Abstract: This article reports on the occurrence of Differential Object Marking (DOM) with proper names in Romance languages and language varieties. The analysis reveals that proper names do not constitute a homogeneous group. More precisely, a distinction of proper names comprised of deity names, personal names, kinship names, animal names, and place names contributes to a better understanding of the synchronic and diachronic variation within Romance languages. In the languages surveyed, animacy and definiteness condition the occurrence of DOM with common nouns. In contrast, animacy seems to pattern differently in proper noun phrases, thereby supporting evidence for a grammar of names. In some languages DOM is found with human and animate names (Spanish) while in others it is found with human, animate, and inanimate names (Sardinian). Additionally, the diachronic patterns of DOM shed light on the expansion and retraction of DOM with proper names.
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1 Introduction

Recent work has been dedicated to the grammar of names (among others: Debus, Heuser & Nübling 2014, Helmbrecht, Nübling & Schlücker 2017). In linguistic typology, proper names have been traditionally associated with the extended animacy hierarchy, where they occupy an intermediate position between pronouns and common nouns with human referents, as illustrated in (1) (see Comrie 1989: 185–200, Croft 2003: 130–132, Whaley 1997: 172–179 for details). Other terms employed in the literature include activity scale, empathy hierarchy, indexability hierarchy, nominal hierarchy, and referential hierarchy (see Haude & Witzlack-Makarevich 2016: 433 for references).
(1) Extended animacy hierarchy:

first/second person pronouns > third person pronoun > proper names > human common noun > non-human animate common noun > inanimate common noun

The extended animacy hierarchy is comprised of, at least, three different hierarchies: person, referentiality, and animacy proper, as shown in (2) (Croft 2003: 130). Let us illustrate this hierarchy with the proper names Marco and Madrid and the common nouns man and city. The personal name Marco is not more animate than the common noun man. However, the personal name is higher in referentiality (or definiteness). Similarly, the proper name Madrid is not more animate than the common noun city. However, the place name is higher in referentiality (or definiteness). Additionally, the personal name Marco is higher in animacy than the place name Madrid. In the same vein, the common noun man is higher in animacy than the common noun city. That is, animacy proper allows to distinguish between subcategories within the class of proper names and common nouns.

(2) Person: first, second > third
Referentiality: pronoun > proper name > common noun
Animacy: human > animate > inanimate

The extended animacy hierarchy helps to explain cross-linguistically recurrent patterns involving morphosyntactic phenomena. These include plural marking, split ergative case marking, differential object marking, scrambling of definite NPs, etc. (see Bickel, Witzlack-Makarevich & Zakharko 2015 and Helmbrecht et al. (forthcoming) for a critical discussion). The first version of the extended animacy hierarchy, the so-called hierarchy of inherent lexical content, was put forward by Silverstein (1976: 167) in order to capture the patterns of split ergative case marking in Australian aboriginal languages such as Aranda, Bandjalang, Dalabon, Diyari, and Gumbaynggirr. Interestingly, proper names and kinship terms are only relevant for the split ergative system of Gumbaynggirr. In addition to Gumbaynggirr, split ergative languages such as Chukchee, Kala Lagaw Ya, and Warungu provide evidence for the cut-off point between proper names and common nouns (see Comrie 1979, 1981, 1989).

\[1\] With regard to the interaction among different parameters, Comrie (1989: 197–199) distinguishes between animacy in the strict sense, definiteness, singularity, concreteness, and assignability of a proper name while Whaley (1997: 172–174) distinguishes between sociocentric orientation, empathy, and definiteness.
Notwithstanding the prominence of proper names in the extended animacy hierarchy, little is known of their morphosyntactic properties. Remarkably, in recent work on hierarchy scales (Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Malchukov & Richards 2015) and differential object marking (Seržant & Witzlack-Makarevich 2017), proper names did not receive much attention. A possible explanation is that language grammars seldom contain descriptions of proper names, as pointed out by scholars such as Croft (1990: 268).

Let us take a closer look at the morphosyntactic patterns of proper names in two genetically unrelated languages with split case marking: Gumbaynggirr and Chuckchee. In Gumbaynggirr, a Pama-Nyungan language spoken in New South Wales, there are two noun classes: proper names (“kin and section nouns”) and common nouns (“ordinary nouns”), which exhibit different case systems (Eades 1979: 272–273). Proper names include personal names and kinship terms. In Chukchee, a Chukotko-Kamchatkan language spoken in Siberia, the extended animacy scale captures the patterns of plural and case marking (Comrie 1979: 327, 1989: 189–190). With regard to plural marking, pronouns and proper names have a singular-plural distinction in the absolutive and oblique case while common nouns only have a singular-plural distinction in the oblique case.² Proper names include personal names, kinship terms, and animal names. In sum, the patterns of proper names in Gumbaynggirr and Chuckchee show that cross-linguistically proper names do not behave homogeneously. First, place names do not pattern morphosyntactically with other proper names. A possible explanation is that in ergative languages place names cannot occur in the A argument role since they are low in agentivity. Second, in Gumbaynggirr animal names behave as common nouns while in Chuckchee they behave as proper names. And third, kinship terms behave as proper names in both languages. In sum, a fine-grained classification is needed in order to account for the morphosyntactic properties of proper names.

In addition to numeral marking and case split marking, the morphosyntactic patterns of proper names may contribute to a better understanding of differential object marking (DOM). In Romance linguistics, DOM has attracted the attention of scholars working on linguistic typology, historical linguistics and language variation (among others: Bossong 1991, 1998, García García 2017, Mardale 2008). However, the cross-linguistic patterns of DOM with proper names are still poorly understood. This paper is the first to examine the patterns of DOM with proper names in Romance languages. It will be shown that DOM can be explained in a more satisfactory way when breaking up the category of proper names into deity names, personal names, kinship names, animal names, and place names.

² Note that the plural form of the personal name Rintin is Rintinti with the meanings ‘men called Rintin’ and ‘Rintin and his associates’ (for associative plural with proper names and kinship terms see Corbett 2000: 101–111, Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 207–208, and Daniel & Moravcsik 2013).
The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly describes DOM. Section 3 presents an animacy-based classification of proper names. Section 4 gives a synchronic and diachronic account of DOM in Romance languages and language varieties according to the proper name classes. Section 5 discusses the implications derived from the patterns of DOM with proper names.

