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SETTING THE STAGE

→ Romance languages: an animacy-based split, as illustrated by Modern Spanish (1)

(1)  
ROMANCE – MODERN STANDARD SPANISH  
(Ormazabal and Romero 2013a, ex.1 a, b)  
a. He encontrado *(a) la niña.  
have.1.SG found DOM² DEF.F.SG girl  
‘I have found the girl.’  
b. He encontrado *(a) el libro.  
have.1.SG found DOM DEF.M.SG book  
‘I have found the book.’
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| Animacy/person: | 1/2 > 3 > proper name > human > animate > inanimate |
| Specificity/definiteness: | pronoun > name > definite > specific indefinite > non-specific |

¹ Acknowledgments at the end.  
² Abbreviations: ACC = accusative, ANIM = animate, AOR = aorist, CL = clitic, COND = conditional, DAT = dative, DEF = definite, DOM = differential object marking, ERG = ergative, F = feminine, FUT = future, IMP = imperative, IMPF = imperfect, INF = infinitive, M = masculine, N = neuter, NOM = nominative, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, PRT = participle, PST = past, REFLEX = reflexive, REL = relative, SG = singular, SUBJ = subjunctive, 1 = first person, 3 = third person.
II. ROMANCE DOM IN DIACHRONY: the general idea seems to be that DOM started with objects higher on the Scales (e.g. 1st and 2nd personal pronouns, proper names, human DPs, etc.) and then progressively extended to those lower down


A COUNTEREXAMPLE DISCUSSED HERE:
- important differences between Old Spanish (OS), on the one hand, and Old Catalan (OC)/Old Romanian (OR), on the other hand
- OC/OR: classes lower down on the Scales show DOM to the exclusion of higher ones, contrary to what the Scales would predict

- OC/OR - 3rd person pronouns show DOM to the exclusion of 1st/2nd person
- OC/OR - pronouns are possible without DOM, while other DPs show DOM (see the Appendix)

II. a. OLD SPANISH DOM


(2) a. e ssi fuéredes vençidos, non rebtede a nós
and if be.COND.2PL defeated not blame.IMP.2PL DOM us
‘but if you are defeated you are not to blame us’

(12th c., Cid, 3566, apud von Heusinger and Kaiser 2005)

b. Dios salve a nuestros amigos e a vós más, señor
God save.SUBJ.3SG DOM our friends and DOM you more lord
‘May God save our friends and you above all, my lord’

(12th c., Cid, 3038, apud Ramsden 1961: 49)

(3) a. ellos comdes gallizanos a él tienen por señor.
they counts Galicians a él DOM he have.3PL as lord
‘They, Galician counts, have him as lord.’

(12th c., Cid, 2926, apud Ramsden 1961: 48)

b. todos a él guardavan.
all DOM he observe.IMPF.3PL
‘They all observed him.’

(13th c., Poema de Fernán González, 553b, apud Ramsden 1961: 48)
II. b. OLD CATALAN DOM

- OC texts (11 to 16 c) - it does not seem to be the case that DOM consolidated first with 1st/2nd person and then extended to 3rd person (see also Pineda forthc.):

(4) *Curial e Güelfa*, 15th c.

a. vós havets honrat a ell.  
   you.2PL have.2PL honoured DOM he  
   ‘You have honored him.’

b. ell e un companyó seu combatrían a ell.  
   he and a companion his fight.COND.3PL DOM he  
   ‘You and a mate of his would fight him.’

c. ¿què ha mogut tu e ton companyó a...?  
   what has moved you and your companion to  
   ‘What compelled you and your mate to…’

d. aquella senyora, qui mira nosaltres...  
   that lady who look.3SG we  
   ‘That lady, who watches us…’

Actually, an overview of the occurrences of DOM in this novel shows that the contrast is quite robust:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO DOM</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd sg/pl</td>
<td>4 (44,4%)</td>
<td>5 (55,5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg/pl</td>
<td>1 (16,7%)</td>
<td>5 (83,3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. *Curial e Güelfa*, 15th century. First 30.000 words.

A similar pattern is found in other works from the 14th and 15th centuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO DOM</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd sg/pl</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg/pl</td>
<td>6 (66,7%)</td>
<td>3 (33,3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. *Novel·letes Hongria*, 14th century. Entire text [9.000 words]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO DOM</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd sg/pl</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg/pl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. *Clams i crims*, 14th century. First 30.000 words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO DOM</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd sg/pl</td>
<td>9 (64,3%)</td>
<td>5 (35,8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg/pl</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. *Epistolari*, 14th century. First 30.000 words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO DOM</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd sg/pl</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg/pl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. *Epistolari*, 15th century. First 30.000 words.

