 130). In the cartographic structure of nominal arguments (Cinque 2002), therefore, different features in the DP can be argued to select ad as a Case-marker (K), the probe features for which (u-K) may be parasitic on different features and projections (Mordoñedó 2007, 163ff), namely the

---

6 This may correlate with countability, since it has been argued that individual count nouns are more likely to be marked than non-individual mass nouns (Laca 1995,78-81; Kliffer 1995, 96).
lexical root of the head noun containing features of humanness and animacy (human/animate), proper nouns which check definiteness in the highest definiteness projection (D) (Longobardi 1994, 640), and pronominal Phi-projections which decompose into PersonP (Pers) and NumberP (Num) with their respective feature values as well as features of specificity (i-specific) (7a-b):

As nouns are widely assumed to undergo movement to D and K (Longobardi 1994; Vincent/van Kemenade 1997), the microvariations in Romance DOM may be modelled on the position of probe features (u-K) which correlates with different projections in the DP by virtue of their featural content. In the next section, the licensing factors for DOM in the verbal domain are similarly analysed.

1.2 Verbal Differential Object Marking: ‘Affectedness’ and Aktionsart

Similar to nouns, different types of verbs have been shown to have different tendencies for selecting ad as verbs that are more ‘affective’ tend to trigger DOM more often than less ‘affective’ ones where ‘affectedness’ is correlated with transitivity and refers to the resultative change of state in the object (Hopper/Thompson 1980, 252-253; Tsunoda 1985, 388), as seen in Spanish:

9) matar ‘to kill’ > ver ‘to see’ > considerar ‘to consider’ > tener ‘to have’

However, such topical uses of ad are open to alternative explanations and may not necessarily stand as an independent factor for DOM. As topics denote known information and are generally referential (Dalrymple/Nikolaeva 2011), the use of ad in marking topics may be more economically subsumed within the referentiality scale of DOM (main text, 2). Furthermore, it has been shown that cross-linguistically dislocated objects have to be Case-marked due to the fact that they are non-adjacent to the main verb and Case-assignment is widely assumed to obey adjacency (Bobaljik/Wurmbrand 2008), and the use of ad in marking topics may be driven by Case-theoretic reasons, which is also seen in other constructions such as comparatives (Irimia/Guardiano 2016). In any case, it is unclear how topicality is related to other DOM-factors such as animacy either synchronically or diachronically (Melis 1995), which leaves its status in DOM in doubt. In my analysis, topicality is not treated as a unique factor for DOM but one that is related to other factors such as referentiality and Case-assignment (I am grateful to Dr Mario Della Costanza for our discussion on these points).

Another commonly postulated DOM-factor in Romance is topicality since it has been noted that left-dislocated topicalised objects are often obligatorily marked by ad (Berretta 1989; Iemmolo 2010; Della Costanza 2016; Belletti 2018):

i) *(a) muchos estudiantes, ya los conocía AD many students already them know-IMPERF.1SG
   ‘As for many students, I already knew them.’

ii) ya conocía (a) muchos estudiantes already know-IMPERF.1SG AD many students
   ‘I already knew many students.’ (Spanish) (von Heusinger 2008, 6)
As *matar* ‘to kill’ seems to have a bigger effect on its object, which can be analysed thematically as a patient undergoing the adversative action of killing, than *tener* ‘to have’ does on its own, which is a theme in possession (Pottier 1968, 87), the former obligatorily selects *ad* whereas the latter does not (von Heusinger/Kaiser 2011, 609), which indicates that *ad* can also be analysed as a marker of transitivity denoting ‘affectedness’ (Delbecque 1994 34-36). Within a formal framework of argument/event structure which models verbal predicates in terms of semantic primitives (Davidson 1967; Dowty 1979; Rappaport/Levin 1998; van Valin 2005), different A(rgument)-positions can be established for different types of verbs in accordance with their thematic and aspectual properties (Hale/Keyser 1993; 2002), and in the case of highly transitive ‘affective’ verbs there is postulated an extra functional layer denoting the change undergone by the object (BECOME) which may be labelled as Affect and in whose specifier are ‘affected’ objects marked by *ad* (KP) selected and merged (Torrego 1998; Mordoñedo 2007; López 2012), and above this there is another functional projection (CAUSE) introducing the external agentive initiator which may be labelled Voice (Ritter/Rosen 1993; Kratzer 1996).\(^9\) In accordance with standard Projection Principles of thematic arguments (Baker 1988; Butt 2006), therefore, the following verbal structure can be posited:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{SpecVoice} \quad \text{Voice'} \\
\text{[agent]} \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{AffectP} \\
\text{SpecAffect} \quad \text{Affect'} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{SpecV} \\
\text{t} \quad \text{SpecV'} \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

Since ‘affectedness’ defined as change undergone by the ‘affected’ object entails a natural endpoint to the event (Tenny 1994; Ritter/Rosen 2000; cf footnote 11), ‘affective’ verbs are regularly telic and can be marked for aspect, which is indeed the case with Romance DOM as it has been noted that *ad* is more compatible with telic verbs than with non-telic ones (Torrego 1998, 17ff), as shown in the following alternation where *ad* is obligatory with the telic (11b), but not the atelic (11a), interpretation of the Spanish verb *conocer* ‘to know/meet’:

\[^{10}\text{The agentivity of the subject has also been shown to have subtle DOM-effects as they constitute volitional/intentional agents which are also hallmarks of transitivity (Hopper/Thompson 1980, 252):}\]

\[^{9}\text{There are instances of Spanish *tener* selecting *ad* as a marker of its object, though in these cases the object of *tener* is not the literal possessum but an object under the influence of the subject which may be analysed as inclusion and hence be argued to be ‘affected’ (Delbecque 1994, 37-39):}\]

\[^{11}\text{It is also noted that objects of ‘affective’ verbs tend to be definite and quantized due to the fact that ‘affective’ verbs denote finite, as opposed to continuous, events (Ritter/Rosen 2000), which correlates with the referentiality scale of DOM (main text, 2).}\]
11a) conoc-en (a) un vecino
know-PRES.3PL AD a neighbour
‘They know a neighbour.’

