

Javier Caro Reina

Differential Object Marking with proper names in Romance languages

Abstract: This article reports on the occurrence of Differential Object Marking (DOM) with proper names in selected Romance languages. 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 with proper names than with common nouns, 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 analysis sheds light on the patterns of DOM expansion and retraction with proper names.

Keywords: agentivity, animacy, definiteness, deity names, Differential Object Marking (DOM), kinship names, personal names, place names, identifiability.

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, and 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).

□□

Javier Caro Reina: Romanisches Seminar, Universität zu Köln, Albertus-Magnus-Platz, D-50923 Köln, +49(0)221-470-2831, javier.caroreina@uni-koeln.de

(1) Extended animacy hierarchy:

first/second-person pronoun > third-person pronoun > proper name > 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).¹ 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 higher in animacy than the common noun *man* since both are animate. However, the personal name ranks higher on the referentiality scale. Similarly, the proper name *Madrid* is not higher in animacy than the common noun *city* since both are inanimate. However, the place name ranks higher on the referentiality scale. 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*. Thus, referentiality allows for a distinction between noun classes (proper name vs. common noun) while animacy allows for a distinction within the noun classes (human vs. inanimate).

(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). 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 (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 hierarchies (Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Malchukov & Richards 2015) and differential argument marking (Seržant & Witzlack-Makarevich 2018), proper names did not receive much attention. A possible explanation is that reference grammars seldom contain descriptions of proper names, as pointed out by scholars such as Croft (1995: 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). With regard to case marking, personal names and kinship terms behave similarly as opposed to animal names and place names. In Chuckchee, 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 However, a closer look at proper names reveals that personal names, kinship terms, and animal names behave similarly as opposed to place names. In sum, the morphosyntactic patterns of proper names in Gumbaynggirr and Chuckchee show that proper names do not behave homogeneously. First, place names do not pattern morphosyntactically with other proper name classes. 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. 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; Mardale 2008; García García 2018). 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

□□

² Note that the plural form of the personal name *Rintin* is *Rintinti* with the meanings ‘men called Rintin’ and ‘Rintin and his associates’ (see Corbett 2000: 101–111, Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 207–208, and Daniel & Moravcsik 2013 for associative plural with proper names and kinship terms).

will be shown that DOM can be described 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.

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; 1985) in order to describe the differential marking of patient arguments in Romance 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 2018 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) Definiteness hierarchy:
definite > specific > 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 2018 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 hierarchy or the definiteness hierarchy. In contrast, 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 European Spanish. Note that the direct object is differentially marked by means of the case

ending *-(y)I* in Turkish and the preposition *a* in European 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 European Spanish DOM occurs with personal names but not with place names, as shown in (5).

(4) Turkish

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

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 Modern European 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’). By contrast, in Old 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 enables us 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 direct objects are differentially marked prior to low affected human direct objects (von Heusinger & Kaiser 2005; García García 2018: 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 twelfth-century Spanish DOM occurs with human names and definite human nouns with a frequency of 96% (25/26) and 36% (13/36), 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 Rohlf’s 1971: 55–59 and Bossong 1998: 218–230; 2008: 286–288 for a comprehensive overview). In Allerese and Roussillon Catalan, there is a split between first/second and third-person strong pronouns referring to humans (see D’Alessandro 2017: 8 for Allerese). In Central Catalan we find DOM with strong personal pronouns regardless of person. In

Corsican, Galician, and Portuguese DOM occurs with strong personal pronouns and proper names but not with common nouns. In Asturian, Romanian, Sardinian, Sicilian, and Spanish there is DOM with strong personal 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 (ALLA 2001: 352; Jones 1995: 39; 2003: 69; Ledgeway 2009: 838–839; Prieto 2010: 26).³ Table 1 gives an overview of the extent of DOM in selected Romance languages. Interestingly, we find examples that run counter to the implicational hierarchy. This is the case in Old Sardinian, where proper names are differentially marked as opposed to strong human pronouns (Putzu 2008: 415–416). However, this counterexample does not invalidate the extended animacy hierarchy (see Whaley 1997: 178–179 and Helmbrecht et al. 2018 for discussion).

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

Language	1st/2nd pers. pronoun	3rd pers. pronoun	Proper name	NP (definite and human)
French, Italian	–	–	–	–
Allerese, Roussillon Catalan	+	–	–	–
Central Catalan	+	+	–	–
Corsican, Galician, Portuguese	+	+	+	–
Asturian, Neapolitan, Sardinian, Sicilian	+	+	+	±
Romanian, Spanish	+	+	+	+

In Romance linguistics, research on DOM has revolved around the question of how nominal and verbal features condition the occurrence of DOM, especially with common nouns (see García García 2018 for Spanish). However, the patterns of DOM with proper names are still poorly understood. In addition, descriptions of DOM involving proper names poses some problems. First, the term proper name has been widely used as a synonym for personal name. Second, there is not always a clear distinction between proper names and common nouns. Such is the case with some kinship terms and deity terms which may constitute kinship names and deity names, respectively. This issue will be discussed in more detail in Section 3. Third, proper names have been often viewed as a homogeneous group. For example, López (1993) does not distinguish between deity names and personal names although in Portuguese deity names differ

□□

³ In Romanian, DOM is obligatory with definite human objects when combined with clitic doubling. Compare *Lam văzut pe copil* ‘I have seen the child’, where the *pe*-marker is coupled with clitic doubling, and *Am văzut copilul*, where the definite human object *copilul* ‘the child’ is not differentially marked (see von Heusinger & Gáspár 2008: 18–74 for an overview). Note that the occurrence of the definite article *-ul* blocks the occurrence of the *pe*-marker. This syntactic constraint, however, does not apply to personal names and kinship names, as we will see in Sections 4.2 and 4.3, respectively.

from personal names with respect to DOM. In contrast, scholars such as Rohlfs (1971), Monedero (1983), and Cabanes (1995) offer more fine-grained distinctions. For example, Rohlfs (1971; 1973) examines 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) study 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 explored 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. Topicalising constructions involving clitic dislocations will not be considered. With regard to clitic left-dislocations, DOM is optional in Balearic Catalan, but categorical in Galician, Asturian, Sardinian, Neapolitan, and northern Italian dialects. With regard to clitic right-dislocations, DOM is obligatory in Balearic Catalan and in varieties of French (Jones 1995: 44; 2003: 69; ALLA 2001: 353; Berretta 2003; Cidrás 2006: 162–163; Escandell-Vidal 2009: 846; Ledgeway 2009: 839; Fagard & Mardale 2014).

