Elisabeth Stark, University of Zurich   estark@rom.uzh.ch

"What is marked by differential object marking in Romance?"

It is a well-known fact that some Romance languages have to mark their direct (and sometimes even indirect) objects (*DO*) according to some apparently semantic-pragmatic features, i.e. animacy, referentiality, of the object referent and/or the degree of transitivity of the whole construction ("differential object marking", *DOM*, cf. Lazard 1984, Bossong 1998, Aissen 2003, Næss 2004). There are essentially two formal strategies used for this, which may also be combined: prepositional marking of the normally non-marked accusative object and/or clitic doubling, see the examples under (1):

(1)   a. Ce-ai făcut cu **bomboanele**? **Le**-am mîncat PE **toate**.
            Qué has hecho con **los caramelos**? **Los** he comido **(*A) todos**.
                'What did you do with the sweets? I have eaten them all.'
        b.   Ce-ai făcut cu **musafirii**? **I**-am dat afară PE **toţi**.
            Qué has hecho con **los huéspedes**? **Los** he echado a la calle ***(A) todos.**
                'What did you do with the guests? I have thrown them all out.'

In these examples, we can see some differences between Rumanian and Spanish DOM: e.g. the bigger importance of referentiality (definiteness, specificity) in Rumanian (the quantifier *tot*, 'all', in (1a) and (1b) always triggers DOM in the DO, irrespective of its animacy, cf. Roegiest 1979) vs. the seemingly bigger importance of animacy in Spanish (no DOM with inanimate DO in (1a), cf. Torrego Salcedo 1999, von Heusinger/Kaiser 2005, 67, for American Spanish).

In my talk, I would like to compare the diachronic development of Spanish and Rumanian DOM with direct objects in order to reveal the fundamental (semantic) features leading to different results in Romance. While the former development is usually described as a expansion of the prepositional marking with *a* along the semantic-pragmatic dimensions of animacy and referentiality (cf. von Heusinger/Kaiser 2005, Laca 2006, going back to the multidimensional scale in Aissan 2003, 459) – even if the discussion about the decisive features is far from being closed (cf. Pensado 1995, Mardale 2002, 83, arguing against animacy as the main factor triggering DOM in Romance) - , research into the history of Rumanian DOM is to a large extent still to be done in a systematic and comparative way (for a small sketch on indirect object marking cf. Saramandu 1966, but see now von Heusinger/Onea 2008).

After presenting a short overview over the Rumanian data (based on a choice of texts from the 17th to the 20th century) in comparison to the existing results for Spanish, I will try to corroborate an alternative, i.e. a "correlative hypothesis" based on the feature [± individualized] (cf. Harley / Ritter 2002): I argue that DOM in Romance is a classification or individualization device existing precisely in those Romance languages which lack the respective features in their (pro)nominal feature geometry due to diachronic developments in their gender (and maybe also determiner) system. While Rumanian seems to have no means to indicate the degree of [individualization] 'inside' the DP (via gender marking and/or indefinite determiners), Spanish seems to have lost the classifcation node, having thus no means to indicate [(in)animacy] 'inside' DPs, which might explain the different function of DOM in these two Romance languages.

References

Aissen, Judith (2003): „Differential object marking: iconicity vs. economy", in: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21, 435-483.

Bossong, Georg (1998a): "Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe", in: Jack Feuillet (ed.): *Actance et Valence dans les Langues d'Europe*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 193-258.

Harley, Heidi / Ritter, Elizabeth (2002): "Structuring the bundle: a universal morphosyntactic feature geometry", in: Horst Simon / Heike Wiese (eds.): *Pronouns – Grammar and Representation*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 23-39.

Heusinger, Klaus von / Kaiser, Georg (2005): "The evolution of differential object marking in Spanish", in: Elisabeth Stark / Klaus von Heusinger / Georg Kaiser (eds.): *Specificity and the evolution/emergence of nominal determination systems in Romance. Selected papers from the international workshop NEREUS II, Oct. 2004 in Berlin*, Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, 33-69.

Heusinger, Klaus von / Onea, Edgar (2008): "Triggering and blocking effects in the diachronic development of DOM in Romanian", to appear in: *Probus* 20:1.

Laca, Brenda (2006): "El objeto directo. La marcación preposicional", in: Concepción Company Company (ed.): *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Primera parte: La frase verbal*, vol.1, México: FCE, UNAM, 423-475.

Lazard, Gilbert (1984): "Actance variations and categories of the object", in: Frans Plank (ed.): *Objects: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*, London: Academic Press, 267-292.

Mardale, Alexandru-Daniel (2002): "Note despre construirea obiectului direct prepoziţional în Româna şi Spaniolă", in: *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 1-2, 77-94.

Næss, Åshild (2004): "What markedness marks: The markedness problem with direct objects", in: *Lingua* 114, 1186-1212.

Pensado, Carmen (1995): *El complemento directo preposicional*, Madrid: Visor Libros.

Roegiest, Eugeen (1979): "A propos de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans quelques langues romanes", in: *Vox romanica* 38, 312-334.

Saramandu, Nicolae (1966): "Reluarea şi anticiparea complementului indirect exprimat prin substantiv în limba română din secolul al XVIII-lea", in: *Studii şi Cercetări Lingvistice*, 17.4, 423-434.

Torrego Salcedo, Esther (1999): "El complemento directo preposicional", in: Ignacio Bosque / Violeta Demonte (eds.). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 2: *Las construcciones sintácticas fundamentales. relaciones temporales, aspectuales y modales*, Madrid: Espasa, 1779-1805.