11b) est-o-oy conoc-iendo a un vecino
COP-PRES.1SG know-PRES.PTCP AD a neighbour
‘I am getting to know a neighbour.’ (Torrego 1998, 32)

The verbal parameter of Romance DOM, therefore, distinguishes different A-positions in the V(erb)P(hrase) as projected by the event structure, and AffectP which is an essential component of highly transitive verbs may be argued to select ad in its specifier where ad marks the ‘affected’ object. Both nominal and verbal parameters of Romance DOM may now be combined to provide an overall structural representation.

1.3 Nominal and Verbal Parameters of Differential Object Marking: Formal Representation

In the nominal domain, Romance ad shows different selectional properties in line with the fact that DOM is licensed by different features in the internal structure of the DP such as lexical semantic features in the head noun (N) (human/animate), categorial features in the D-layer like pronominal (Pers/Num) and proper nouns (Proper), and the general definiteness/specificity (D) of the object noun (section 1.1), and similarly Romance ad is shown to correlate with different A-positions in the VP where ad can be argued to be selected by projections denoting ‘affectedness’ (AffectP) (section 1.2). In sum of both types of parameters, Romance DOM may be summarised in the following representation where ad (K) is selected by Affect in the extended projection of the VP as well as various projections in the DP.\footnote{As verbal properties related to ‘affectedness’ and nominal semantic and categorical features are not necessarily co-extensive (though see previous footnote), these two parameters entail mismatches in that one parameter may be generalised over the other (e.g. non-affected human/animate, affected non-human/inanimate). This will become clear in later parts of the paper.}

2.1 Spanish Differential Object Marking (strong)

As is well known, DOM is particularly prominent in Spanish among Romance languages (Bossong 1991, 147-151; Zamboni 1993, 787) and this is reflected by the fact that ad may be licensed independently and sufficiently by either nominal or verbal parameter (see footnote 12). In the nominal domain, ad is attested as a general animacy marker as it marks all animate objects encompassing humans.

\footnote{As verbal properties related to ‘affectedness’ and nominal semantic and categorical features are not necessarily co-extensive (though see previous footnote), these two parameters entail mismatches in that one parameter may be generalised over the other (e.g. non-affected human/animate, affected non-human/inanimate). This will become clear in later parts of the paper.}
(13a), animals (13b), place-names denoting communities or groups of people (13c), and any object that might be associated with an animate being e.g. musical (13d) or literary composition (13e):  

13a) ve-o a la muchacha  
see-PRES.1SG AD the girl  
‘I see the girl.’ (Kliffer 1995, 93)  

13b) vi-a a un perro  
see-PRET.1SG AD a dog  
‘I saw a dog.’ (Pensado 1995, 19-20)  

13c) estudi-a a l-pueblo de Numancia  
investigate-PRES.3SG AD-the town of Numancia  
‘(S)he investigates the population of Numancia.’ (Torrego 1999, 1799)  

13d) … se va a procurar en todo el mundo  
REFL.PRO go-PRES.3SG AD try.INF in whole ART world  
tocar mucho a Beethoven?  
play.INF much AD Beethoven  
‘… he goes off to try and play a lot of Beethoven all over the world?’ (Laca 1995, 62)  

13e) he leí-do a Virgilio  
have.PRES.1SG read-PERF.PTCP AD Virgil  
‘I have read Virgil.’ (Hill 1920, 217)  

Furthermore, while it is widely noted that non-specificity gives rise to optionality in DOM (14a-b, cf 7a-b), it has also been pointed out that ad is not prohibited from marking non-specific objects as these can still be marked by ad, albeit optionally (14b), which renders animacy a sufficient criterion for Spanish DOM with specificity relegated to being a secondary factor (Kliffer 1995, 102; Leonetti 2004, 80ff):  

14a) necesit-a a una enfermera  
necesit-PRES.3SG AD a nurse  
que pas-a la mañana con ella  
REL.PRO spend-PRES.IND.3SG ART morning with her  
‘She needs a nurse who spends the morning with her.’  

14b) necesita (a) una enfermera  
necesita-PRES.3SG AD a nurse  
que pas-e la mañana con ella  
REL.PRO spend-PRES.SUBJ.3SG ART morning with her  
‘She needs a(n) nurse to spend the morning with her.’ (Leonetti 2004, 80)  

Moreover, Spanish DOM applies to inanimate objects too, which may or may not be interpretable as personified, especially when these are the objects of certain types of ‘affective’ verbs found in technical registers such as scientific and grammatical prose (García 2007, 64ff; von Heusinger/Kaiser 2008, 88-89):  

---

13 It should be mentioned that ad tends to be optional with non-human animate objects as these are not as regularly marked as human objects. My thanks to Professor Pountain for pointing this out to me.  
14 The meaning of community is evident in that fact that ad denotes the inhabitants of a place, without which the connotation of people is said to be lost (i) (cf main text, 13c), though there are examples of place-names which do not necessarily denote community but are marked for being proper names (ii):  

i) estudi-a el pueblo de Numancia  
study-PRES.3SG ART town of Numancia  
‘(S)he investigates the village of Numancia’ (Torrego 1999, 1799)  

ii) he visita-do a Zaragoza  
have.PRES.1SG visit-PERF.PTCP AD Zaragoza  
‘I have visited Zaragoza.’ (Kliffer 1995, 98)
15a) el entusiasmo venc-e a la dificultad
   ART enthusiasm conquer-PRES.3SG AD ART difficulty
   ‘Enthusiasm conquers difficulty.’ (García García 2007, 68)

15b) la primavera prece-d-e a-l verano
   ART spring preceed-PRES.3SG AD-ART summer
   ‘Spring precedes winter.’ (Laca 1995, 67)