3 Proper name classes

This section presents a classification of proper names based on animacy, agentivity, and identifiability that will be applied to the synchronic and diachronic patterns of DOM in Romance languages (Section 3.1). It further discusses the differences between deity names and deity nouns (Section 3.2) as well as kinship names and kinship nouns (Section 3.3).

3.1 Classification of proper names

There have been a number of classifications of proper names in the literature (among others: Bauer 1985: 50–57; Bajo 2002: 173–209; Leroy 2004: 33–35; Van Langendonck 2007: 183–255). For example, Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser (2015: 101–106) put forward a classification of proper names based on animacy, agentivity, and contour, thereby distinguishing between personal names (anthroponyms), animal names (zoonyms), place names (toponyms), brand names (ergonyms), event names (praxonyms), and weather names (phenonyms).

Previous classifications have not included deity names and kinship names, which are relevant for the present investigation. As we will see in Section 4, the patterns of DOM with proper names in Romance languages can be grasped by means of a classification of proper names comprised of deity names, personal names, kinship names, animal names, and place names. In what follows, I will put forward a classification of proper names based on animacy (Croft 2003: 130), agentivity (Dowty 1991), and identifiability (Lyons 1999: 8, 21–22).

(6) Classification of proper names:

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

Animacy allows for a distinction between personal/kinship names, animal names, and place names, since they are human, animate, and inanimate, respectively. However, animacy does not allow for a distinction between deity names and personal/kinship names since animacy does not apply for deity names.⁴ As for agentivity, I will talk about potential (or inherent) agentivity rather than relational agentivity. The notion of potential agentivity is based on Dowty's (1991) proto-agent properties (Primus 2012; García García 2014: 133). An advantage of potential agentivity is that it can be disentangled from argument realization. That is, it can be applied to other morphosyntactic phenomena. The agentivity features include volition (or control), sentience, causation, movement, and independent existence. Volition enables us to distinguish deity names and personal/kinship names from animal names and place names while sentience, causation, and movement enable us to distinguish animal names from place names. The agentivity-based classification reinforces the animacy-based classification. However, an additional feature is needed in order to characterize deity names. Identifiability allows us to distinguish deity names from other proper name classes since only deity names denote unique entities. As a consequence, context is not important for the identification of the referent.

□□

⁴ Note that some scholars such as Barteld, Hartmann & Renata Szczepaniak (2016) speak of “super-human” when referring to entities such as *God*.

Table 2: Classification of proper names according to animacy, potential agentivity, and identifiability (Caro Reina & Mürmann 2018)

	Deity name	Personal name, kinship name	Animal name	Place name
Animacy		+ human	+ animate	– animate
Potential agentivity	+ volition + sentience + causation + movement + independent existence	+ volition + sentience + causation + movement + independent existence	+ sentience + causation + movement + independent existence	+ independent existence
Identifiability	+ context independent	– context independent	– context independent	– context independent

Personal names do not differ from kinship names with respect to animacy, agentivity, and identifiability. Although scholars such as Bajo (2002: 173) and Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser (2015: 51–52) view kinship names as instances of personal names, there is evidence supporting a division between personal names and kinship names. This is the case in 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 1985: 23, 130). Examples from Chāli are *Hasan-e* ‘Hasan-ACC’, *pia-r* ‘father-ACC’, and *cupun-ar* ‘shepherd-ACC’ (Yarshater 1969: 87–90).

The classification of proper names put forward in (6) may help to grasp morphosyntactic differences between proper names classes. For example, the grammaticalization of the onymic markers *en* and *na* in Catalan was sensitive to this classification since it expanded from personal names to animal names and finally to place names (Caro Reina 2014: 198). As we will see in Section 4, DOM expansion (and retraction) is also sensitive to this classification.

3.2 Deity names vs. deity nouns

The distinction between deity names and deity nouns is not straightforward 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* ‘God’ is a deity name while *der Herr* ‘the Lord’ and *der Heilige Geist* ‘the Holy Ghost’ are deity nouns (see Bauer 1985: 56 for discussion). Different lines of evidence show the (non-)proprial status of deity terms when accompanied by definite or possessive articles. First, in late fifteenth-

century-Portuguese DOM occurs with the deity name *Deus* ‘God’, but not with deity nouns, as in *nosso Senhor* ‘our Lord’, *o Salvador* ‘the Saviour’, etc (Delille 1970: 43–44). Second, in Vitu, an Austronesian language spoken in Papua New Guinea, proper names and common nouns are assigned different definite articles (*a* vs. *na*), possessive articles (*-dolu* vs. *kadolu* ‘our’), and prepositions (*ni* vs. *na* ‘LOC’). The deity term *Deo* occurs with the definite article *a* (*a Deo*) and the preposition *ni* (*ni Deo* ‘to God’). That is, *Deo* is a proper name. However, it takes the possessive article *kadolu* (*kadolu Deo* ‘our Lord’) rather than *-dolu*. This implies that *Deo* behaves as a common noun with the possessive article (Berg & Bachet 2006: 28–29). Thus, the absence of DOM with *nosso Senhor* ‘our Lord’ in Portuguese and the presence of a possessive article *kadolu Deo* ‘our Lord’ in Vitu are instances of common nouns.

The lack of a clear distinction between deity names and deity nouns led to false interpretations of the syntactic patterns of DOM in languages such as Corsican, where DOM is restricted to proper names (see Section 2). For example, Marcellesi (1986) assumed that the *a*-marker and the definite article are in complementary distribution. More specifically, the occurrence of the *a*-marker implies the absence of the definite article, as in *Temu à Dio* ‘I fear God’. Conversely, the absence of the *a*-marker implies the occurrence of the definite article, as in *Temu u Signori* ‘I fear the Lord’. This assumption, however, can be challenged arguing that in Corsican DOM is found with proper names but not with definite human nouns since *Dio* ‘God’ (without definite article) is a proper name while *Signori* ‘Lord’ (with the definite article *u*) is a common noun. In other words, they constitute a deity name and a deity noun, respectively.

Cross-linguistically, deity terms may resemble personal names (and not personal nouns) with respect to morphosyntactic phenomena such as absence/presence of definite articles (as in Corsican), different definite articles (as in Vitu), and possessive constructions (see Kopf this volume for *Gott* ‘God’ in Early New High German). With regard to possessive constructions, an example of deity terms patterning with personal names comes from Old French, where there is juxtaposition with deity names (*Dieu* ‘God’) and personal names (*Girart*), but preposition (*de/à*) with common nouns (*sa seror* ‘his sister’), as shown in (7) (Hall/Clair-Sobell 1954: 199; Palm 1977; Buridant 2000: 99–100).