2 Differential object marking (DOM)

The term Differential Object Marking was coined by Bossong (1982: 580, 1985) in order to describe the differential marking of patient arguments in Sardinian and Iranian languages. Cross-linguistically, patient arguments may be coded differently according to inherent and non-inherent argument properties. Inherent argument properties may be lexical (person, animacy, uniqueness, discreteness, and number) or morphological (part-of-speech and gender/inflectional-class distinction). Non-inherent argument properties include definiteness, specificity, and topicality (see Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant 2017 for details). The extended animacy hierarchy only captures instances of DOM triggered by inherent lexical argument properties. This is the case in Russian (Croft 2003: 131). In some languages, however, DOM is triggered by non-inherent argument properties such as definiteness. This is the case in Turkish, where DOM obeys the definiteness hierarchy, which is given in (3) (Croft 2003: 132).

\[(3) \text{ Definiteness hierarchy:} \]
\[\text{definite} > \text{specific} > \text{non-specific}\]

In other languages, DOM results from the interaction of the extended animacy and the definiteness hierarchies. Such is the case in Spanish (see García García 2017 for details). In this respect, Aissen (2003: 449–472) makes a distinction between one-dimensional and two-dimensional DOM. One-dimensional DOM follows either the extended animacy or the definiteness hierarchies. In constrast, two-dimensional DOM combines both of them. Different models have been proposed in order to capture two dimensional DOM. These include the harmonic alignment (Aissen 2003), the semantic map (Croft 2003: 168), and the cross-classification (von Heusinger & Kaiser 2005: 40).

Let us examine the patterns of DOM with proper names in Turkish and Spanish. Note that the object is differentially marked by means of the case ending -(y)I in Turkish and the preposition a in Spanish. In Turkish, DOM occurs with personal names and place names, as illustrated in (4). This is due to the fact that DOM is triggered by the definiteness hierarchy. As a result, proper names are differentially marked regardless
of animacy. By contrast, in Spanish DOM occurs with personal names but not with place names, as shown in (5).

(4) Turkish

\[ \text{ben Kaan-ı gör-dü-m / ben İstanbul-ı gör-dü-m} \]

1SG Kaan-ACC see-PST-1SG / 1SG Istanbul-ACC see-PST-1SG

'I saw Kaan / I saw Istanbul.'

(5) Spanish

\[ \text{yo vi a Marco / yo vi Madrid} \]

1SG see.PST[1SG] ACC Marco / 1SG see.PST[1SG] Madrid

'I saw Marco / I saw Madrid.'

In Spanish, animacy patterns similarly with proper names and common nouns since both human names and human definite nouns are \( a \)-marked (Vi a Marco ‘I saw Marco’, Vi al hombre ‘I saw the man’). However, in earlier stages of Spanish we find DOM with place names (see Section 4.5). As a consequence, proper names differ from common nouns with respect to animacy since inanimate names are \( a \)-marked as opposed to inanimate definite nouns (Vi a Madrid ‘I saw Madrid’ vs. Vi la ciudad ‘I saw the city’).

Romance languages typically have two-dimensional DOM, which allows to compare the patterns of animacy with proper names and common nouns. Additionally, in Spanish the development of DOM was triggered by affectedness such that high affected human objects are differentielly marked prior to low affected human objects (von Heusinger & Kaiser 2005, García García 2017: 222–225). Crucially, only definite human nouns are sensitive to affectedness while human names are always \( a \)-marked (see von Heusinger & Kaiser 2011 for details). For example, in 12th century Spanish DOM occurs with human names and definite human nouns with a frequency of 96% and 36%, respectively (Laca 2006: 442–443). Thus, evidence from the patterns of animacy and affectedness support the notion of a grammar of names (see Schlücker & Ackermann 2017 for further examples).

Within the Romance language family, there are languages with DOM such as Spanish and languages without DOM such as French and Italian (see Rohlfs 1971b: 55–59, Bossong 1998: 218–230, 2008: 286–288 for a comprehensive overview). In Allerese and Roussillon Catalan, there is a split between differentially marked first/second person pronouns and unmarked third person pronoun (see D’Alessandro 2017: 8 for Allerese). In Central Catalan we find DOM with strong pronouns regardless of person. In Corsican, Galician, and Portuguese DOM occurs with pronouns and proper names but not with common nouns. In Asturian, Romanian, Sardinian, Sicilian, and Spanish there
is DOM with strong pronouns, proper names, and definite human nouns. However, definite human nouns are optionally marked in Asturian, Neapolitan, Sardinian, and Sicilian while they are obligatorily marked in Romanian and Spanish (see ALLA 2003: 352 and Prieto 2010: 26 for Asturian, Jones 1995: 39, 2003: 69 for Sardinian, Ledgeway 2009: 838–839 for Neapolitan). Table 1 gives an overview of the extent of DOM in selected Romance languages.

Table 1: DOM according to the extended animacy hierarchy in Romance languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1./2. personal pronoun</th>
<th>3. personal pronoun</th>
<th>PNs</th>
<th>NPs (definite and human)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French, Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerese, Roussillon Catalan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Catalan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsican, Galician, Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asturian, Neapolitan, Sardinian, Sicilian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish, Romanian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Romance linguistics, research on DOM has revolved around the question of how nominal and verbal parameters condition the occurrence of DOM, especially in noun phrases (see García García 2017 for Spanish). However, the patterns of DOM with proper names are still poorly understood. Additionally, descriptions of DOM involving proper names pose, at least, two problems. First, there is not always a clear distinction between proper names and common nouns. One of the consequences is the false interpretation of the syntactic patterns of DOM in languages where DOM is restricted to proper names as in Corsican (see Table 1). In this respect, Marcellesi (1986) assumed that the a-marker and the definite article are in complementary distribution. With regard to deity terms, he (p. 132) points out that the occurrence of the a-marker implies the absence of the definite article as in *Temu à Dio* ʻI fear Godʼ. Conversely, the absence of the a-marker implies the occurrence of the definite article as in *Temu u Signori* ʻI fear the Lordʼ. This assumption, however, can be challenged arguing that in Corsican DOM is found with proper names but not with definite human nouns since *Dio* ʻGodʼ is a proper name while *Signori* ʻLordʼ is a common noun. More precisely, they constitute a deity name and a deity noun, respectively. Similarly, previous work failed to recognize the proprial status of kinship terms derived from specific morphosyntactic criteria. The implications derived from a distinction between proper names and common nouns will be discussed in more detail in Section 3, Section 4.1, and Section 4.3.