15c) su voluntad obedec-e a la razón
   his will obey-PRES.3SG AD DEF.ART reason
   ‘His will obeys his reason.’ (Fabregas 2013, 15)

15d) el adjetivo modifica-d-a a-l sustantivo
   ART adjective modify-PRES.3SG AD-ART noun
   ‘The adjective modifies the noun.’ (Torrego 1999, 1801)

15e) l-os ácido-s atac-an a l-os metal-es
   ART-PL acid-PL attack-PRES.3PL AD ART-PL metal-PL
   ‘Acids attack metals.’ (Molho 1958, 214)

15f) l-as dificultad-es priv-an a l-as proyecto
   ART-PL difficulty-PL deprive-PRES.3PL AD-ART project
   de todo su atractivo inicial
   of all its attractiveness initial
   ‘The difficulties which I have just enumerated deprive the project of all its initial attractiveness.’ (adapted from Laca 1995, 69)

In these examples, while objects like dificultad ‘difficulty’ (15a), verano ‘summer’ (15b), razón ‘reason’ (15c) may be interpreted as personified forces of nature, others such as sustantivo ‘noun’ (15d), metales ‘metals’ (15e), proyecto ‘project’ (15f) are less likely so (Weissenrieder 1985; 1991), which indicates that ad may be functioning purely as a marker of transitivity in marking ‘affected’ objects regardless their nominal properties (Delbecque 1994, 38; García García 2007, 72ff).

Spanish DOM is hence robust in that ad is regularly used independently in both the nominal and verbal domains where it seems to have been generalized to all animate objects (13-14) as well as to all ‘affected’ objects (15), which may be represented thus (cf 12):

In the next sub-section, a comparison is made with Italo-Romance varieties, many of which also use ad as a marker of DOM, albeit to a smaller extent than Spanish.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} While standard Italian generally abstains from DOM apart from some pronominal and topical usages (Berretta 1989; Nocentini 1992), many Italian dialects, especially those from the south, do use ad for DOM (Berretta 1989; Guardiano 2000; Fiorentino 2003).
2.2 Italo-Romance Differential Object Marking (intermediate)

DOM in Italian dialects (see footnote 15) is more restricted than in Spanish in that *ad* tends to mark human objects (17a-d) to the exclusion of animals (17e-g) and affiliated objects (17h), unless there is independent motivation like personification (17i), high referentiality (17j), and proper names such as toponyms (17k):\footnote{16}

17a) **agg-io vis-to a Don Gennarino**

   'I saw Don Gennarino.' (Neapolitan) (Fiorentino 2003, 118)

17b) **canisicuvi a Luvici**

   'I met Luigi.' (Sicilian) (Iemmolo 2007, 4)

17c) **app-u vis-tu a Juanne**

   'I saw Giovanni.' (Sardinian) (Jones 1995, 38)

17d) **Giuanne acciamende a Mmarije Giovanni look.PRES.3SG AD Maria**

   'Giovanni looks at Maria.' (Barese) (Andriani 2015, 62)

17e) **ammazz-aru (*a) u cani kill-PRET.3PL AD ART dog**

   'They killed the dog.' (Sicilian) (Iemmolo 2007, 5)

17f) **app-o vis-tu (*a) su cane have-PRES.1SG see-PERF.PTCP AD his dog**

   'I saw his dog.' (Sardinian) (Jones 1995, 38)

17g) **so assute (*a) u cane COP.PRES.1SG exit.PERF.PTCP AD ART dog**

   'I have taken out the dog.' (Barese) (Andriani 2015, 70)

17h) **app-o leggi-du (*a) Platone read-PERF.PTCP AD Plato**

   'I read Plato.' (Sardinian) (Floricic 2003, 251)

17i) **puoie dicere avere serv-uto a lo Viento can.PRES.2SG say.INF have.INF serve-PERF.PTCP AD ART Wind**

   '… you can say that you have served the Wind.' (Neapolitan)

   (Fiorentino 2003, 124)

17j) **vuogghiu a ‘stu cani ‘cca want-PRES.1SG AD this dog here**

   'I want this dog here.' (Sicilian) (Guardiano 2000, 25)

17k) **app-o vis-tu a Nápoli have-PRES.1SG see-PERF.PTCP AD Napoli**

   'I have seen Napoli.' (Sardinian) (Floricic 2003, 251)

Furthermore, referentiality seems to play a bigger role in Italian than in Spanish (cf 14), since even if the object noun is human, *ad* has been shown to be non-obligatory or even ungrammatical in several varieties when the human object is either indefinite (18a-b), non-specific (18c) or non-individual (i.e. plural) (18d-f):

\footnote{16}{It is unclear whether verbal properties like ‘affectedness’ can license or catalyse Italo-Romance DOM, as shown in the following example where *ad* is prohibited even with a strongly ‘affective’ verb:}

i) **u stagnare squaggh-je (*a) u ffiierre ART tinsmith melt-PRES.3SG AD ART iron**

   ‘The tinsmith melts iron.’ (Barese) (Andriani 2015, 70)

In this sub-section, I limit my analysis of Italian DOM to the nominal properties of the object argument, which seem to be uniform across all types of verbs (Jones 1995, 38; Andriani 2015, 71).
18a) 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)

18b) anti pigau (*a) una piciocca have-3PL snatch.PERF.PTCP AD a girl ‘They snatched a girl.’ (Sardinian) (Iemmolo 2007, 8)

18c) cercave (*a) nu crestiene ca sape lesca search-IMPERF.1SG AD a person REL.PRO know read u Bbarese ART Barese ‘I was looking for a(ny) person who can read Barese.’ (Barese) (Andriani 2015, 66)

18d) arrubb-aru (a) i so cuscini snatch-PRET.3PL AD ART.PL his cousin-PL ‘They snatched his cousins.’ (Sicilian) (Iemmolo 2007, 5)

18e) 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)

