

## Workshop Program

- 8:45-9:00 Welcome
- 09.00-10.15 Klaus von Heusinger (Stuttgart) & Edgar Onea (Stuttgart) :  
The diachronic development of DOM in Romanian
- 10.15-10.30 Coffee break
- 10.30-11.00 Sofiana Chiriachescu (Brasov):  
Remarks about the evolution of DOM in Romanian (1800-2000)
- 11.00-11.30 Alexandru Mardale (Paris):  
Bare plurals and differential object marking in Romanian and Spanish
- 11.30-13.00 Lunch
- 13.00-14.15 Victoria Escandell-Vidal (Madrid):  
Differential object marking and topicality in Balearic Catalan
- 14.15-14.30 Coffee break
- 14.30-15.45 Manuel Leonetti (Alcala): Specificity in clitic doubling and in differential object marking
- 15.45-16.00 Coffee break
- 16.00-17.15 Klaus von Heusinger (Stuttgart) & Georg Kaiser (Konstanz):  
Differential object marking and the lexical semantics of verbs in Spanish
- 19.00 Dinner

The workshop has been organized within the **SFB 732 “Incremental specification in context”** at the University of Stuttgart.

Organizers:

Klaus von Heusinger (University of Stuttgart)  
Edgar Onea (University of Stuttgart)

We wish all the participants a pleasant stay in Stuttgart !



Differential Object Marking  
in  
Romance

15<sup>th</sup> June 2007  
University of Stuttgart

## The Diachronic Development of Differential Object Marking in Romanian

Klaus von Heusinger & Edgar Onea

According to recent studies, the diachronic development of differential object marking in Romance is expected to start out at the left corner of the animacy and referentiality scale and spread steadily towards the right. However in Romanian this unidirectional evolution is surprisingly reversed around the 19th century: the conditions of DO marking with the preposition “pe” are more restrained today than 200 years ago. In this study we present this unusual development based on a diachronic corpus consisting of Bible translations from different centuries.

The main argument of our paper is that the regress in DOM can be explained by the independent development of the Romanian clitic doubling system that case marking gets strongly correlated to. Thus instead of two alternatives, namely marked and unmarked DOs, in 20th century Romanian three types of indefinite DOs can be observed. While this complex system of case marking leads to semantic differences, diachronic data suggest that this system may have only a transitory character, thus differential object marking without clitic doubling tends to disappear.

### Remarks about the evolution of DOM in Romanian (1800-2000)

Sofiana Chiriacescu

Based on a diachronic study that comprises a time period of 200 years (1800- 2000), this presentation aims to unveil certain stages in the evolution of DOM in the Romanian language. Firstly, we will notice that the usage of DOM increases in a constant manner during the analyzed period of time. Not only that DOs are being wider used in the year 2000 than in 1800, but the criteria determining the markedness of DO have also changed. Even if the distribution into phrases of morphologically marked DOs has remained roughly the same in this period, we notice some changes with respect to proper names, definite NPs and other NPs. Animacy, another factor characterizing morphologically marked DO has also changed in time. While at the beginning of the 19th century only DOs specified for the feature [+human] were differentially marked, we see that in the years that follow, DOs that are specified for the feature [+animated] can also be case-marked in certain contexts. Secondly, it is impossible not to notice, that in Romanian, the spreading of DOM works hand in hand with the phenomenon of clitic -doubling. In comparison to the 21st century, clitic-doubling is scarcely used at the beginning of the 19th century. Finally, we will look at the differentially marked and unmarked DOs with respect to the kind of information they introduce in the discourse: if it is new or old information and to the art of NP they are realized. Then, we will see that referents that are introduced by means of a differentially marked object in the discourse tend to be taken up in the following 1-5 sentences more often than unmarked ones.

### Bare Plurals and Differential Object Marking in Romanian and Spanish

Alexandru Mardale

Assuming a property-analysis of B(are) N(ominals)s (McNally 1992, 1995, van Geenhoven 1995, Dobrovie-Sorin 1997), and considering the fact that DOM is excluded with property-denoting nouns (Mardale 2007, Cornilescu & Dobrovie-Sorin 2007), the following contrast comes to mind: DOM is possible with certain modified B(are) P(lural)s in Spanish, but not in Romanian:

Our analysis of this contrast is based on the answers to the following questions: (i) from a syntactic perspective, what is the relation of DOM

(a) to the distinction between NPs, NumPs and DPs (Dobrovie-Sorin & al. 2006), (b) to argument position (Longobardi 1994) and (c) to pseudo-incorporation (Massam 2001)? (ii) from a semantic perspective, (a) what kind of reading have marked BPs?; (b) should we assign different semantic types to marked BPs vs. unmarked BNs?; (c) how should we define the process of semantic incorporation for marked BPs (van Geenhoven 1996, Farkas & de Swart 2003)?