Second, proper names were often treated as a homogeneous group. For example, López (1993) did not distinguish between deity names and personal names although in Portuguese deity names differ from personal names. In contrast, scholars such as Rohlf (1971), Monedero (1983), and Cabanes (1995) offer more fine-grained distinctions. For example, Rohlf (1971, 1973) addressed DOM in Balearic Catalan, Corsican, southern
Italian dialects, Ladin, Occitan, and Sardinian according to deity names, personal names, animal names, city names, and country names. Similarly, Monedero (1983) and Cabanes (1995) studied DOM in Spanish and Catalan respectively according to deity names and personal names. Notwithstanding, DOM has not been systematically studied according to different proper name classes. This issue will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.

It will be shown that a classification of proper names comprised of deity names, personal names, kinship names, animal names, and place names grasps the synchronic and diachronic variation found among Romance languages. The analysis will concentrate on SVO structures since in some languages DOM is categorical with left dislocations (see Cidrás 2006: 162–163 for Galician, ALLA 2003: 353 for Asturian, Escandell Vidal 2009 for Balearic Catalan, Jones 1995: 44, 2003: 69 for Sardinian, Ledgeway 2009: 839 for Neapolitan, Berretta 2003 for northern Italian dialects, and Fagard & Mardale 2014 for French varieties).

3 Classification of proper names

This section presents a classification of proper names that will be applied to the patterns of DOM in Romance languages (Section 4). Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser (2015: 101–106) provide a classification of proper names based on animacy, agentivity, contour, and causally affected, thereby distinguishing between personal names (anthroponyms), animal names (zoonyms), place names (toponyms), brand names (ergonyms), event names (praxonyms), and weather names (phenonyms). An animacy-based classification of proper names is given in (6), which includes human, animate, and inanimate names. Note that this classification can be decomposed in terms of Dowty’s (1991) agentivity properties in the following way: control and autonomous movement are restricted to human names, sentience is shared by human and animate names, and independent existence may occur with human, animate, and inanimate names. Linguistic processes involving proper names may be sensitive to this classification. For example, the grammaticalization of the onymic markers *en* and *na* in Catalan is in accordance with the animacy scale since it expanded from personal names to animal names and finally to place names (Caro Reina 2014: 198).

(6) Classification of proper names:
   personal name > animal name > place name

The classification of proper names depicted in (6) can be implemented by adding deity names and kinship names. Note that deity names and kinship names are absent from the
typology of proper names put forward by Van Langendonck (2007: 183-255). Deity names (theonyms) such as God, Jesus, etc. are ranked higher than personal names (see Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser 2015: 103 for discussion and Kopf 2017 for the propial stauts of Gott ‘God’ in Early New High German). A distinction between deity names and personal names cannot be based on animacy proper but rather on agentivity. This issue will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.3. In contrast to deity names, it is not clear whether personal names are ranked higher than kinship names.\(^3\) Note that personal names do not outrank kinship names in versions of the extended animacy hierarchy that include kinship terms (e.g. Whaley 1997: 173). A modified classification of proper names, which introduces deity names and kinship names, is given in (7). As we will see in the ensuing section, instances of DOM involving proper names are triggered by this scale in Romance languages.

(7) Classification of proper names (revised):

deity name > personal name, kinship name > animal name > place name

In language typology, kinship terms have been mainly associated with possessive constructions (alienable vs. inalienable, obligatory vs. optional) and their taxonomy (ascending, descending, and horizontal) (Greenberg 1980, Jonsson 2001, Moravcsik 2013: 34–39). In this respect, Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001: 205–213) provide an account of the grammatical properties of kinship terms. Cross-linguistically, kinship terms may behave morphosyntactically as proper names. These morphosyntactic similarities include verbal agreement, gender assignment, inflection, possessive constructions, and onymic markers. In Hungarian, for example, the objective conjugation (-om/-om/-öm ‘1SG.OBJ’) is employed with definite objects while the subjective conjugation (-ok/-ek/-ök ‘1SG.SBJ’) is employed with indefinite objects. In this respect, Bárány (2012) explains this instance of verbal agreement in terms of differential object marking. In addition to definite noun phrases, personal names, place names, and kinship terms trigger the objective conjugation, as illustrated in (8).

(8) Objective conjugation in Hungarian

lát-om Máriá-t / Budapest-et / apu-t

\(^3\) Evidence supporting a division between personal names and kinship names comes from Tati, a Northwestern Iranian dialect group spoken in Iran. In these dialects, the singular oblique of kinship terms is formed by adding the suffix -(a)r. Interestingly, this ending has expanded to definite human nouns. As a consequence, personal names have a different ending than kinship names and definite human nouns (Yarshater 1969: 73–74, 86–95, Bossong 1982: 23, 130). Examples from Chāli are Hasan-e ‘Hasan-ACC’, pia-r ‘father-ACC’, and cupun-ar ‘shepherd-ACC’ (Yarshater 1969: 87–90).
In languages with non-sex-based gender systems (especially the Niger-Congo family), proper names and kinship terms may be assigned to the same noun class. This is the case in Eton, a Bantu language spoken in Cameroon, where proper names and kinship terms belong to noun class 1a (Van de Velde 2003). Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser (2015: 51‒52) observe that in standard German kinship terms resemble proper names with respect to the absence of definite articles (Mutter / Maria kommt nachher ‘Mom / Mary arrives later’), prenominal genitive constructions (Vaters / Peters Geburtstag ‘Dad’s / Peter’s birthday’), and genitive -s with feminines (Mutters / Marias Geburtstag ‘Mom’s / Mary’s birthday’) (see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003 for examples from European languages). In Romanian, the possessive marker lui is restricted to proper names as opposed to common nouns such as fată ‘girl’. In addition to personal names, it occurs with kinship terms, as shown in (9) (see Miron-Fulea, Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2013: 24–25 for details).