18f) io serv-o (*a) uomini e donne I serve-PRES.1SG AD men and women ‘I serve men and women.’ (Neapolitan) (Fiorentino 2003, 127)

Moreover, in some dialects referentiality seems to be itself sufficient for DOM as there are examples of definite inanimate objects marked by *ad*:

19a) app-o vis-tu a custu / cussu have-PRES.1SG see-PERF.PTCP AD this / that ‘I saw this/that.’ (Sardinian) (Floricic 2003, 253)

19b) miette a kkweiste put.IMPERATIVE.2SG AD this ‘Put this one.’ (Gorgoglione, in Basilicata) (Manzini/Savoia 2005, 508)

19c) te dewe (a) kkwiste you owe.PRES.1SG AD this ‘I owe you this.’ (Colobaro, in Basilicata) (Manzini/Savoia 2005, 509)

Italian DOM, then, seems to be more conservative than Spanish in that *ad* remains a marker of humanness and referentiality which has not been generalized to other types of objects (see footnote 12),¹⁷ which may be represented thus:

---

¹⁷ The conservativity of Italian DOM is corroborated by comparative evidence in Medieval Romance where *ad* is similarly restricted to marking referential human objects to the general exclusion of indefinite, non-specific and plural human objects (Zorraquino 1967; Sornicola 1997; 1998), and it is well documented that there is a subsequent expansion of DOM to all animate objects in the history of Spanish (Kaiser/von Heusinger 2007; García García 2018). More is said about this below.
In the next sub-section, all remaining varieties in Western Romance are examined where DOM is much less common and seems to be conditioned by specific categorial features which, interestingly, also apply to Spanish and Italian.

2.3 Other Types of Romance Differential Object Marking (weak)

In other varieties of Romance such as Portuguese (European (EP) / Brazilian (BP)), Catalán and Gallic varieties like Bearnean (Joly 1971), DOM is much more marginal than in Spanish and Italian as *ad* is mainly used for marking personal pronouns (21a-c) and proper names of people (21d-f) (Roegiest 1979; Escandell-Vidal 2007), especially divinity (21g-h) and authorities (21i) which are often marked by *ad* in Portuguese and Catalán (Meier 1945; Aldon/della Costanza 2013):

21a) od-eia  a mim
    ʰe hate-PRES.3SG AD me
    ‘He hates me.’ (EP/BP) (Schwenter 2014, 238)

21b) jo  t’ ajud-o  a tu
    I you help-PRES.1SG AD you
    i tu m’ ajudar-ãs  a mi
    and you me help-FUT.2SG AD me
    ‘I help you and you’ll help me.’ (Catalán) (Escandell-Vidal 2007, 188)

21c) il faut  l’ aider  a elle
    EXPL necessary her help.INF AD her
    ‘It is necessary to help her.’ (French) (Joly 1971, 287)

21d) vej-o (a) João
    see-PRES.1SG AD Joao
    ‘I see Joao.’ (EP) (Roegiest 1979, 38)

---

18 As there is no perceptible difference in the licensing of DOM with different types of verbs (see footnote 16), the nominal factors for DOM are represented in both A-positions.

19 The marking of personal pronouns in BP is not always obligatory as it seems to be so only with first person singular in line with the Number and Person hierarchies of DOM (section 1.1, 3-4, many thanks to Professor Scott Schwenter for pointing this out to me):

i) João viu  a mim / *a nós / *a ele
   João see.PRET.3SG AD me / AD us / AD him
   ‘João saw me/us/him.’ (Kliffer 1995, 109)
21e) veur-é a la Maria
see-FUT.1SG AD ART Maria
‘I shall see Mary.’ (Colloquial Catalán) (Escandell-Vidal 2009, 840)

21f) oun abe-t trouba-t a Titou
where have-PRES.2PL find-PERF.PTCP AD Titou
‘Where have you found Titou?’ (Bearnese) (Joly 1971, 288)

21g) deve-mos amar a Deus
must-PRES.1PL love.INF AD God
‘We must love God.’ (BP/EP) (Schwenter 2014, 238)

21h) així se prov-e si am-es a Jesuchrist
thus CL prove-PRES.3SG whether love-PRES.2SG AD Jesus.Christ
‘Thus it proves whether you love Jesus Christ.’ (Escandell-Vidal 2009, 842)

21i) tem que respeitar a-o chefe
have.PRES.3SG COMP respect.INF AD-ART boss
‘He has to respect his boss.’ (BP/EP) (Kliffer 1995, 109)

Such a restricted distribution of DOM in these varieties suggests that ad is predominantly a marker of pronouns and proper names, the latter of which subsume a particular subclass of animate nouns, namely deities, which may be represented thus:

\[
\text{\textbf{22) VoiceP SpecVoice Voice'}}
\]
\[
\text{\textbf{Voice AffectP SpecAffect Affect'}}
\]
\[
\text{\textbf{V_i SpecAffect Affect'}}
\]
\[
\text{\textbf{KP Affect vP Specv v'}}
\]
\[
\text{\textbf{ad D ... NP v t_i Specv t_i V KP^{20}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textbf{ad D DP ... NP [i-K] [i-phi] [i-Proper] N [u-K] [divine]}}
\]
\[
\text{\textbf{ad D DP ... NP [i-K] [i-phi] [i-Proper] N [u-K] [divine]}}
\]

Romance varieties, therefore, reveal significant microvariations in the uses and distribution of ad as a marker of DOM, which range from strong types as seen in Spanish where both nominal parameters of animacy and referentiality and verbal parameter of ‘affectedness’ independently and sufficiently license DOM (section 2.1), through to intermediate conservative types in Italian dialects where ad is used for marking human and referential objects (section 2.2), and to all other varieties (EP/BP, Catalán, Bearnese) in which ad is mainly a pronominal and proper noun marker (section 2.3). These parametric options are further discussed in the next sub-section.