(7) Possessive constructions in Old French (taken from Palm 1977)

li filz Ø *Dieu* ‘the son of God’

filz Ø *Girart* ‘son of Girart’

filz de sa seror ‘son of his sister’

3.3 Kinship names vs. kinship nouns

In language typology, research on been kinship terms (or kin terms) has mainly revolved around possessive constructions (alienable vs. inalienable, obligatory vs. optional) and taxonomy (ascending, descending, and horizontal) (Greenberg 1980; Jonsson 2001; Moravcsik 2013: 34–39). Recent work has focused on the grammatical properties of kinship terms (Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 205–213). However, a clear distinction between kinship names and kinship nouns on the basis of morphosyntactic phenomena has not been made in the literature.

The onymic status of kinship terms leads to a revision of previous analyses. This issue will be illustrated with the languages Yiddish and Mikayo. 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 Katz 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 cut-off point is between human proper names and common nouns. Another example comes from Ikema, a dialect of Mikayo spoken in Japan. Ikema exhibits Differential Subject Marking (DSM). More specifically, we find *ga* with personal names and *nu* with place names as well as human and inanimate common nouns. Iwasaki (2015: 761, 767–770) observes that personal names take *ga* while human nouns such as *bikidun* ‘man’, *midun* ‘woman’, and *uibitu* ‘old person’ take *nu*. The author indicates that there are exceptions, which include human nouns such as *zza* ‘father’, *mma* ‘mother’, *obaa* ‘grandma’, and *ozii* ‘grandpa’, since they may take either *ga* or *nu*. These human nouns constitute instances of kinship terms that behave as personal names. This a prime example of the intermediate position that kinship terms have between personal names and human nouns. Similar to Yiddish, Mikayo has two-dimensional DOM.

Cross-linguistically, there is a substantial amount of evidence that kinship terms may pattern morphosyntactically with personal names. For example, Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser (2015: 51–52) observe that in standard German kinship terms such as *Mutter* ‘mother’ und *Vater* ‘father’ resemble personal names with respect to the absence of determiner (*Mutter/Maria kommt nachher* ‘Mom/Mary arrives later’), prenominal genitive constructions (*Vaters/Peters Geburtstag* ‘Dad’s/Peter’s birthday’), and genitive *-s* with feminine nouns (*Mutters/Marias Geburtstag* ‘Mom’s/Mary’s birthday’) (see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003 for examples from European languages).

Morphosyntactic evidence that kinship terms pattern with personal names includes verbal agreement, gender assignment, possessive constructions, and determiners. In Hungarian, for example, the objective conjugation (*-om/-em/-öm* ‘1SG.OBJ’) is

employed with definite direct objects while the subjective conjugation (*-ok/-ek/-ök* ‘1SG.SUBJ’) is employed with indefinite direct 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
 see-1SG.OBJ Maria-ACC / Budapest-ACC / father-ACC
 ‘I see Maria / Budapest / dad.’

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 2006: 205–209). In Romanian, the possessive marker *lui* is restricted to proper names such as *Alina* as opposed to common nouns such as *fată* ‘girl’. In addition to personal names, it occurs with kinship terms such as *mama* ‘Mom’, as shown in (9) (see Miron-Fulea, Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2013: 24–25 for details).

(9) Genitive marker *lui* in Romanian

carte-a fet-ei / 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 and common nouns are accompanied by different determiners. This is the case in Vitu, an Austronesian language spoken in Papua New Guinea, where the definite article *a* occurs with proper names such as deity names (*a Deu* ‘God’), personal names (*a Kalago* ‘Kalago’), and place names (*a Lama* ‘Lama’) while the definite article *na* occurs with common nouns (*na tamohane* ‘the man’, *na malala* ‘the village’). Importantly, the definite article *a* 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. Interestingly, 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. Compare *Mamá/María trabaja hoy* ‘Mom/Mary works today’, where the kinship term *mamá* ‘mom’ resembles

the personal name *María* with respect to the absence of the determiner, and *Mi madre/Mi mujer trabaja hoy* ‘My mother/My wife works today’, where the kinship term *madre* ‘mother’ resembles the common noun *mujer* ‘wife’ with respect to the presence of the determiner (see Bajo 2002: 117, 123 for details).

Crucially, not all kinship terms may behave as proper names. For example, in German, the kinship term *Tante* ‘aunt’ differs from kinship terms such as *Mutter* ‘mother’ in that the absence of determiner, prenominal genitive constructions, and genitive *-s* would result in ungrammatical sentences. Similarly, in Spanish the kinship term *tía* ‘aunt’ requires the determiner. In contrast to German and Spanish, the kinship term *tía* ‘aunt’ is a proper name in Asturian owing to the absence of determiner and the occurrence of DOM. In Section 4.3, I will discuss the proprial status of kinship terms in selected Romance languages.

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). Further proper name classes such as plant names (phytonyms) and object names (ergonyms) will not be considered.⁵ The languages selected are Galician, Portuguese, Asturian, Spanish, Catalan, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Romanian. The sources include reference grammars, dialect descriptions, and selected diachronic studies (see Appendix). Additionally, I used the corpora *Corpus Informatizat del Català Antic* (CICA), *Corpus diacrónico del español* (CORDE), and *Tesouro informatizado da lingua galega* (TILG). The diachronic analysis will allow us to detect DOM expansion and retraction (Section 4.6). Note that the diachronic analysis is restricted to deity names, personal names, and place names since animal names and kinship names are scarcely attested in historical records. For example, in Laca’s (2006) diachronic study of Spanish animal names were only found in the seventeenth century.

□□

⁵ DOM is attested with plant names in Sardinian (Jones 2003: 69) while it is attested with object names in Old Spanish. In Old Spanish, DOM occurs with sword names, as in *Dar uos he dos espadas, a Colada e a Tizon* ‘I have to give you two swords, Colada and Tizon’ (Mio Cid). Scholars such as Jacob (2011: 602) explains instances of DOM with sword names (and place names) in terms of personification. However, DOM does not occur with the common noun *espada* ‘sword’, as in *el espada Coladal dio* ‘He gave the sword Colada to him’.

4.1 Deity names

Deity names (theonyms) include names of gods, saints, devils, etc.⁶ Among Romance languages, DOM is attested in all languages surveyed: Galician, Portuguese, Asturian, Spanish, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Romanian (Rohlf's 1971: 314, 317–318; 1973: 619; Pittau 1972: 129; Marcellesi 1986: 132; Guardiano 2000: 22; Perini 2002: 444; Cidrás 2006: 157; Ledgeway 2009: 837–838).⁷ Note that 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’.