(9)  Genitive marker lui in Romanian

carte-\(a\)  fet-\(e\)i / lui  Alina / lui  mama
book-DEF.F  girl-DEF.GEN / POSS  Alina / POSS  mom
‘The girl’s / Alina’s / Mom’s book’

Further evidence that kinship terms behave as proper names comes from Austronesian languages where proper names are accompanied by onymic markers while common nouns are accompanied by other determiners. This is the case in Vitu, an Austronesian language spoken in Papua New Guinea, where the onymic marker a occurs with proper names such as deity names (a Deu ‘God’), personal names (a Kalago ‘Kalago’), and place names (a Lama ‘Lama’) as opposed to common nouns (na tamohane ‘the man’, na malala ‘the village’). Importantly, the onymic marker also occurs with kinship terms (a tama-na ‘his/her father’) (Berg & Bachet 2006: 27‒30, 33‒35).

In light of the morphosyntactic similarities between proper names and kinship terms, we have to distinguish between kinship names and kinship nouns. Kinship term doublets may reflect this differentiation (see Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 217 for examples of doublets). In European Spanish, for example, mamá ‘mom’ is a kinship name while madre ‘mother’ is a kinship noun. This becomes evident from structures such as Mamá / María trabaja hoy ‘Mom / Mary works today’ and Mi madre / Mi profesora trabaja hoy ‘My mom / My teacher works today’. Note that not all kinship terms may behave as proper names. In Spanish, for example, hermana ‘sister’ is re-
stricted to DPs as in *Mi hermana trabaja hoy ‘My sister works today’ (*Hermana trabaja hoy). In Section 4.3 I will discuss the proprial status of kinship terms in selected Romance languages. The onymic status of kinship terms would lead to revise some previous analyses. For example, Aissen (2003: 456) points out that Yiddish has one-dimensional DOM since case marking is restricted to human referents (see Section 2 for one-dimensional DOM). These include personal pronouns, personal names, and human common nouns. However, a closer look at these human common nouns reveals that they are mostly kinship terms such as *mame ‘mother’, *tate ‘father’, etc. (see Kratz 1987: 97–99 for details). The occurrence of DOM with kinship names forces us to classify Yiddish as a language with two-dimensional DOM where the cutt-off point is between proper names and common nouns.

4 DOM with proper names in Romance languages

In this section, I will give a synchronic and diachronic account of the patterns of DOM in Romance languages with deity names (Section 4.1), personal names (Section 4.2), kinship names (Section 4.3), animal names (Section 4.4), and place names (Section 4.5). The languages selected are Galician, Portuguese, Asturian, Spanish, Catalan, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, and Romanian. The diachronic analysis will allow to identify DOM expansion and retraction and explain it in terms of animacy and agentivity (Section 4.6). The diachronic analysis will be restricted to deity names, personal names, and place names since animal names and kinship names are not so frequently attested in historical records. For example, in Laca’s (2006) diachronic study of Spanish animal names were only found in the 17th century.

4.1 Deity names

Deity names (theonyms) include names of gods, saints, devils, etc. Similar to kinship terms (see Section 3), there is no clear distinction between deity names and deity nouns in the literature. For example, in their analysis of capitalization in Early New High German, Bergmann & Nerius (1998: 56) classified *Gott ‘God’, *der Herr ‘the Lord’, *der Heilige Geist ‘the Holy Ghost’, etc. as nomina sacra, although *Gott is a deity name while *der Herr ‘the Lord’, etc. are deity nouns. Different lines of evidence show the non-proprial status of deity terms when accompanied by definite or possessive articles. For example, in late 15th century Portuguese, DOM occurs with the deity name Deus ‘God’ but not with deity nouns as in *nosso Sehnor ‘our Lord’, *o Salvador ‘the Saviour’,
etc. Interestingly, DOM does not even occur with Jesucristo ‘Jesus Christ’ (Delille 1970: 43–44).

The presence of DOM with deity names has been traditionally called “prepositional accusative of deity” (see Delille 1970: 43–44 for Portuguese, Meier 1947: 244–246 for Catalan, and Monedero 1983: 266–273 for Spanish). This is due to the fact that deity names and deity nouns have not been treated separately. In other words, the onymic status of deity terms has remained obscure. A distinction between deity names and deity nouns helps to explain why personal names resemble deity names with respect to DOM (both are proper names). However, the question remains open as to why DOM is restricted to deity names as in 15th century Portuguese (and modern Portuguese as a result of DOM retraction). In this respect, we can assume that in the patient argument the deity name God outranks personal names in agentivity rather than animacy. Among Dowty’s (1991) agentivity properties, independent existence is always given with deity names, but not necessarily with personal names. Additionally, the degree of proto-agent properties such as control is higher with deity names than with personal names. For scholars such as Primus (2012), independent existence is the crucial factor determining the occurrence of DOM. She argues that the properties of the patient proto-role result from the basic properties of the agent proto-role. This co-argument dependency model relates the emergence of DOM to arguments that deviate from the patient proto-role in terms of agentivity. In this respect, deity names are more marked than personal names. This could explain why DOM is more prone to occur with deity names than with personal names, as becomes evident from the patterns found in Portuguese (see Section 4.6 for discussion).  

Among Romance languages, DOM is attested in all languages surveyed: Galician (Cidrás 2006: 157), Portuguese (Perini 2002: 444), Asturian, Spanish, Corsican (Rohlfs 1971: 318, Marcellesi 1986: 132), Sardinian (Rohlfs 1971: 317), Sicilian (Rohlfs 1971: 314), Neapolitan (Rohlfs 1973: 619, Ledgeway 2009: 837–838), and Romanian. 5 Deity names are not confined to gods from Christianity as illustrated by the example from Galician Entre os que a Cristo adoran, a Osiris e a Adonai ‘Among those who adore Christ, Osiris, and Adonai’.

---

4 The co-argument dependency could also be related to the notion of contingency. In western culture, and more precisely in the scholastic era, God is claimed to exist by necessity as opposed to the Universe which exists by contingency. As a consequence, human beings are contingent and their existence is ultimately derived from God.

