On the interaction of DOM and clitic doubling in Romanian

Virginia Hill, University of New Brunswick – Saint John
Alexandru Mardale, INaLCO Paris – SeDyL UMR8202 CNRS

Differential Object Marking (DOM) in Modern Romanian (MR), implemented through the particle *pe*, is tightly related to clitic doubling (CD): in (1), both CD and DOM are obligatory.

(1)   *Am strigat-*(o$_j$) pe ea$_j$.*   'I called her.' (Rom. *p(r)e* < Lat. *per* 'on')
        have.1 called-her.CL DOM her

However, diachronic studies show that DOM and CD were dissociated in Old Romanian (OR), that neither CD nor DOM were obligatory with any class of nouns, and that the occurrence of *pe* for DOM was related to discourse (i.e., salient information) rather than to functional (i.e., Case marker) needs (Hill & Tasmowski 2008; Mardale 2015). Hence, the **question** we address in this paper is when and why the interaction between DOM and CD emerged in OR in a way that makes both operations obligatory in the context of (1).

The **data** come from a corpus of mixed OR texts from the 16th c., but the statistics concern only the documents written directly in Romanian (DÎ = 195.183 words, from 1521-1625; and chronicles = 436.717 words, from 1640-1780). The general **observations** listed below indicate an unstable option for DOM implementation, diachronically.

- There is evidence that the oldest form of DOM involved Dative Case marking (see also Gheţie 1997; Antonov & Mardale 2014). Only [+human] DPs qualified for this.

- The generalization of structural (Acc) Case to direct objects led to the reanalysis of the Dative to indirect objects, while *pe* emerges in DOM.

- DOM with *pe* extends from [+animate] DPs to [-animate], on the condition that they entail **foregrounding** (an umbrella term we use for contrastive topic, new information and any other type of intended emphasis on the DP).

- CD could occur independently of DOM, but is unproductive (5 exemples in DÎ). When it does, it **backgrounds** the DP (de-emphasizing; avoiding salient information readings).

- The co-occurrence of CD and *pe*-DOM is scarce before the 17th c.; i.e., 9.3% of DOM-ed DPs in DÎ, half of which display strong personal pronouns (as in (1)).

- This co-occurrence increases in the 18th c. and becomes obligatory when the *referential stability* of the DP object is high (in terms of Farkas & Heusinger 2003).

This overview tells us **when** CD and DOM start to interact (mid17th c.) and become productive (end of 18th c). Next, the **analysis** must point out **why** such an interaction arises. We adopt Delfitto's (2002) analysis of pronominal clitics as variables bound by a λ-operator in TopP within CP (i.e. [Top e] [λx (Marcello legge x)] for 'Marcello lo legge'= 'Marcel reads it'); and Farkas & Heusinger's (2003) scale of referential stability, where DOM is obligatory at the high end of the scale (names and personal pronouns) but generally absent at the low end (indefinites).

In OR, CD occurs by itself as in (2) and cancels the emphasis/new information reading that otherwise strong pronouns (vs their clitic counterpart) would prompt (Hill & Tasmowski 2008). Delfitto's prediction applies: lack of clitic left dislocation of the strong pronoun to TopP ensures a familiar (backgrounding) reading. For OR, CD is arises when D has a [+human] feature in the Agr cluster the clitic spells out. By the 16th c., CD is unproductive and fading out.

(2)   ***m*-au   *tremis* **mine**   *părintele*** (CEV {140})
me.CL-has   sent   me   priest.the   'The priest sent me.'

Concurrently, direct objects display DOM through Dative Case marking, either through an inflectional ending or through the particle *a* as in (3), resembling DOM in Spanish. There is no discernible discourse feature to trigger (3), only a restriction to [+human] DPs.

(3)   *să judece **a** seracu* (PS 29) // *să judece seracu**lui*** (CP2, 18r)
        SUBJ judge DOM poor.the // SUBJ judge poor.the.DAT 'to judge the poor'

Dative inflection, however, also applies to indirect objects and adjuncts to *verbes à régime*, creating ambiguity for DOM (Pană-Dindelegan 2014). Crucially, there is free variation in the 16th c. between Dative-DOM (e.g., *nu ascultară* **lui Moise** 'they did not listen to Moise'; PO: 172) and *pe*-DOM (4b), only the latter being productive. Mardale (2015) shows that *pe*-DOM arises as a foregrounding marker with narrow scope over DP, creating contrasts with the neutral non-DOM-ed version of the same object (4a). At this stage, OR *pe* merges in a contrastive Top of a DPmax and selects DP.

(4) a. *ascultați mine* (PO {73}) // b. *au ascultat **pre** mine* (PO {119})

    hear.IMP.2PL me 'hear me!'   have.3PL heard DOM me 'they heard me'

The discourse function of *pe*-DOM explains why this operation is not limited to [+human] DPs (although they remain prototypical for DOM), but extends to a number of inanimate DPs.

Basically, the 16th c. grammar displays separate CD and DOM, both sensitive to the [+human]/animacy feature of D, but achieving opposite discourse effects, i.e., backgrounding vs foregrounding. In the same texts, the scarce interaction of CD and DOM applies to strong personal pronouns, where CD neutralizes their inherent emphasis increased through DOM. In Delfitto's framework, the λ-operator binds the clitic, hence imposing restrictions on CD/DOM-ed DPs and overrides the discourse effect of *pe*. This signals that *pe* got reanalyzed when interacting with CD (while still foregrounding the DP when occurring independently of CD).

The reanalysis is visible in MR, where the interaction of CD and DOM is prevalent. For MR, we point out that, although the higher end of the referentiality scale in Farkas & Heusinger covers prototypically animate DPs, the crucial property is *deixis*, not animacy; e.g., demonstratives undergo CD/DOM although they may refer to inanimate objects; conversely, definite animate DP objects occur without CD/DOM if they take a pure role reading: in (5a) the bride's identity is unknown and irrelevant; in (5b) there is a certain bride I kissed, a reading arising from CD/DOM. So referentiality is the overarching property of CD/DOM-ed objects.

(5) a. *am pupat mireasa* // b.   *am pupat-o pe mireasă* (Gierling 1997)

    have.1 kissed bride.the //   have.1 kissed-her.CL DOM bride 'I kissed the bride.'

We consider that the referential stability pervasive with CD/DOM is an epiphenomenon arising from a checking configuration in syntax, involving *pe*-DP and the clitic pronoun. From Leonetti (2004) we adopt the definition of the DOM particle as an internal topic marker. Accordingly, the contrastive/salient feature of *pe* is stripped, and *pe* is reanalyzed from a Top head to a D head, where it spells out a secondary [topic] feature (in terms of Nikolaeva 2001: 26, "a secondary topic is an entity such that the utterance is construed to be about the relationship between it and the primary topic"). Familiar Top is incompatible with indefinites unless the syntactic context somehow provides rescue. On the other hand, the clitic pronoun has a *u*[topic] feature (being bound from Top) and probes *pe*-DP. This is a type of Agreement relation, where the DP must match the inherent specificity of the clitic pronoun, which is successful when the DP has referential content, or is definite, or has some kind of modification that makes the referentiality recoverable at LF. The preference for DPs at the higher end of the referential stability scale follows thus from the Agr relation between the clitic and *pe*-DP. This relation can be formalized as in Miyagawa (2010), where Agr at C involves [topic], which, on a par with the phi-feature set, may remain in C or be transferred to T (i.e., the location for clitic pronouns in OR/MR), the latter allowing for CD/DOM.