Portuguese is the only Romance language where DOM is confined to deity names (*a Deus* ‘ACC God’). Although the occurrence of DOM with *Deus* ‘God’ is described in grammars of Brazilian and European Portuguese (among others: Thomas 1969: 256; Perini 2002: 444; Hundertmark-Santos 2014: 122), it has never been explained in terms of the extended animacy hierarchy. That is, DOM occurs with strong personal pronouns and deity names. 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.’

In historical linguistics, the presence of DOM with deity names in Portuguese, Spanish, and Catalan has been traditionally termed “prepositional accusative of deity” (Meier 1947: 244–246; Delille 1970: 43–44; Monedero 1983: 266–273). 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 remained obscure. In late fifteenth-century-Portuguese,

□□

⁶ According to Bajo (2002: 184, 194–195), saint names constitute personal names while names of gods, demigods, devils, etc. constitute names of supernatural and fantastic beings.

⁷ ALLA (2003) and Prieto (2010) do not contain instances of DOM with deity names. An example from Asturian is *Tuvo mentando a Dios/a Xesucristo/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 human direct object is differentially marked by means of the preposition *pe*.

DOM is first attested with the deity name *Deus* ‘God’. Interestingly, it does not occur with *Jesucristo* ‘Jesus Christ’ (Delille 1970: 43–44). These findings suggest that DOM occurs with deity names prior to personal names. This issue will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.6. Recall from Section 2 that in Catalan DOM is restricted to strong personal pronouns. However, in earlier stages DOM is attested with deity names with a relative frequency of 0% (0/5), 26% (19/74), and 83% (20/24) in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, respectively (Cabanes 1995; see also Pineda forthcoming).

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, Asturian, Spanish, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Romanian (Rohlf’s 1971: 314, 317–318; 1973: 619; Pittau 1972: 129; Marcellesi 1986: 131; Jones 1995: 38; 2003: 68–69; López 1995: 555–556; Torrego 1999: 1799; Guardiano 2000: 21; ALLA 2001: 352; Putzu 2005: 234; Cidrás 2006: 156–160; Iemmolo 2007: 343; Ledgeway 2009: 837–838; Prieto 2010: 25; Tigãu 2011: 35; Neuburger & Stark 2014: 374).⁸

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 (López 1995: 556; Cidrás 2006: 157). In Section 2, Catalan was characterized as a language where DOM is restricted to strong personal pronouns. However, in earlier stages DOM is attested with personal names with a relative frequency of 8% (26/325), 52% (222/430), 78% (108/138) in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, respectively (Cabanes 1995; see also Pineda forthcoming).

4.3 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 case in Galician, Asturian, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, and Neapolitan (see Table 1). Among

□□

⁸ López (1995: 556) observes that in central and eastern areas of A Coruña Galician DOM is absent from personal names, as in *Onte vin Pepe no bar* ‘Yesterday I saw Pepe in the bar’. In this respect, this variety resembles Portuguese.

Romance languages, we can distinguish the following morphosyntactic structures depending on whether kinship terms are heads of NPs (without determiner) or DPs (with determiner): (1) kinship term, (2) possessive article + kinship term (or kinship term + possessive article), (3) definite article + kinship term, and (4) definite article + possessive article + kinship term. Let us take a look at these structures. Kinship terms as heads of NPs 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.⁹ In this respect, kinship names differ from deity names since deity names do not occur with possessive articles, as in fifteenth-century Portuguese (*nosso Senhor* ‘our Lord’). 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.¹⁰ 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.

DOM occurs with kinship names in Galician, Asturian, Spanish, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Romanian (Pittau 1972: 129; Marcellesi 1986: 131; Jones 1995: 38; 2003: 68–69; Guardiano 2000: 22–23, 29; ALLA 2001: 352–353; Putzu 2005: 234; Cidrás 2006: 160–161; Iemmolo 2007: 344; Ledgeway 2009: 837–838; Prieto 2010: 25–26; Giancarli 2014: 203–204; Neuburger & Stark 2014: 377–378). In

□□

⁹ 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).

¹⁰ 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).

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 3 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.¹¹ 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 *mâmmata* ‘mother’ refer to the hearer’s relatives (see Marcellesi 1986: 131 for details).

□□

¹¹ Compare the grammaticality in the following examples: a) Span. *Vi a mamá/a papá/*a abuela/*a abuelo/*a tía/*a tío* ‘I saw mom, etc.’; b) Ast. *Vi a ma/a pá/a güela/a güelo/a tía/a tío*; and Sic. *Viristi a mamma/a papà/a nonna/a nonnu/*a ziu/*a zia*.

Table 3: Proprial status of kinship terms in selected Romance languages

Language	Kinship names
Asturian	<i>ma</i> ‘mother’, <i>pá</i> ‘father’, <i>güela</i> ‘grandmother’, <i>güelo</i> ‘grandfather’, <i>madrina</i> ‘godmother’, <i>padrín</i> ‘godfather’, <i>tía</i> ‘aunt’, <i>tíu</i> ‘uncle’
Spanish	<i>mamá</i> ‘mother’, <i>papá</i> ‘father’
Corsican	<i>mamma</i> ‘mother’, <i>babba</i> ‘father’, <i>caccara</i> ‘grandmother’, <i>caccaru</i> ‘grandfather’, <i>missiavonu</i> ‘great-grandfather’, <i>minnannona</i> ‘great-grandmother’
Sicilian	<i>mama</i> ‘mother’, <i>papá</i> ‘father’, <i>nonna</i> ‘grandmother’, <i>nonnu</i> ‘grandfather’

Crucially, kinship terms constitute the bridge between personal 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 doublets. Note that in Corsican the kinship term *zio* ‘uncle’ may behave both as a proper name and a common noun (see example in Footnote 10). 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 twelfth-century Spanish DOM is obligatory with kinship terms while it is optional with other human nouns (see Reichenkron 1951: 359–360 for details). One word of caution, however, is that the examples include left dislocations and kinship terms in plural, as in *A las sues fijas en braço las prendía* ‘His daughters, he embraced them’. On the one hand, in Old Spanish definite human nouns are optionally marked when dislocated (García García 2018: 212–215). On the other hand, kinship terms cannot behave as proper names when occurring in the plural (see Footnote 9 for examples). Note that appellatives can be pluralized, but not proper names (Van Langendonck 2007: 152). Therefore, the first attested forms of DOM with human direct objects should be carefully examined with respect to sentence structure and proprial 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, Spanish, Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Romanian (Rohlf 1971: 314, 317–318; 1973: 620; Marcellesi 1986: 131; Jones 1995: 40; 2003: 69; Torrego 1999: 1799; Guardiano 2000: 21; Putzu 2005: 234; Ledgeway 2009: 839–840; Prieto 2010: 25; Tigău 2011: 35–36).¹²

□□

¹² In contrast to Rohlf (1971: 317), Jones (1995: 40; 2003: 69) and Putzu (2005: 234), Pittau (1972: 129) observes that in Nuorese Sardinian DOM is absent from animal names.