5 ALLA (2003) and Prieto (2010) do not contain instances of DOM with deity names. An example from Asturian is Tuvo mentando a Dios / a Jesucristo / a San Antón ‘S/he was mentioning God / Jesus / Saint Anthony’ (Prieto, p.c.). An example from Romanian is Îl adorăm pe Dumnezeu ‘We adore God’ (Tigău, p.c.). Note that in contrast to other Romance languages the object is differentially marked by means of the preposition pe.
Portuguese is the only Romance language where DOM is confined to deity names (a Deus ‘ACC God’). Examples from Corsican are given in (10), where the deity names are differentially marked while the corresponding deity nouns are not. Note that in Corsican, DOM does not occur with definite human nouns (see Table 1).

(10) Corsican (Marcellesi 1986: 137)
   a. Tem-u à Diu / à Satanassu / à Sampetru
      fear-1SG ACC God / ACC Satan / ACC Saint Peter
      ‘I fear God / Satan / Saint Peter.’
   b. Tem-u u Signori / u diauli / u santu
      fear-1SG DEF.M Lord / DEF.M Devil / DEF.M saint
      ‘I fear the Lord / the Devil / the saint.’

4.2 Personal names

Personal names include first names, family names, etc. (see Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser 2015: 107–110 for a classification). Note that personal names may be combined with terms of address (Mister, Miss) and titles (Doctor). DOM occurs with personal names in Galician (Cidrás 2006: 156–160), Asturian (ALLA 2003: 352, Prieto 2010: 25), Spanish (Torrego 1999: 1799), Corsican (Rohlfs 1971: 318, Marcellesi 1986: 131, Neuburger & Stark 2014: 374), Sardinian (Rohlfs 1971: 317, Jones 1995: 38, 2003: 68–69), Sicilian (Rohlfs 1971: 314, Iemmolo 2007: 343), Neapolitan (Rohlfs 1973: 619, Ledgeway 2009: 837–838), and Romanian (Tigău 2011: 35). In Galician, the use of determiners such definite articles and possessive articles with personal names favours the absence of DOM as in Eu xa non amaba o Queitán ‘I did not love Queitán any more’ and Cando vexo o meu Antonio ‘When I annoy Antonio’, respectively (see Sousa 1994 and Lorenzo 2015 for the use of the definite article with personal names). In Section 2, Catalan was characterized as a language where DOM is restricted to strong personal pronouns (see Table 1). However, in earlier stages DOM is attested with personal names with a relative frequency of 8% in the 14th century, 52% in the 15th century, and 78% in the 16th century.

4.3 Kinship names

After establishing a difference between kinship names and kinship nouns on the basis of morphosyntactic criteria (see Section 3), let us observe the patterns of DOM with kinship names. DOM may help to determine the proprial status of kinship terms in languages where the cut-off point is between proper names and common nouns. This is the
Differential object marking with proper names in Romance languages

Among Romance languages, we can distinguish the following morphosyntactic structures depending on whether kinship terms are heads of a noun phrase or a definite phrase: a) kinship term, b) possessive article + kinship term (or kinship term + possessive article), c) definite article + kinship term, and d) definite article + possessive article + kinship term. Let us take a look at these structures. Kinship terms as heads of noun phrases – that is, without determiner – morphosyntactically resemble personal names (as long as personal names are not employed with a definite article). Kinship terms accompanied by possessive articles have proprial status in Galician, Corsican, Sardinian, and Sicilian, but not in Asturian and Spanish. In this respect, kinship names differ from deity names since deity names do not occur with possessive articles (see examples from 15th century Portuguese in Section 4.1. Interestingly, the possessive article may not occur with all kinship terms. For example, in Corsican possessive articles are not possible with ascending kinship terms involving lineal relatives such as mamma ‘mother’, babbu ‘father’, etc. as in Andate à vede à mamma ‘Go and see my mother’. However, they may occur with kinship terms such as figliolo ‘son’, figliola ‘daughter’, etc. as in Piengu à me figliola ‘I mourn after my daughter’ (Giancarli 2014: 203). Further, kinship terms accompanied by definite articles (and additionally with possessive adjectives) behave as common nouns in all Romance languages. Certainly, the morphosyntactic properties determining the proprial status of kinship terms are still poorly understood and deserve a cross-linguistic study. In the following, I will concentrate on the proprial status of kinship terms in nominal phrases and in definite phrases with possessive articles.


---

6 Examples from Sardinian and Sicilian are Appo vistu a frate tuo ‘I saw your brother’ and Arrubbaru a so cuscinu ‘They kidnapped his/her cousin’, respectively (Jones 1995: 38, Iemmolo 2007: 344). Note that kinship terms behave as nouns when modified by a prepositional phrase or when employed in plural. In these cases, the kinship noun is optionally marked as in Sardinian Appo vistu (a) su frate de Lidia ‘I saw Lucy’s brother’ and Sicilian Arrubbaru (a) i so cuscinu ‘They kidnapped his/her cousins’ (Jones 1995: 42, Iemmolo 2007: 344).

7 In Asturian, for example, kinship terms may be optionally marked when accompanied by a definite article as in La neña quier el ~ al (a+el) padre ‘The girl loves her father’ (Prieto 2010: 26). In this respect, they behave as common nouns since DOM is obligatory with proper names but optional with common nouns (see Table 1). In Corsican, the structure definite article + possessive article + kinship term involves a common noun as in Aghju vistu u meu ziu ‘I saw my uncle’ (without DOM) vs. Aghju vistu à meu ziu ‘I saw my uncle’ (with DOM) (Marcellesi 1986: 131, 137).
838), and Romanian. In Romanian, kinship terms resemble personal names with regard to their endings, as illustrated in (11). Note that the common noun fată ‘girl’ cannot occur with the marker pe when followed by the definite article -a. However, this restriction does not apply for personal names such as Alina. Interestingly, the kinship term mamă ‘mother’ patterns with the personal name Alina. In contrast to the common noun fată ‘girl’, the kinship term occurs with the definite article (see Miron-Fulea, Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2013: 721–725 for discussion).

(11) Romanian
   a.  o iub-ește pe fată / pe *fat-a
       CL.ACC love-2SG ACC girl / ACC girl-DEF.F
           ‘S/he loves the girl.’
   b.  o iub-ește pe Alina
       CL.ACC love-2SG ACC Alina
           ‘S/he loves Alina.’
   c.  o iub-ește pe mama / pe *mamă
       CL.ACC love-2SG ACC mom / ACC mom
           ‘S/he loves mom.’