2.4 Formal Typology of Romance Differential Object Marking

A comparative analysis of Romance DOM reveals a hierarchy of DOM factors which may be ranked as follows in order of obligatoriness (cf section 1.1, 7):

DOM-hierarchy in Romance:

23) Personal Pronouns > Proper Nouns > Divine > Human > Animate > Referential

Personal pronouns are most commonly marked by ad since even in weak types of DOM such as Portuguese, Catalán and Gallo-Romance (section 2.3), personal

---

20 As with Italo-Romance DOM (see footnote 18), there is no attested difference in the probability of DOM triggered by verbal ‘affectedness’ so the nominal properties are inserted in both A-positions here.
pronouns are still regularly marked (21a-c) (though see footnote 19) and in stronger types of DOM such as Spanish and Italian (sections 2.1, 2.2) personal pronouns are obligatorily marked by *ad* (Laca 1995:66; Guardiano 2000, 20-21), which is also a typological trend (Aissen 2003, 282). Next on the hierarchy are proper names which are also marked in weak types of DOM (section 2.3, 21d-f) and strongly associated with *ad* in Spanish and Italian (Laca 1995, 66; Guardiano 2000, 21-22). Below these functional categories in the DP come lexical nouns which are marked by *ad* depending on their lexical semantic features, namely humanness and animacy of which the former is a subset of the latter as seen in Spanish and Italo-Romance DOM (sections 2.1, 2.2, 13, 17), and a further distinction is made with deities and authorities as sub-types of animate objects in Portuguese and Catalán (section 2.3, 21g-i). These are further complemented by referentiality which is a secondary factor in the marking of human/animate nouns (section 2.1-2.2, 14, 18) and a primary determinant in some Italian dialects (section 2.2, 19). There are hence structural correlations between the selection of *ad* in DOM and the cartographic projections in the nominal domain in that higher projections seem to have a greater affinity with *ad* in K than lower ones: 24) (cf section 1.1, 8)

As different Romance varieties posit different microparametric settings for the selection of *ad* in DOM, this has resulted in the discrepancies as seen in the three types of DOM, which further suggests that there may be multiple independent causal factors for each category (D/Phi/Proper/N) in the derivation of Romance DOM. In the next section, each of these licensing factors is examined in relation to the grammaticalization of *ad* in Latin/proto-Romance where *ad* is reanalyzed from being a spatial preposition to a Case-marker (Adams/de Melo 2016).

### 3 Formation of Romance Differential Object Marking: Latin *ad*

As the wide geographical and historical distribution of DOM in Romance strongly suggests that Romance DOM is formed in the prehistoric stage of proto-Romance (Lapesa 1907; Nocentini 1985; Sornicola 1997; 1998), historical evidence for its formation can be traced back to Latin *ad*, which marks direct and indirect objects of two-place and three-place verbs respectively (Adams 2011; 2013; Adams/de Melo 2016). Furthermore, as Latin *ad* is originally a lexical spatial (allative) preposition, it has selectional restrictions, some of which seem to anticipate the various licensing factors for Romance DOM identified in the previous sections. In this section, the origins of each licensing factor for Romance DOM are proposed in accordance with the chronology of Latin *ad* being construed with different types of lexical verbs, which consist of the following (Tse 2013): verbs of vision (verba *videndi*) > verbs of serving (verba *serviendi*) > verbs of calling (verba *clamandi*) > verbs of begging (verba *rogandi*).
3.1 Verbs of Vision (*verba videndi*): ‘Affectedness’ and Referentiality

As argued in section 1.2, the main verbal parameter for Romance DOM is the general transitivity and ‘affectedness’ of the verb which also affect its argument and aspectual properties in that *ad* imposes telicity on the verb and thematic constraints on the object (9-11). The origins of these verbal properties are evident in the earliest attestations of Latin *ad* being construed with two-place verbs, namely verbs of vision (*verba videndi*) which are attested from Plautus (2nd century BC) onwards, the spatial meaning of *ad* is always evident as it indicates the ‘direction/destination’ of vision which often implies travelling in the sense of visiting one’s house (25a), which also conforms to the meaning and usage of the cognate verb *visere* ‘to visit’ (25b):

25a) nunc ad era-m revide-bo
now AD mistress-ACC revisit-FUT.1SG
‘I shall see her again (at hers) now.’ (Plautus *Truculentus* 320)

21 The distribution of verbs of vision + *ad* is vast as they are attested in all historical stages of Latin (i-iii) and in all varieties of Romance (iv-viii) which display DOM, which strongly suggests that they played a central role in the formation of (proto-)Romance DOM:

Classical Latin:

i) vere-or, ne… nunc ad Caeciliana-m fabula-m spect-et
fear-PRES.1SG COMP now AD Caecilian-ACC.SG play-ACC.SG watch-3SG
‘I fear that… he may now watch the play of Caecilius.’ (Cicero *ad Atticum* 1.16.6)

Christian Latin:

ii) et aspic-i-e-nt ad me
and look-FUT.3PL AD me
‘And they will look at me…’ (Jerome *Epistulae* LVII.7)

Medieval Latin:

iii) ipse farinarius ad ipso Verno nonquam aspe-xissit
ART baker AD ART Vernus never look-PERF.3SG
‘The baker never looked at Vernus.’ (Merovingian documents XXXII)

Medieval Spanish:

iv) ver-é a la mugier…
see-FUT.1SG AD ART woman
‘I shall see the woman…’ (*El Poema del Mio Cid* 228b)

Medieval Portuguese:

v) ve-r a Rainha da Grá-Bretanha
see-INF AD Queen of Great-Britain
‘to see the Queen of Great Britain.’ (*Prosa do Padre Antonio Vieira* 289)

Medieval Catalan:

vi) yo veh-ia a Jesuchrist…
I see-IMPERF.1SG AD Jesus.Christ
‘I saw Jesus Christ…’ (*The Sermons of Saint Vicent Ferrer* 60)

Medieval Neapolitan:

vii) guard-a a me
watch-IMPERATIVE AD me
‘Look at me…’ (*Vita e favole di Esopo* 19, 18)