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).¹³ 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 sfraciatu 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 twelfth and seventeenth-century Spanish. In *Cantar de Mio Cid* (ca. 1140), the horse name *Bavieca* is always differentially marked, as in *Ensiëllante a Bavieca* ‘They saddle Bavieca for him’ (taken from CORDE) while the common noun *cavallo* ‘horse’ is never marked. In Cervantes’ (1605) *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, the horse name *Rocinante* occurs 28 times as a direct 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 twelfth century (100% vs. 36%) and the seventeenth century (100% vs. 86%) (Laca 2006: 442–443).

□□

¹³ 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 pacían 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 2007: 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, Sardinian, and Sicilian (Rohlf's 1971: 315, 319; Marcellesi 1986: 131; Jones 1995: 38; 2003: 69; Neuburger & Stark 2014: 376).¹⁴ An example from Sardinian is given in (12). Otherwise, DOM with place names is absent from Galician, Portuguese, Asturian, Spanish, Neapolitan, and Romanian (López 1995: 557; Cidrás 2006: 160; Ledgeway 2009: 840; Prieto 2010: 25; Tigãu 2011: 36).¹⁵ However, in some varieties of Spanish DOM is also attested, albeit in varying degrees (DeMello 2000; Kock 1997).¹⁶

(12) Sardinian (Jones 1995: 38)

app-o vistu a Nápuli

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 absence of DOM in Romanian cannot be explained in terms of animacy.

(13) Romanian

□□

¹⁴ Rohlf's (1971: 315) gives examples of DOM with city names and country names in Sicilian such as *A Trápani unni lu canúsciu* ‘I do not know Trapani’ and *st'òmu arruvinà all'Italia* ‘This man ruined Italy’, respectively. Follow-up work on Sardinian and Sicilian reveals that DOM is no longer attested with city names (Pittau 1972: 129; Guardiano 2000; Putzu 2005: 234–235). This points to DOM retraction (see Section 4.6 for discussion). Guardiano (2000: 22) observes variation in Ragusa Sicilian, where city names may be differentially marked, as in *Vitti (a) Napuli* ‘I saw Naples’.

¹⁵ However, DOM has been documented in Sobrescobio Asturian, 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 this is an innovation or, rather, a retention of a previous language stage. In this respect, the historical evidence supported by Prieto (2010: 28) is not conclusive.

¹⁶ On the basis of the *Habla Culta* project, 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%), 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%).

am văz-ut București-ul / oraș-ul

AUX.1SG see-PTCP Bucarest-DEF.M / city-DEF.M

‘I saw Bucarest / the city.’

Interestingly, DOM used to occur with place names in Galician, Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, and Romanian (Sáenz 1936; Reichenkron 1951: 371–380; Delille 1970: 114; Martín 1976: 562; Monedero 1978; 1983; Folgar 1988; López 1993: 241–247; Tigău 2011: 53).¹⁷

The occurrence of DOM with place names has been mainly explained in terms of definiteness and metonymy (see Monedero 1978: 260–261 for Spanish).¹⁸ 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 (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.¹⁹

Let us take a look at nineteenth-century Spanish and Galician, where DOM is triggered by definiteness and metonymy, respectively. In nineteenth-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

□□

¹⁷ In nineteenth-century European Spanish, DOM is also attested with country names, mountain names, and river names. Examples are *Conocía a Inglaterra y a Francia* ‘S/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). An example from sixteenth-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 sixteenth-century Valencian, DOM is attested with place names, as in *Aprés 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.

¹⁸ Scholars such as Lapesa (1964: 82), Jacob (2011: 601–602), and Fábregas (2013: 41) talk about “personification”. Following Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 35), who distinguish between personification and metonymy, I will talk about “metonymy”.

¹⁹ 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.

are a series of examples that cannot be associated with metonymy.²⁰ Second, the use of DOM is not confined to city names. Interestingly, it is also attested with mountain names and river names (see Footnote 14 for examples). Third, metonymy would be expected to occur also with the common nouns *país* ‘country’, *ciudad* ‘city’, *pueblo* ‘village’. Thus, in nineteenth-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). However, 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 diachronic patterns of DOM with proper names are summarized in Table 4 and Table 5, 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 lacks DOM with proper names while Corsican, Sardinian, and Sicilian always exhibit DOM. The patterns found in Galician, Neapolitan, Portuguese, Romanian, and Spanish can be explained in a more satisfactory way applying a classification of proper names based on animacy, agentivity, and identifiability. 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, 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.

□□

²⁰ Examples from nineteenth-century Spanish are *Todos vosotros habéis visto a Cádiz desde el mar* ‘You have all seen Cadiz from the sea’ and *Esa mujer [...] conocía a Madrid palmo a palmo* ‘That woman knew Madrid like the back of her hand’ (taken from CORDE).

Table 4: Synchronic patterns of DOM with proper name classes in Romance languages

Language	Deity name	Personal name	Kinship name	Animal name	Place name
Catalan	–	–	–	–	–
Portuguese	+	–	–	–	–
Galician	+	+	+	–	–
Asturian	+	+	+	+	–
Neapolitan	+	+	+	+	–
Romanian	+	+	+	+	–
Spanish	+	+	+	+	–
Corsican	+	+	+	+	+
Sardinian	+	+	+	+	+
Sicilian	+	+	+	+	+

The diachronic analysis offers a window on language change involving DOM expansion and retraction. DOM expansion has been widely studied for Romanian and Spanish (Laca 2006; von Heusinger & Gáspár 2008; von Heusinger & 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 Delille 1970 for Portuguese and Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011: 212 for Catalan). 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 eighteenth 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 5: Diachronic patterns of DOM with proper name classes in Romance languages

Language	Deity name	Personal name	Place name
Galician			
13th-century Galician	±	±	–
14th-century Galician	+	+	±
Modern Galician	+	+	–
European Portuguese			
15th-century Portuguese	+	–	–
16th-century Portuguese	+	±	–
17th-century Portuguese	+	+	±
18th-century Portuguese	+	–	–
Modern Portuguese	+	–	–
European Spanish			
12th-century Spanish	+	+	±
19th-century Spanish	+	+	+
Modern Spanish	+	+	–
Catalan			
14th-century Catalan	–	–	–
15th-century Catalan	+	+	–
16th-century Catalan	+	+	±
Modern Catalan	–	–	–
Sicilian			
14th-century Sicilian	+	+	–
Modern Sicilian	+	+	+
Neapolitan			
18th-century Neapolitan	±	±	–
Modern Neapolitan	+	+	–
Romanian			
16th-century Romanian	+	+	±
Modern Romanian	+	+	–

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 Old Sicilian, where deity names were always differentially marked while personal names were differentially marked in 70% (358/506) of the cases (Iemmolo 2009: 201–202). However, the hypothesis is not borne out for Old Catalan, where in the fifteenth century DOM had a relative frequency of 26% (19/74) with deity names and 52% (222/430) with personal names. This implies that in Old Catalan deity names are not ranked higher than personal names. In other words, identifiability is not relevant. 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 Old 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 (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 strong personal pronouns to personal names. In the same vein, kinship names constitute the bridge for DOM expansion from personal names to human nouns.