Table 2 contains the kinship terms with proprial status in Asturian, Spanish, Corsican, and Sicilian. Interestingly, the number of kinship terms with proprial status varies cross-linguistically. The examples involve ascending kinship terms. Note that the referent of a kinship name may vary from language to language. For example, in Asturian kinship names do not necessarily refer to the speaker’s relatives as in ¿Quies mucho a güelu? ‘Do you love your grandfather very much?’. In Corsican, babbà ‘father’ and mammà ‘mother’ refer to the speaker’s relatives while bâbbitu ‘father’ and màmmata ‘mother’ refer to the hearer’s relatives (see Marcellesi 1986: 131 for details).

---

8 Compare the grammaticality in the following examples: a) Span. Ví a mamá / a papá / *a abuela / *a abuelo / *a tía / *a tí / ‘I saw mom, etc.’; b) Ast. Ví a ma / a pá / a güelu / a güelo / a tía / a tío; and Sic. Viristi a mamma / a papà / a nonna / a nonnu / *a ziu / *a zia.
Table 2: Proprietary status of kinship terms in selected Romance languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kinship names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>mamá ‘mother’, papá ‘father’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian</td>
<td>mama ‘mother’, papá ‘father’, nonna ‘grandmother’, nonnu ‘grandfather’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crucially, kinship terms constitute the bridge between proper names and human common nouns. This is the case when kinship terms may behave simultaneously as kinship names and common nouns. That is, when the distinction is not lexically coded by means of doublettes. Note that in Corsican the kinship term zio ‘uncle’ may behave both as a proper name and a common noun (see example in Footnote 7). From this intermediate status we can deduce that expansion of DOM from proper names to common nouns occurs via kinship names. In this respect, Bossong (1985: 130) observes that in 12th century Spanish DOM is obligatory with kinship terms while it is optional with other human nouns (see Reichenkron 1951: 359–360 for details). A word of caution, however, is that the examples include left dislocations and kinship terms in plural as in A las sues fíjas en braço las prendía ‘His daughters, he embraced them’. On the one hand, in Old Spanish definite human nouns are optionally marked when dislocated (see García García 2017: 212–215 for discussion). On the other hand, kinship terms cannot behave as proper names when occurring in plural (see Footnote 6). Thus, the first attested forms of DOM with human objects should be examined with respect to sentence structure and proprietary status.

4.4 Animal names

Animal names include names of companion, farm, and zoo animals (see Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser 2015: 191–193 and Leibring 2016 for a classification). DOM is attested with cow names, dog names, and horse names in Asturian (Prieto 2010: 25), Spanish (Torrego 1999: 1799), Corsican (Rohlfs 1971: 318, Marcellesi 1986: 131), Sardinian (Rohlfs 1971: 317, Jones 1995: 40, 2003: 69), Sicilian (Rohlfs 1971: 314), Neapolitan (Rohlfs 1973: 620, Ledgeway 2009: 839–840), and Romanian (Tigău 2011: 35–36). In Asturian, DOM is only attested with animal names when employed without definite articles (Lluis quier a Micifú ‘Luis loves Micifú’). In Galician, animal names are not differentially marked. The absence of DOM is syntactically constrained since animal names mostly occur with definite articles as in Alindar a Xovenca i a Marela ‘to pasture
Xovenca and Marela’ (taken from TILG). Note that these patterns mirror personal names, which are mostly employed without definite articles. In Corsican, DOM was reported for dog names but not for horse names as in Fighjolgu à Lionu ‘I observe Lionu’ and Ha purtatu u Sciroccu ‘S/he has ridden Siroco’, respectively (Marcellesi 1986: 137). In this respect, familiarity and empathy may influence the occurrence of DOM.

Animal names do not differ from common nouns denoting animals (and even persons) with respect to animacy but rather with respect to definiteness (see Comrie 1989: 196 for discussion). As a consequence, DOM may occur with animal names and not with common nouns. This is the case in Asturian, Corsican, and Spanish. In Asturian we find DOM with animal names but not with common nouns (regardless of animacy) as in Lluis quier a Micifú ‘Luis loves Micifú’ vs. Lluis quier el perru ‘Luis loves the dog’ (Prieto 2010: 25–26). In Corsican, dog names are accompanied by DOM as opposed to definite noun phrases containing a dog noun as in Fighjolgu à Lionu ‘I observe Lionu’ and A vittura hà sfracicatu u ghjâcaru ‘The car ran over the dog’, respectively (Marcellesi 1986: 137). Note that in Asturian definite human nouns may be differentially marked while in Corsican they are not differentially marked (see Table 1). Another example comes from 12th and 17th century Spanish. In Cantar de Mio Cid (ca. 1140), the horse name Bavieca is always differentially marked as in Ensíëllanle a Bavieca ‘They saddle Bavieca for him’ (taken from CORDE) while the common noun cavallo ‘horse’ is never marked. In Cervantes’ Don Quijote de la Mancha (1605), the horse name Rocinante occurs 28 times as an accusative object and is always differentially marked as in Ensillar a Rocinante ‘to saddle Rocinante’ (taken from CORDE). In contrast, definite noun phrases containing an animal noun (caballo ‘horse’, rocín ‘old horse’, asno ‘donkey’, and mula ‘mule’) occur 7 times with DOM and 11 times without DOM (39% vs. 61%) (see Reichenkron 1951: 370–371 for discussion). Moreover, DOM occurs more frequently with animal names than with human definite nouns both in the 12th century (100% vs. 36%) and the 17th century (100% vs. 86%) (the percentages of definite human nouns were taken from Laca 2006: 442–443).