Medieval Sicilian:

viii) vid-i a Dido
see-PRET.1SG AD Dido
‘I saw Dido.’ (*La istoria di Eneas* 3.21)

22 As argued by Adams 2013, 243ff, Latin *ad* even when construed directly with lexical verbs is not identical to the morphological cases since it often retains its directional meaning and should hence be analysed as a lexical preposition rather than a Case-marker, even if its uses anticipate Romance Case-marking. This creates a layered distribution in Latin where unmarked synthetic forms (morphological case) and marked analytic forms (*ad*-PP) co-exist synchronically (Ledgeway 2012, 23-25), which feeds into the distribution of *ad* as a marker of ‘marked’ objects in Romance DOM (see section 1).
In these examples, *ad* is spatial as it marks motion towards a particular destination (*ad eram* ‘to my mistress’ home’ (25a), *huc ad eum*... *domi* ‘hither to his house... at home’ (25b)), and the object of *ad* is necessarily definite and specific since *ad* is inherently deictic in marking ‘direction/destination’. This is particular evident in examples where *ad* denotes rotation:

```
26) quis illic est qui tam proterve
    who there be.PRES.3SG REL.PRO so impudently
    nostras aedis ariet-at ? ego sum,
    our rooms ram.PRES.3SG I be.PRES.1SG
    respice ad me
    look.back-IMPERATIVE.2SG AD me
    ‘Who is the one over there who is battering our rooms? It is I, look back at me.’ (Plautus Truculentus 256-257)
```

Due to the spatial force implied by *ad* (illic... ‘over there’), its object (*respite ad me ‘look back at me’) is strongly referential, which is an important criterion in Romance DOM (section 2.4). Furthermore, *ad* in these examples imposes telicity on the act of seeing as it adds a natural endpoint to the event by specifying the destination of vision (*ad eram* (25a), *ad eum* (25b), *ad me* (26)), in addition to which *ad* selects an object that is not merely the <stimulus> of vision but an ‘affectee’ since the object of *ad* can be analysed thematically as the <beneficiary/recipient> of one’s visit. These uses of Latin *ad* with verbs of vision, therefore, seem to alter the *aktionsart* of the verb in ways which anticipate Romance DOM.

### 3.2 Verbs of Serving (*verba serviendi*): Pronominal and Proper Nouns

In the history of Latin, *ad* overlaps in function with the morphological dative as it comes to mark indirect objects which obligatorily require *ad* in Romance (Adams 2013, 278ff). Sornicola (1997; 1998) argues that Latin *ad* also competes with dative objects of two-place verbs which regularly select inherently human/animate semantic roles such as <recipient/beneficiary/experiencer> which turn out to be marked by *ad* in Romance. The earliest example is *servire* ‘to serve’ which is regularly construed
with the dative (27a) and is first attested with *ad* in Jerome (27b) (4th century AD) which is inherited in Medieval Latin (27c) and Romance (27d-f) (Blake and Velázquez-Mendoza 2012):

27a) vid-emus exempla captiva servire tibi
see-PRES.1PL example-PL captive-PL serve.INF you.DAT.SG
AD victory
‘We see that the examples of the slaves serve you for the purpose of victory.’ (Jerome Epistulae 48.13)

27b) ad cuius imperium
AD REL.PRO-GEN.SG command.ACC.SG
cael-um terr-a mar-ia servi-eba-nt
heaven.NOM.SG land-NOM.SG sea-NOM.PL serve-IMPERF-3PL
‘... whose power heaven, earth and the seas served.’ (Jerome Epistulae 82.3)26

27c) ibi deb-ent seruire a sancta maria
there must-PRES.3PL serve.INF AD holy Mary
‘... there they must serve Holy Mary.’ (Medieval Latin) (Sahagún 423)

27d) los que qui-siere-n ir
those REL.PRO want-FUT.SUBJ.3PL go.INF
servir a-l Campeador
serve.INF AD-ART Campeador
‘those who want to go and serve the Campeador.’ (Medieval Spanish) (El Cantar del mio Cid 1369)

27e) perché non poss-o ad tal signor servire
because NEG can-1SG.PRES AD such lord serve.INF
‘... because I cannot serve such a lord.’ (Medieval Neapolitan) (Vita e favole di Esopo 20.13)

27f) para servir a tão ilustres senhor-es
in.order serve.INF AD so distinguished.PL sir-PL
‘... in order to serve such distinguished guests.’ (Medieval Portuguese) (Ciganita 35)

As with verbs of vision in the previous sub-section, *ad* shows selectional restrictions here since it is mostly used for marking nouns that are prosodically heavy (*ad*... *imperium* (27b), *a sancta maria* (27c), *al Campeador* (27d), *ad tal signor* (27e), *a tão ilustres senhor-es* (27f)) whereas clitic pronouns remain inflected (*tibi* (27a)) (Sornicola 1998, 423-425; Adams/de Melo 2016, 90-91), which may account for the marking of Romance tonic personal pronouns and proper names (section 2.4). Other verbs which select *ad* and the morphological dative are examined below.

3.3 Verbs of Shouting and Begging (*verba clamandi et rogandi*):
Humanness/Animacy/Divinity

Of the three-place verbs which are construed with *ad* as a marker of indirect objects (Adams 2011; 2013; Adams/de Melo 2016), there are some which are structurally ambiguous between bivalency and trivalency, which yields the possibility of reanalyzing indirect objects as direct objects which, given that indirect objects are

---

As *ad* comes to displace the morphological dative, therefore, it becomes associated with human/animate objects, as is presented discussed.