(14) Extended animacy hierarchy (revised):

first/second-person pronoun > third-person pronoun > deity name > personal/
kinship name > animal name > place name > 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 us to examine the interaction of definiteness and animacy with proper names and common nouns, as illustrated in Table 6. For example, in Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, and earlier stages of Spanish proper names are differentially marked regardless of animacy (both personal names and place names) while only human nouns are differentially marked. That is, in these languages animacy patterns differently with proper names and common nouns. By contrast, in Asturian, Neapolitan, and Modern European Spanish, personal 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 6: Impact of definiteness and animacy on DOM with proper names and common nouns

	Proper name		Common noun	
	human	inanimate	human	inanimate
Corsican, Sardinian, Sicilian, Old Spanish	+	+	±	–
19th-century Spanish	+	+	+	–
Asturian, Neapolitan	+	–	±	–
20th-century Spanish	+	–	+	–

Acknowledgments

The research for this paper has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as part of the SFB 1252 “Prominence in Language” in the project B04 “Interaction of nominal and verbal features for Differential Object Marking” at the University of Cologne. I would like to thank Marco García García and Klaus von Heusinger for insightful comments on a previous version of this paper. My thanks also go to Stephen Morelli, Francisco Cidrás, Clara Elena Prieto, Alina Tigău, and Alessia Cassarà for discussion on data from Gumbaynggirr, Galician, Asturian, Romanian, and Sicilian, respectively.

Corpora

CICA = Torruella, Joan, Manel Pérez Saldanya & Josep Martines (eds.) (2009): *Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic*. <http://www.cica.cat> (01.05.2019).

CORDE = Real Academia Española: *Banco de datos (CORDE) [en línea]. Corpus diacrónico del español*. <http://www.rae.es> (01.05.2019).

TILG = Santamarina, Antón (ed.): *Tesouro informatizado da lingua galega*. Santiago de Compostela: Instituto da Lingua Galega. <http://ilg.usc.es/TILG> (01.05.2019).

References

- ALLA = Academia de la Llingua Asturiana (ed.) (2001): *Gramática de la llingua asturiana*. Uviéu: Academia de la Llingua Asturiana.
- Aissen, Judith (2003): Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21 (3), 435–483.
- Bajo Pérez, Elena (2002): *La caracterización morfosintáctica del nombre propio*. Noia: Toxosoutos.
- Bárány, András (2012): Hungarian conjugations and differential object marking. In Balázs Surányi & Diána Varga (edd.), *Proceedings of the First Central European Conference of Postgraduate Students*, 3–25. Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Catholic University.

- Bauer, Gerhard (1985): *Namenkunde des Deutschen*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Berg, René van den & Peter Bachtet (2006): *Vitu grammar sketch*. Ukarumpa, EHP: SIL Printing Press.
- Bergmann, Rolf & Dieter Nerius (1998): *Die Entwicklung der Großschreibung im Deutschen von 1500 bis 1700*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Berretta, Monica (2003): Sulla presenza dell'accusativo preposizionale in italiano settentrionale: note tipologiche. *Vox Romanica* 48, 13–37.
- Bickel, Balthasar, Alena Witzlack-Makarevich & Taras Zakharko (2015): Typological evidence against universal effects of referential scales on case alignment. In Ina Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Andrej L. Malchukov & Marc D. Richards (edd.), *Scales and hierarchies: A cross-disciplinary perspective*, 7–44. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Ina, Andrej L. Malchukov & Marc D. Richards (edd.) (2015): *Scales and hierarchies: A cross-disciplinary perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bossong, Georg (1982): Historische Sprachwissenschaft und empirische Universalienforschung. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 33, 17–51.
- Bossong, Georg (1985): *Empirische Universalienforschung: differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Bossong, Georg (1991): Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In Dieter Wanner & Douglas Kibbee (edd.), *New analyses in Romance linguistics: Selected papers from the linguistic symposium on Romance Languages XVIII, Urbana-Champaign, April 7–9, 1988, 143–170*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bossong, Georg (1998): Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe. In Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence*, 193–258. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bossong, Georg (2008): *Die romanischen Sprachen: Eine vergleichende Einführung*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Brauns, Julius (1908): *Über den präpositionalen Accusativ im spanischen mit gelegentlicher Berücksichtigung anderer sprachen*. Hamburg: Lütcke & Wulff.
- Brdar, Mario & Rita Brdar-Szabó (2009): The (non-)metonymic use of place names in English, German, Hungarian, and Croatian. In Klaus-Uwe Panther, Linda Thornburg & Antonio Barcelona (edd.), *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar*, 229–257. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Buridant, Claude (2000): *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*. Paris: SEDES.
- Cabanes Fitor, Vicent (1995): Anàlisi de la construcció d'objecte directe de persona en català (segles XIII–XVI). Estudi del nom propi. *A Sol Post* 3, 47–89.
- Caro Reina, Javier (2014): The grammaticalization of the terms of address *en* and *na* as onymic markers in Catalan. In Friedhelm Debus, Rita Heuser & Damaris Nübling (edd.), *Linguistik der Familiennamen*, 175–204. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Caro Reina, Javier & Sophie Mürmann (2018): *The prominence of proper names in the extended animacy hierarchy*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference Prominence in Language. University of Cologne.
- Cidrás Escáneo, Francisco Antonio (2006): Sobre o uso da preposição “a” con OD en galego. *Verba: Anuario galego de filoloxia* 33, 147–174.
- Comrie, Bernard (1979): The animacy hierarchy in Chukchee. In Paul Clyne, William Hanks & Carol Hofbauer (edd.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 322–329. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Comrie, Bernard (1981): Ergativity and grammatical relations in Kalaw Lagaw Ya (Saibai dialect). *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 1 (1), 1–42.