Note that the singular definite feminine article is homophonous with the case marker. In the agent argument, animal names also exhibit the definite article as in A Marela i a Xovenca pacian os gromos tenros ‘Marela and Xovenca browsed the tender shoots’. Animal names are derived from nouns such as xovenca ‘calf’ and adjectives such as marela ‘yellow’.
4.5 Place names

Place names (toponyms) include names of countries, cities, villages, etc. (see Van Langendonck 207–210 and Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser 2015: 206–208 for a classification). In this section, I will mainly concentrate on city names. DOM occurs with city names in Corsican (Rohlfs 1971: 319, Marcellesi 1986: 131, Neuburger & Stark 2014: 376), Sardinian (Jones 1995: 38, 2003: 69), and Sicilian (Rohlfs 1971: 315). An example from Sardinian is given in (12). In some varieties of Spanish DOM is also attested, albeit to different degrees. With regard to place names, DOM is absent from Galician (Cidrás 2006: 160), Portuguese, Asturian (Prieto 2010: 25), Neapolitan (Ledgeway 2009: 840) and Romanian (Tigãu 2011: 36).

(12) Sardinian (Jones 1995: 38)
app-o vistu a Nápoli
AUX-1SG see.PTCP ACC Naples
‘I saw Naples.’

In Romanian, the absence of DOM results from a syntactic constraint. Since place names are employed with definite articles (Miron-Fulea, Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2013: 726), they cannot be differentially marked. That is, in contrast to Galician, the

\[\text{Rohlfs (1971: 315) gives examples of DOM with city names and country names in Sicilian such as A Trápāni unni lu canisciu ‘I do not know Trapani’ and st’ōmu arruvinā all’Italia ‘This man ruined Italy’, respectively. In recent work (Guardiano 2010), the presence of DOM with place names is not attested, which seems to point to retraction (see Section 4.6 for discussion). In Spanish, DOM is also attested with country names, mountain names, and river names. Examples from 19th century European Spanish are Conocía a Inglaterra y a Francia ‘He knew England and France’, No basta haber visto a Sierra Nevada ‘It is not enough to have seen Sierra Nevada’, and [...] ver, no ya al Manzanares, pero ni tampoco al Tajo ‘see neither the Manzanares nor the Tajo’ (taken from CORDE). Additional research would be needed in order to to gain further insight into the occurrence of DOM with place names in the history of Spanish.}

On the basis of the Proyecto de estudio coordinado de la norma lingüística culta, DeMello (2000: 302) observes that DOM is employed in varieties of European and Latin American Spanish, albeit to different degrees: La Paz 10 (63%) vs. 6 (37%), Bogotá 10 (59%) vs. 7 (41%), La Habana 9 (50%) vs. 9 (50%), San Juan 3 (43%) vs. 4 (57%), Madrid 5 (38%) vs. 8 (62%), Caracas 5 (31%) vs. 11 (69%), San José 5 (31%) vs. 11 (69%), México 6 (29%) vs. 15 (71%), Sevilla 3 (25%) vs. 9 (75%), Santiago 3 (14%) vs. 25 (86%), Buenos Aires 3 (12%) vs. 23 (88%), and Lima 3 (7%) vs. 38 (93%).

With regard to Asturian, DOM has been documented in Sobrescobio as in Nun konozía nin a Jijón ni a Ubieu ‘S/he did not know either Gijón or Oviedo’ (Prieto 2010: 25). The question remains open as to whether DOM was previously used with place names. In this respect, the historical evidence supported by Prieto (2010: 28) is not conclusive.
absence of differential object marking in Romanian cannot be explained in terms of animacy.

(13) Romanian

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{am văz-ut Bucrești-ul} / \text{am văz-ut oraș-ul} \\
\text{AUX.1SG see-PTCP Bucarest-DEF.M} / \text{AUX-1SG see-PTCP city-DEF.M}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I saw Bucarest / I saw the city.’


The occurrence of DOM with place names has been mainly explained in terms of definiteness and metonymy (see Monedero 1978: 260–261 for Spanish). Definiteness implies the use of DOM with proper names regardless of animacy – that is, both with human, animate, and inanimate names. With regard to metonymy, the PLACE FOR PEOPLE metonymy conceptualizes the referenced object (the inhabitants of the city) with the associated concept (the city name), which enables DOM to occur with city names. A word of caution, however, is that cross-linguistically metonymy is not always possible with city names owing to conceptual, discourse-pragmatic, and grammatical factors (see Brdar & Brdar-Szabó 2009). This, however, does not seem to apply in Romance languages. Certainly, metonymy is always given when place names occur in the A (transitive or ditransitive subject) participant role, but not necessarily when they occur in the S (intransitive subject) or P (transitive direct object) participant roles.16

---

13 An example from 16th century Romanian is Au lovit pre Sneatin ‘They hit Sneatin’ (Tigău 2011: 53). Note that the city name is not accompanied by the definite article as opposed to nowadays, as shown in (13). In 16th century Valencian, DOM is attested with place names as in Après de haver saquejat a Gandia a Gandia y Oliva ‘After plundering Gandia and Oliva’ (taken from CICA). Examples of DOM with place names involve verbs such as cobrar ‘retake’, fundar ‘found’, edificar ‘build’, sitiar ‘besiege’, etc., which exclude a metonymic interpretation.

14 For example, in Cantar de Mio Cid DOM occurs with personal names and place names with a frequency of 96% and 64%, respectively (Martín 1976: 562 and Monedero 1978: 295).

15 Scholars such as Lapesa (1964: 82) and Fábregas (2013: 41) talk about “personification”. Following Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 35), who distinguish between personification and metonymy, I will talk about metonymy.

16 The capacity of place names to occur in the A argument role in ergative languages has remained obscure in the literature. Additional research would be needed to clear up this matter.
Let us take a look at 19th century Spanish and Galician, where DOM is triggered by definiteness and metonymy, respectively. In 19th century Spanish we find DOM with place names. Metonymy can be excluded for the following reasons. First, notwithstanding the presence of metonymy in cases such as *No había visto a Madrid tan agitado* ‘I had never seen Madrid so agitated’ (taken from CORDE), there are a series of examples that cannot be associated with metonymy.\(^{17}\) Second, the use of DOM is not confined to city names. Interestingly, it is also attested with mountain names and river names (see Footnote 10 for examples). Third, in contrast to city names, we do not find DOM with hodonyms (square names) and dromonyms (street names), where we would expect metonymy. Thus, in 19th century Spanish the occurrence of DOM with place names is triggered by definiteness. By contrast, in Galician DOM is exclusively associated with metonymy as in *A Xunta critica a Madrid* ‘The Government of Galicia criticizes Madrid’ (Cidrás 2006: 160). Note that metonymy is not necessarily coupled with DOM. In Neapolitan, for example, DOM does not occur with place names (Ledgeway 2009: 840). Notwithstanding, the PLACE FOR PEOPLE metonymy is possible.