### Differential Object Marking and Topicality in Balearic Catalan

Victoria Escandell-Vidal

Many languages overtly case-mark some DOs, depending on semantic and pragmatic features, such as definiteness and animacy: this is known as DOM, following Bossong (1991) and Aissen (2003). The functional motivation for DOM is to distinguish subject and object: the more subjectlike an object is, the greater the likelihood of its being overtly case marked. Catalan has been described as manifesting DOM in a very restricted way, with pronouns only, covering the upper end of the scale of definiteness (Comrie 1979, Aissen 2003). Such basic description is usually made taking into account the standard or privileged variant only. Some degree of abstraction is, of course, necessary in order to obtain relevant generalisations for typological characterisations and inter-linguistic comparison. However, paying attention only to the received standard can definitely condemn many data from dialectal syntax to obscurity — data that are nevertheless precious to obtain not only a more fine-grained picture of the language itself, but also a better understanding of the parameters responsible for variation and linguistic change.

The aim of this paper is to present some data on DOM from Balearic Catalan and to address some of the questions that they raise. My examples show that in Balearic Catalan a preposition systematically occurs to introduce not only strong pronouns, but also (some) clitic-dislocated objects. As far as I know, this fact is new to the literature on DOM in Catalan and calls for a principled explanation: How is the occurrence of the preposition to be accounted for? What kind of objects can receive the special mark? What is the relevant dimension? How do those data fit in with our current views on DOM? What are the consequences and implications for a general theory of DOM?

The analysis presented points to topicality as the relevant dimension that can explain the distribution and the spreading of DOM. This finding is consistent with the proposals by Rohlf (1971), Pensado (1985), Laca (1987), and Leonetti (2004), among others. Thus, when information packaging devices are taken into account, a different picture of DOM in Catalan emerges.

### Specificity in Clitic Doubling and in Differential Object Marking

Manuel Leonetti

Several languages show specificity restrictions in different types of object marking constructions (scrambling, clitic doubling, case marking, object agreement). Such constraints share a number of properties: they appear with DOs only, and not with other verbal arguments, are triggered by grammatical elements that do not encode any [+specific] feature themselves, and arise only when object marking is optional. One of the major questions raised by the mentioned constructions is why specificity effects are present in all of them. Spanish represents an interesting source of data for research on object marking, as it is a well known case of a language with Differential Object Marking (DOM), and shows different systems of clitic doubling in its dialectal varieties. Mostly relying on Spanish data, I intend to give an answer to two interrelated questions: (i) What kind of connection holds between these two kinds of object marking? (ii) How do specificity effects arise in both cases? Is there a unified explanation for them?

An answer to question (i) involves a reexamination of the fundamental intuition behind so-called ‘Kayne’s generalization’ (cf. Jaeggli 1982, Bleam 1999), i.e. the assumption that clitic doubling requires the object to be case-marked. Two problems for this generalization are its descriptive inadequacy — given that counterexamples are available both in Spanish dialectal syntax and in languages such as Greek (Anagnostopoulou 1999) — and its inability to offer an adequate account of the parallel interpretive constraints that characterize both clitic doubling and DOM. Thus, the idea that there is a syntactic dependence holding between them should be excluded. Their cooccurrence in certain languages is simply an effect of their common properties. As for question (ii), my point is that there is no unified account of specificity restrictions. In clitic doubling, they originate in the [+definite] feature of the clitic and the formal and interpretive requirements it imposes on the associate DP (Gutiérrez Rexach 2001): when the associate is an indefinite DP, the only way it can obey the matching condition established by the definite clitic in the do bling configuration is being assigned a specific (partitive or D-linked) reading. In this way, not only the specificity condition on the doubling with indefinites is accounted for, but also the preference for anaphoric and D-linked interpretations of any kind of DP participating in clitic doubling, as well as the ban against doubling with bare nouns (as they lack specific and D-linked readings). DOM, on the contrary, is not associated with specificity by means of definiteness and discourse-dependence. The basic property that triggers specificity restrictions in DOM contexts, whatever it may be (topicality, prominence, or marking of type-theoretic properties, as in Bleam 2006), does not give rise to the same presuppositional effects and anaphoric readings that clitic doubling forces. Thus, specificity effects derive from different semantic features in the two constructions. However, most of the resulting semantic properties are essentially the same (for instance, wide scope of indefinite objects). This provides some justification for an analysis of the similarities and the differences related to specificity in both cases: it should offer useful data for the study of specificity types, as well as some clues for a better understanding of the nature of both clitic doubling and DOM.

### Differential Object Marking and the Lexical Semantics of Verbs in Spanish

Klaus von Heusinger & Georg A. Kaiser

The use of the marker *a* with the DO in Spanish is an instance of Differentiated Object Marking (DOM), which is cross linguistically a well-documented phenomenon. In Spanish, there are three main dimensions that determine *a*-marking of DOs: (i) the referential properties of the DO, such as animacy, definiteness, specificity and topicality, (ii) the competition between the arguments in the sentence, and (iii) the lexical semantics of the verb. Diachronically, *a*-marking spreads along the Referentiality Hierarchy from personal pronouns and proper names to definite and finally indefinite noun phrases, often triggered by topicality. While this factor of *a*-marking is well studied, it does not suffice to account for the diachronic and synchronic variation. In this study, we argue that the lexical semantics of verb classes can account for this investigation. We present original findings from different types of corpora searches from the 12th to the 19th century. We can show that *a*-marking systematically spreads from one verb class to another. These findings suggest that *a*-marking in Spanish, and DOM in general, can only be described in a multi-dimensional space consisting of the referential properties of the DO and the lexical semantics of the verb.