- Comrie, Bernard (1989): *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Corbett, Greville G. (2000): *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, William (1995): *Typology and universals*. 1st edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, William (2003): *Typology and universals*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta (2017): When you have too many features: Auxiliaries, agreement and clitics in Italian varieties. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2 (1), 1–36.
- Dahl, Östen & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001): Kinship in grammar. In Irène Baron, Michael Herslund & Finn Sørensen (edd.), *Dimensions of possession*, vol. 47, 201–225. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Irina Nikolaeva (2011): *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, Michael & Edith Moravcsik (2013): The associative plural. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (edd.), *The world atlas of language structures online*, Munich: Max Planck Digital Library.
- Debus, Friedhelm, Rita Heuser & Damaris Nübling (edd.) (2014): *Linguistik der Familiennamen*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Delille, Karl Heinz (1970): *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des präpositionalen Akkusativs im Portugiesischen*. Bonn: Universität Bonn.
- DeMello, George (2000): “A” de acusativo con nombre propio geográfico. *Hispania* 83 (2), 301–312.
- Dowty, David (1991): Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, 547–619.
- Eades, Diana (1979): Gumbaynggir. In Robert M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (edd.), *Handbook of Australian languages*, vol. 1, 245–361. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Escandell-Vidal, Victoria (2009): Differential object marking and topicality: The case of Balearic Catalan. *Studies in Language* 33 (4), 832–884.
- Fábregas, Antonio (2013): Differential Object Marking in Spanish: state of the art. *Borealis* 2 (2), 1–80.
- Fagard, Benjamin & Alexandru Mardale (2014): Non, mais tu l’as vu à lui? Analyse(s) du marquage différentiel de l’objet en français. *Verbum* 36 (1), 143–168.
- Folgar Fariña, Carlos (1988): A + topónimo objeto directo en español arcaico. *Verba* 15, 403–420.
- Fraurud, Kari (2000): Proper names and gender in Swedish. In Barbara Unterbeck & Matti Rissanen (edd.), *Gender in grammar and cognition*, 167–219. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- García García, Marco (2014): *Differentielle Objektmarkierung bei unbelebten Objekten im Spanischen*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- García García, Marco (2018): Nominal and verbal parameters in the diachrony of differential object marking in Spanish. In Ilja A. Seržant & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (edd.), *Diachrony of differential argument marking*, 209–242. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Giancarli, Pierre-Don (2014): L’accusatif prépositionnel en corse. *Faits de langues* 43 (1), 197–212.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. (1980): Universals of kinship terminology: Their nature and the problem of their explanation. In Jacques Maquet (ed.), *On linguistic anthropology: Essays in honor of Harry Hoijer*, 9–32. Malibu: Udena.
- Guardiano, Cristina (2000): Note sull’oggetto diretto preposizionale nel siciliano. *L’Italia Dialettale* 61, 7–41.
- Hall, Geoffrey L. & James St. Clair-Sobell (1954): Animate gender in Slavonic and Romance languages. *Lingua* 4, 194–206.
- Haude, Katharina & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (2016): Referential hierarchies and alignment: An overview. *Linguistics* 54 (3), 433–441.

- Helmbrecht, Johannes, Lukas Denk, Sarah Thanner & Ilenia Tonetti (2018): Morphosyntactic coding of proper names and its implications for the Animacy Hierarchy. In Sonia Cristofaro & Fernando Zúñiga (edd.), *Typological hierarchies in synchrony and diachrony*, 381–404. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Helmbrecht, Johannes, Damaris Nübling & Barbara Schlücker (edd.) (2017): *Namengrammatik*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Hundertmark-Santos Martins, Maria Teresa (2014): *Portugiesische Grammatik*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Iemmolo, Giorgio (2007): La marcatura differenziale dell'oggetto in siciliano: un'analisi contrastiva. In Maria Illiescu, Heidi Siller-Runggaldier & Paul Danler (edd.), *Actes du XXV Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, 341–350. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Iemmolo, Giorgio (2009): La marcatura differenziale dell'oggetto in siciliano antico. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 94 (2), 185–225.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi (2015): Animacy and differential subject marking in the Ikema dialect of Miyako. *Studies in Language* 39 (3), 753–777.
- Jacob, Daniel (2011): Mujeres, vasallos, y perfrasis verbales: discurso ideológico, estructura textual y gramática en el Poema de Mío Cid. In José Jesús Bustos Tovar, Rafael Cano Aguilar, Elena Méndez García de Paredes & Araceli López Serena (edd.), *Sintaxis y análisis del discurso hablado en español. Homenaje a Antonio Narbona*, vol. 2, 587–606. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Jones, Michael Allan (1995): The prepositional accusative in Sardinian: its distribution and syntactic repercussions. In John Charles Smith & Martin Maiden (edd.), *Linguistic theory and the Romance languages*, 37–75. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jones, Michael Allan (2003): *Sintassi della lingua sarda*. Cagliari: Condaghes.
- Jonsson, Niklas (2001): Kin terms in grammar. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (edd.), *Language typology and language universals*, vol. 2, 1203–1214. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Katz, Dovid (1987): *Grammar of the Yiddish language*. London: Duckworth.
- Kock, Josse de (1997): El régimen directo preposicional: los nombres propios geográficos. In Josse de Kock & George De Mello (edd.), *Lengua escrita y habla culta en América y España: diez casos*, 135–143. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2003): Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe*, vol. 7, 621–722. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Laca, Brenda (2006): El objeto directo. La marcación preposicional. In Concepción Company Company (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica del español. Primera parte: La frase verbal*, vol. 1, 423–475. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson (1980): *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lapesa, Rafael (1964): Los casos latinos: restos sintácticos y sustitutos en español. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 44 (171), 57–105.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2009): *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Leibring, Katharina (2016): Animal Names. In Carole Hough (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of names and naming*, 615–627. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leroy, Sarah (2004): *Le nom propre en français*. Paris: Ophrys.
- López Martínez, María Sol (1993): *O complemento directo con preposición a en galego*. Santiago de Compostela: USC.