With regard to languages where DOM is triggered by definiteness, the question remains open as to why DOM mostly occurs with city names rather than with other place names such as mountain names and river names. A possible explanation is that city names are more prominent in terms of animacy and agentivity (see Schmidely 1986: 118 and Fraurud 2000: 199‒204 for animacy and Brauns 1908: 16‒17 for agentivity).

### 4.6 Summary

The results obtained from the synchronic and diacronic patterns of DOM with proper names are summarized in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. Table 4 shows that the Romance languages surveyed differ with respect to the occurrence of DOM with proper names. That is, proper names do not constitute a homogeneous group. For example, Catalan does not exhibit DOM with proper names while Corsican, Sardinian, and Sicilian always exhibit DOM. The patterns found in Galician, Portuguese, Neapolitan, and Romanian can be explained in a more satisfactory way applying a classification of proper names based on animacy and agentivity. The patterns of DOM reveal unidirectional implications. For example, DOM with personal names and kinship names implies DOM with deity names as in Galician, Asturian, Spanish, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian,

---

\(^{17}\) Examples from 19th century Spanish are *Todos vosotros habéis visto a Cádiz desde el mar* ‘You have all seen Cadiz from the sea’ and *Esa mujer [...] conocia a Madrid palmo a palmo* ‘That woman knew Madrid like the back of her hand’ (taken from CORDE).
Neapolitan, and Romanian. Similarly, DOM with place names implies DOM with all other classes as in Corsican, Sardinian, and Sicilian. Conversely, DOM with deity names does not necessarily imply DOM with personal names and kinship names as in Portuguese. Altogether, the occurrence of DOM with place names is rare among Romance languages.

Table 3: Occurrence of DOM with proper name classes in selected Romance languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Deity name</th>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>Kinship name</th>
<th>Animal name</th>
<th>Place name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asturian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsican</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diachronic analysis offers a window on language change involving DOM expansion and retraction. DOM expansion has been widely studied in Romanian (von Heusinger & Onea Gáspár 2008) and Spanish (Laca 2006, von Heusinger, Klaus & Georg Kaiser 2011). However, these studies have mainly concentrated on DOM with common nouns. In contrast to DOM expansion, the patterns of DOM retraction are still poorly understood (see Sinnemäki 2014: 302–304 for Semitic languages and García García 2017: 210–211 for Spanish). In the following, I will give an account of DOM expansion and retraction with proper names. Expansion is expected to proceed from the more prominent categories to the less prominent ones. Conversely, retraction is expected to proceed from the less prominent categories to the more prominent ones. In this sense, more prominent categories such as personal names are higher in agentivity and animacy than less prominent categories such as place names. With the exception of Neapolitan, which did not undergo substantial changes since the 18th century, we find expansion in Sicilian, retraction in Romanian, and both expansion and retraction in Galician, Portuguese, Spanish, and Catalan. The findings support evidence that DOM expansion and retraction are in line with a classification of proper names based on animacy and agentivity.
### Table 4: DOM retraction in selected Romance languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Deity name</th>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>Place name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th century Galician</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th century Galician</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Galician</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th century Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th century Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Portuguese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th century Spanish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century Spanish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Spanish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th century Catalan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th century Catalan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century Catalan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Catalan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th century Sicilian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Sicilian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century Neapolitan</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Neapolitan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century Romanian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Romanian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Section 4.1 we hypothesized that DOM is more prone to occur with deity names than with personal names. This hypothesis is borne out for Sicilian. In modern Sicilian, deity names and personal names are obligatorily marked. By contrast, in the 14th century deity names were always marked while personal names were marked in 358 (70%) of 506 cases (Iemmolo 2009: 201–202). As for other Romance languages, the hypothesis cannot be tested for the following reasons. First, in the earliest historical records DOM is already compulsory with deity names and personal names as in Medieval Spanish (Monedero 1983: 255–263, 266–268). Second, scholars such as López (1993) do not distinguish between deity names and personal names. And third, deity names are seldom attested in historical records examined for Asturian and Catalan (Cabanes 1995: 50–52, Prieto 2010: 28).
5 Conclusions and discussion

The results obtained from the synchronic and diachronic analysis of DOM with proper names in Romance languages force us to revise the extended animacy hierarchy presented in (1), thereby decomposing the category of proper names into different classes according to animacy and agentivity, as shown in (14). As a result, the category of proper names is comprised of deity names, personal names, kinship names, animal names, and place names. This revised version of the extended animacy hierarchy contributes to a better understanding of language variation and change. With regard to language variation, we found unidirectional implications. For example, DOM with personal names implies DOM with deity names. With regard to language change, expansion and retraction obeys this scale. The centrality of proper names results from the intermediate position they occupy between pronouns and common nouns. In this respect, deity names constitute the bridge for DOM expansion from pronouns to proper names. In the same vein, kinship names constitute the bridge for DOM expansion from human names to human nouns.

(14) Extended animacy hierarchy (revised):
first/second person pronouns > third person pronoun > deity names > personal names, kinship names > animal names > place names > human common noun > non-human animate common noun > inanimate common noun

In contrast to languages with one dimensional DOM, languages with two-dimensional DOM allow to examine the interaction of definiteness and animacy with proper names and common nouns, as illustrated in Table 5. For example, in Sardinian, Sicilian, and 19th century Spanish, proper names are differentially marked regardless of animacy while only human nouns are differentially marked. That is, in these languages animacy patterns differently with proper names and common nouns. In contrast, in Asturian, Neapolitan, and modern Spanish, human names are obligatorily marked and human nouns are either obligatorily or optionally marked. That is, in these languages animacy patterns similarly with proper names and common nouns. These findings support the notion of a grammar of names since proper names may grammatically deviate from common nouns.

Table 5: Interaction of definiteness and animacy with proper names and common nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proper name</th>
<th>Common noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>human</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinian, Sicilian, 19th century Spanish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th century Spanish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asturian, Neapolitan, Sicilian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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