26 Although the object of *servire* here (*ad cuius imperium* ‘whose command’) is inanimate, it may be argued to be personified in line with the thematic property of *servire* ‘to serve’ whose object typically denotes <beneficiary> (cf previous footnote). Such personification seems to anticipate the marking of non-human animate objects in Romance DOM too (sections 2.1, 2.2).
predominantly human/animate (see footnote 25), creates a formal opposition between animate objects marked by *ad* and unmarked inanimate objects in the same grammatical relation, which is indeed a cornerstone of DOM (Seržant/Witzelach-Makarevich 2017, 3). The two types of verbs in question here are verbs of shouting (*verba clamandi*) and verbs of begging (*verba rogandi*), both of which are three-place verbs in classical Latin but turn out to be two-place verbs in Romance, the origins of which can be found in the Christian and Medieval periods. As these two types of verbs have different argument structures in that the former (*verba clamandi*) express indirect statements and the latter (*verba rogandi*) indirect commands, they are analysed separately in this section.

3.3.1 Verbs of Shouting (> Calling) (*verba clamandi*)

Latin *clamare* ‘to shout’ typically expresses an indirect statement as well as an indirect object denoting the <recipient/experiencer> of the utterance, the latter of which is typically marked by the morphological dative and sporadically by *ad* in the Classical period (1st century BC) (Sornicola 1997, 72-73):

28a) clam-o mihi ipse: numer-a
    shout-PRES.1SG me.DAT.SG self count-IMPERATIVE.2SG
    ‘I shout to myself: count your years!’ (Seneca, *Epistulae* XXVII.2)

28b) ad me omnes clam-ant: ianua culpa tua est.
    AD me all shout-PRES.3PL door fault your be.PRES.3SG
    ‘Everyone shouts at me: Door, it is your fault.’ (Catullus *Carmina* 67.14)

In Romance, on the other hand, *clamare* ‘to call’ is a two-place predicate as it commonly subcategorises for one object which is also predominantly human/animate as it is the <recipient/experiencer> of the act of calling:

29a) a Minaya Albar Fáñez e a Per Vermudoz
    AD Minaya Albar Fáñez e a Per Vermudoz
    los llamó
    them.ACC.PL call-PRET.3SG
    ‘He called Minaya Albar Fáñez and Per Vermudoz.’ (Medieval Spanish) (*El Poema del Mio Cid* 1894-1895) 27

29b) allora Elia chiam-oe a Dio
    then Elia call-PRET.3SG AD God
    ‘Then Elia called God.’ (Medieval Italian) (*Fra Giordano*)

29c) appressu clam-au a lu primu vinchituri
    then call-PRET.3SG AD ART first wave
    ‘Then he called upon the first wave.’ (Medieval Sicilian) (*La istoria di Eneas* 91.46)

The change in argument structure in Latin/Romance *clamare* can be represented as a shift in grammatical relations as the original three-place predicate ‘to shout’ (<agent>, <theme/proposition>, <recipient/experiencer>) is reduced to a two-place predicate ‘to call’ (<agent>, <recipient/experiencer>) where the original indirect object (<recipient/experiencer>) is reanalyzed as the direct object in the absence of the original direct object (<theme/proposition>). This is anticipated in Christian Latin where the omission of the direct object of *clamare* facilitates this reanalysis:

---

27 The direct object pronoun here (*los llamó*) strongly suggests that the object (*a Minaya Albar Fáñez e a Per Vermudoz*) has been reanalysed as the direct object of *llamar* (Zorraquino 1976, 561).
From the depths of my heart, I shouted (something) at you, my Lord’
> ‘... I called you.’ (Psalmi 129)

As the third argument of Latin clamare, which is strongly human/animate (ad te (30)), is reanalyzed as the second argument in Romance (29), animacy becomes associated with the direct object marked by ad, especially in face of unmarked inanimate objects with which they come into direct opposition:28

31a) a su sobrino... por su nombre lo llamó
AD his nephew by his name him.ACC call-PRET.3SG
‘He called his nephew by his name.’ (El Poema del Mio Cid 3188)29

31b) los moros llam-an ‘Mahoma’ ...
ART moor-PL shout-PRES.3PL Mahoma
‘The Moors shout, “Mahoma”...’ (El Poema del Mio Cid 731)30

The human/animacy criterion of Romance DOM, therefore, may be argued to have been formed in the evolution of Latin verbs of shouting/calling whose subtle changes in argument structure have created this semantic criterion of animacy in the grammatical object relation. Similar changes are seen in Latin/Romance verbs of begging (verba rogandi) which acquire the meaning of praying in the Christian era.

3.3.2 Verbs of Begging (> Praying) (verba rogandi)

The argument structure of Latin/Romance verbs of begging (verba rogandi) is notoriously ambiguous since although they can function as three-place predicates in selecting three arguments, they can also be used with two arguments only with either the human object or the inanimate object in the accusative case (32a), both of which are also passivisable (32b-c) (Huerta 2009, 137-138). Furthermore, the human object can also be selected by the ablative preposition ab ‘from’ denoting the source of begging (32c) i.e. the human from whom the solicitation is made (a senatore):

32a) consul roga-t senator-em sententia-m
consul.NOM.SG ask-PRES.3SG senator-ACC.SG opinion-ACC.SG
‘The consuls asks the senator for his opinion.’

32b) senator roga-tur sententia-m
senator.NOM.SG ask-PRES.3SG.PASS opinion-ACC.SG
‘The senator is asked for his opinion.’

32c) sententi-a roga-tur a senator-e
opinion-NOM.SG ask-PRES.3SG.PASS AB senator-ABL.SG
‘His opinion is asked from the senator.’ (Lazard 2003, 9)

In Medieval Latin, as word-final consonants become phonetically weak which leads to hypercorrect spellings between ad and ab (Lapesa 1907, 72-75; Bastardas Parera 1953, 41; Westerbergh 1956, 255), adlab is construed with verbs of begging and hence forms minimal pairs with unmarked inanimate objects, as seen in Romance:

33a) a todos los roga-va
AD all them.ACC.PL beg-IMPERF.3SG

---

28 A similar analysis is proposed for verbs of menacing whose indirect object marked by ad can also be reanalysed as the direct object and alternate with the inanimate object (Bartra-Kaufman (2005)).