- López Martínez, María Sol (1999): O emprego de a+CD na lingua galega falada. In Rosario Álvarez & Dolores Vilavedra (edd.), *Cinguidos por unha arela común: homenaxe ó profesor Xesús Alonso Montero*, vol. 1, 551–563. Santiago de Compostela: USC.
- Lyons, Christopher (1999): *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcellesi, Jean-Baptiste (1986): Le ‘complement d’objet direct’ en Corse: à + SN de GV, 0 + SN de GV. In *Actes du XVIIe congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes*, vol. 4, 127–138. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.
- Mardale, Alexandru (2008): Microvariation within Differential Object Marking: Data from Romance. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 4 (3), 448–467.
- Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia (1976): A + objeto directo en el Cantar de Mio Cid. In Germà Colón & Robert Kopp (edd.), *Mélanges offerts à Carl Theodor Gossen*, 554–566. Bern-Liège: Francke.
- Meier, Harry (1947): O problema do acusativo preposicional no catalão. *Boletim de Filologia* 8, 237–260.
- Miron-Fulea, Mihaela, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin & Ion Giurgea (2013): Proper names. In Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin & Ion Giurgea (edd.), *A reference grammar of Romanian. Volume 1: The noun phrase*, 719–745. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Monedero Carrillo de Albornoz, Carmen (1978): El objeto directo preposicional y la estilística épica (Nombres geográficos en El Cantar de Mio Cid). *Verba* 5, 259–304.
- Monedero Carrillo de Albornoz, Carmen (1983): El objeto directo preposicional en textos medievales (nombres propios de personas y títulos de dignidad). *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 63, 241–302.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. (2013): *Introducing language typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuburger, Kathrin Anne & Elisabeth Stark (2014): Differential Object Marking in Corsican: Regularities and triggering factors. *Linguistics* 52 (2), 365–389.
- Nübling, Damaris, Fabian Fahlbusch & Rita Heuser (2015): *Namen. Eine Einführung in die Onomastik*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Palm, Lars (1977): *La construction “li filz le rei” et les constructions concurrentes avec “a” et “de” étudiées dans les oeuvres littéraires de la seconde moitié du XIIIe siècle et du premier quart du XIIIe siècle*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Perini, Mário Alberto (2002): *Modern Portuguese: A reference grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pineda, Anna (forthcoming): El complement directe. In Josep Martines & Manuel Pérez-Saldanya (edd.), *Gramàtica del català antic*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pittau, Massimo (1972): *Grammatica del sardo-nuorese*. Bologna: Pàtron.
- Prieto Entrialgo, Clara Elena (2010): Reflexones sobre la marcación preposicional del OD n’asturianu. Dellos datos medievales. *Lletres Asturianas* 103, 17–34.
- Primus, Beatrice (2012): Animacy, generalized semantic roles, and differential object marking. In Monique Lamers & Peter de Swart (edd.), *Case, word order, and prominence. Interacting cues in language production and comprehension*, 65–90. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Putzu, Ignazio (2005): L’acusativo preposizionale in sardo campidanese. Aspetti tipologici e contesti areali. In Antonietta Dettori (ed.), *Lingue e culture in contatto*, 225–260. Carocci: Roma.
- Putzu, Ignazio (2008): Per uno studio dell’acusativo preposizionale in sardo antico: emergenze dallo spoglio del Condaghe di San Pietro di Silki. In Romano Lazzeroni, Emanuele Banfi, Giuliano Bernini, Marina Chini & Giovanna Marotta (edd.), *Diachronica et Synchronica. Studi in onore di Anna Giacalone Ramat*, 397–428. Pisa: ETS.

- Reichenkron, Günter (1951): Das präpositionale Akkusativ-Objekt im ältesten Spanisch. *Romanische Forschungen* 63 (3–4), 342–397.
- Rohlf's, Gerhard (1971): Autour de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes: concordances et discordances. *Revue de linguistique romane* 35, 312–334.
- Rohlf's, Gerhard (1973): Panorama de l'accusatif prépositionnel en Italie. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 24, 617–621.
- Sáenz, Hilario (1936): The preposition “a” before place-names in Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal* 20 (4), 217–220.
- Schlücker, Barbara & Tanja Ackermann (2017): The morphosyntax of proper names: An overview. *Folia Linguistica* 51 (2), 309–339.
- Schmidely, Jack (1986): A devant l'objet “direct” en corse et en espagnol. In *Actes du XVIIe congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes*, vol. 4, 115–125. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.
- Seržant, Ilja A. & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (edd.) (2018): *Diachrony of differential argument marking*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Silverstein, Michael (1976): Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In Robert M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112–171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Sinnemäki, Kaius (2014): A typological perspective on Differential Object Marking. *Linguistics* 52 (2), 281–313.
- Thomas, Earl W. (1969): *The syntax of spoken Brazilian Portuguese*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Tigău, Alina (2011): *Syntax and interpretation of the direct object in Romance and Germanic languages with an emphasis on Romanian, German, Dutch and English*. București: Editura Universității București.
- Torrego, Esther (1999): El complemento directo preposicional. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte Demonte (edd.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1780–1805. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Van de Velde, Mark (2006): Multifunctional agreement patterns in Bantu and the possibility of genderless nouns. *Linguistic Typology* 10 (2), 183–221.
- Van Langendonck, Willy (2007): *Theory and typology of proper names*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Edgar Onea Gáspár (2008): Triggering and blocking effects in the diachronic development of DOM in Romanian. *Probus* 20 (1), 67–110.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Georg Kaiser (2005): The evolution of differential object marking in Spanish. In Klaus von Heusinger, Georg Kaiser & Elisabeth Stark (edd.), *Proceedings of the workshop “Specificity and the evolution/emergence of nominal determination systems in Romance”*, 33–69. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Georg A. Kaiser (2011): Affectedness and Differential Object Marking in Spanish. *Morphology* 21 (3–4), 593–617.
- Whaley, Lindsay J. (1997): *Introduction to typology: The unity and diversity of language*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena & Ilja A. Seržant (2018): Differential argument marking: Patterns of variation. In Ilja A. Seržant & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (edd.), *Diachrony of differential argument marking*, 1–40. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Yarshater, Ehsan (1969): *A grammar of southern Tati dialects*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Appendix

The following table contains the sample of languages and language varieties that constitutes the data base for the investigation of the synchronic and diachronic patterns of DOM presented above.

Language sample

n	Language	References
1.	Asturian	ALLA (2001), Prieto (2010), Viejo (2008)
2.	Catalan	Cabanes (1995), Meier (1947)
3.	Corsican	Giancarli (2014), Marcellesi (1986), Neuburger & Stark (2014), Rohlfs (1971)
4.	Galician	Cidrás (2006), López (1993; 1999), Sousa (1994)
5.	Neapolitan	Ledgeway (2009), Rohlfs (1973)
6.	Portuguese	Delille (1970), Hundertmark-Santos (2014), Perini (2002), Thomas (1969)
7.	Romanian	Tigău (2011), von Heusinger & Gáspár (2008)
8.	Sardinian	Jones (1995; 2003), Pittau (1972), Putzu (2005), Rohlfs (1971)
9.	Sicilian	Guardiano (2000), Iemmolo (2007; 2009), Rohlfs (1971)
10.	Spanish	DeMello (2000), Folgar (1988), Laca (2006), Martín (1976), Monedero (1978; 1983), Sáenz (1936), Torrego (1999)