29 See footnote 27 on the use of the direct object clitic pronoun (here lo llamó).

30 It is interesting that relics of the original trivalency of clamare are retained not only in Medieval Romance where clamare selects an inanimate direct object of utterance (cf main text, 31b) but also in European Portuguese where chamar ‘to call’ is sometimes construed with the dative pronoun:

i) cham-aram-lhe incompetentente
call-PRET.3PL-him.DAT.SG incompetent
‘They called him incompetent.’ (Roegiest 1979, 42)
‘He begged all of them.’ (Medieval Spanish) \textit{(El Poema del Mio Cid 3500)}

\begin{verbatim}
33b) rueg-an a-l rey que los quit-e
d-esta cort
‘They beg the king to remove them from this court.’ (Medieval Spanish) \textit{(El Poema del Mio Cid 2989)}
\end{verbatim}

Moreover, as Latin verbs of begging acquire the meaning of praying in the Christian era (Löfstedt 1959, 73), \textit{ad/ab} comes to be used for selecting deities or higher authorities as targets of praying, which also feeds into Romance DOM (section 2.3):

\begin{verbatim}
34a) Moyes ora-bat ad Dominum
‘Moses was praying to the Lord.’ (Libri Maccabaeorum 2.10)
34b) veniam… ad Domino poposce-bat
‘She was praying to the Lord for mercy.’ (Chronicon Salernitanum 11)
\end{verbatim}

Both Latin verbs of shouting/calling and verbs of begging/praying (\textit{verba clamandi et rogandi}), therefore, display strong associations between the selection of \textit{ad} and their human/animate objects which enter into the same grammatical object relation as their unmarked inanimate objects. The criterion of humanness and its variations such as animacy and divinity in Romance DOM may hence be argued to originate from these structurally ambiguous verbs, which, in combination with two-place verbs of vision and serving (\textit{verba videndi et serviendi}), may have independently given rise to the following set of licensing factors in Romance DOM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb types + \textit{ad}</th>
<th>Types of object selected by \textit{ad}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of vision (\textit{verba videndi} + \textit{ad}) (Plautus)</td>
<td>‘Affected’ and Referential objects (section 3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of serving (\textit{verba serviendi} + \textit{ad}) (Jerome)</td>
<td>Pronominal and Proper Nouns (section 3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of shouting (\textit{verba clamandi} + \textit{ad}) (Latin Bible)</td>
<td>Human/Animate Objects (section 3.3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of begging (\textit{verba rogandi} + \textit{ab/ud}) (Medieval)</td>
<td>Human/Animate/Divine Objects (section 3.3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This layered formation of Romance DOM has created a pool of formal microparametric options from which different Romance varieties seem to have set different selectional criteria for \textit{ad} as a marker of DOM (section 2.4). This raises important questions regarding the formal mechanisms of parameter-(re)setting in the Chomskyan Minimalist framework where formal simplicity is assumed to determine language acquisition and change (Chomsky 2005; 2007; 2013). The variationist implications of Latin/Romance DOM are considered in the next and final section.

4 Formal Parameters of Romance Differential Object Marking

In light of the various definitions of formal simplicity in Minimalism, the current understanding of historical-comparative parametric variation is that syntactic dependencies in the form of movement (\text{F}_{\text{Move}}) and agreement (\text{F}_{\text{Agree}}) are eliminated

\footnote{See footnotes 27 and 29 for the use of the direct object clitic pronoun (\textit{los rogava}) (Zorraquino 1976, 557, 561).}
in favour of external merge (F_Merge) which entails loss of interpretable features (i-F), as shown in the following parametric hierarchies:

35a)  \( F_{\text{Move}} > F_{\text{Agree}} > F_{\text{Merge}} > \emptyset \) (adapted from Roberts/Roussou 2003, 209-213)
35b)  \( \text{semantic feature} > i-F > u-F > \emptyset \) (van Gelderen 2011, 17-20)

The grammaticalization of Latin ad as a Romance Case-marker conforms to these formal definitions, since while Latin ad is a lexical preposition (P_allative) which denotes spatial directional force and assigns morphological case (accusative) to its nominal complement (Cinque/Rizzi 2010), it is reanalysed as a functional preposition (K) in Romance DOM where it forms part of the extended projection of the nominal complement, which conforms to Stowell’s (1981) classic Case Resistance Principle (CRP) which states that Case-assigners (e.g. P) cannot occur in Case positions (e.g. object). Furthermore, the historical-comparative microvariations in Romance DOM indicate that within the parametric and categorial reanalysis of Latin/Romance ad (P > K), ad is analogised differently in different varieties to different sets of objects, which shows different types of analogical levelling at work (section 2.4). The historical-comparative distribution of Latin/Romance ad, therefore, may be represented thus: 36) (cf section 2.4, 24)

\[ 
\text{PP} \longrightarrow \text{K} \longrightarrow \text{NumP} \longrightarrow \text{PersonP} \longrightarrow \text{NP} \\
\text{ad} \longrightarrow \text{DP} \longrightarrow \text{Num} \longrightarrow \text{Person} \longrightarrow \text{Proper} \longrightarrow \text{N} \\
\text{[i-Case]} \longrightarrow \text{D} \longrightarrow \text{[i-s]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \\
\text{[u-K]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} \\
\text{[human/animate/divine]} \longrightarrow \text{[u-K]} 
\]

The formation of Romance DOM (ad), therefore, reveals that there can be significant microvariations within formal parametric (re)setting, which, in the case of Romance DOM (P > K), falls out from the various licensing factors of DOM which interface with syntax in creating different distributions of object Case-marking (section 3).

**Conclusions**

Romance DOM is a complex phenomenon subject to a host of formal, semantic and structural restrictions. This has given rise to complex microvariations in the distribution of ad across Romance varieties, the discrepancies between which reveal important mechanisms in the formal licensing of Case which may have been independently motivated by different mechanisms.
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