→ OC requires an explanation; Scales predict 1st/2nd person to be stronger DOM triggers than 3rd

---

3 From the late 15th c. onwards, DOM becomes systematic with all strong (personal) pronouns, as in Modern Catalan.
II. **c. OLD ROMANIAN DOM**

- differential objects are preceded by the locative preposition *pe/pre/piră* (‘on’), or its directional counterpart *spre* (‘towards’).4

(5) Înţeleptulu soare (...) toţi-i veade, ce mai vârtoșu

*wise.DEF.M.SG sun all-CL.ACC.M.3PL see.3SG but more strong*

*pre cari-i prevescu pre elu.* (CC².1581:439)

Lit: ‘The wise sun sees everyone, especially those who watch him.’ *(agreement tracks subject)*

‘The wise sun sees everyone, especially the ones who look at it.’

**Early 16th century** – possibly indicating patterns from the late 15th century.5

- 3rd person pronouns show DOM, which is optional with 1st and 2nd person pronouns (von Heusinger and Onea Gáspár 2008, Nicula Parashiv 2016, etc.)

- von Heusinger and Onea Gáspár (2008), Table 6 (their Table 1, page 77)6; we supplemented the examination with other corpora: CT, CC, Ev, DÎ, MI7, 8

- von Heusinger and Onea Gáspár (2008) examined only [ + human ] DPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO DOM</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd sg/pl</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg/pl</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>33 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Direct object marking with *p(r)e* in 16th c. Romanian (adapted from von Heusinger and Onea Gáspár 2008, Table 1, page 77)

- von Heusinger and Onea Gáspár (2008 p.79) - the prominence of 3rd person DOM connected to distinct ACC in the 1st/2nd person in Old and Modern Romanian tonic pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>tine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>M el</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F ea</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Morphology of personal pronouns in modern Romanian

---

4 There are significant differences between the use of *pe* in the first part of the 16th c., and in texts written at the end of the 16th c. (after 1580). There also differences between translations and original OR texts (Puşcariu 1921/1922, Rosetti 1978, Hill 2004, Mardale 2015, Pană-Dindelegan 2016, Avram and Zafiu 2017, a.o.). See also the Appendix.

5 Agreed-upon parametrization of OR: i) first period of OR: the period of the earliest texts available (1500-1640); ii) second period of OR: increase in the number and stylistic range of texts (1640-1780), see also Pană-Dindelegan (2016).

6 Data based on a limited corpus from:

Bible A: *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* (The New Testament from Bălgrad) - 1648, Transylvania


7 Corpus label abbreviation conventions from Pană-Dindelegan (ed., 2016).

Some questions:

1. Note however that Table 7 only gives MR patterns. In the 16th century, the 3rd person pronoun could also take distinct accusative morphology (the form sine):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>mene/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>menre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>tine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>M elu</td>
<td>elu,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>sine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>ea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Morphology of personal pronouns in OR (16th century)

- sine appears in OR texts with the DOM preposition, just like (NOM homophonous) elu9

2. Distinct accusative morphology is only seen in the 1st/2nd person singular - 1st/2nd person plural should uniformly show DOM (just like 3rd person) due to the NOM-ACC syncretism

- but this is not what we get in the corpora

(6) Object pronouns in OR texts

a. Nemica voi să vatâme. (CT. 1560 – 1:140°)
   ‘Let nothing hurt you.’ (verb tracks subject agreement in OR)

b. Lumea pre elu nu cunosc. (CT. 1560 – 1:11°)
   ‘People did not recognize him.’

c. Va vindeca noi. (CC2.1581: 20)
   ‘He will heal us.’ (verb tracks subject agreement in OR)

d. Surpa-l-va pre elu. (CC2.1581: 23)
   ‘He will destroy him.’

→ the problem is rather 3rd person itself, and not the NOM/ACC homomorphism (with the need of DOM to disambiguate between subjects and objects)

→ the exact same issue as in OC, where there is NOM/ACC homomorphism too except in the 1st person singular (jo ‘I’ vs. a mi ‘me’).

Thus, both OR and OC require an explanation, as Scales predict 1st/2nd person to be stronger DOM triggers than 3rd person

---

9 Excluding the form sine as a reflexive does not account for its behavior in OR texts, as this morphology does not seem to always carry a reflexive interpretation:

(i) ca să poată hrâni pe sine. (DÎ.1593: XCV)
   such SUBJ can.SUBJ.3SG feed.INF DOM he
   ‘In order to be able to feed him.’

(ii) ca să *(se) poată hrâni (*pe) sine. (MR)
   such SUBJ CL.REFL.ACC.3SG can.SUBJ.3SG feed.INF DOM self.ACC
   ‘In order to be able to feed himself.’
III. DOM VERSUS INCORPORATION

Preliminary analysis in a nutshell:

- under recent accounts, DOM is equated with structural Case/licensing
- objects that cannot show DOM are assumed to undergo (pseudo)-incorporation, as predicates (López 2012, Ormazabal and Romero 2013a, b, Levin 2018, Kalin to appear, a.o.)

Our Claim: the prepositional accusative does not simply signal the difference between objects that undergo (pseudo)-incorporation (DOM-less ones) and DOM that must be licensed in the syntax

- OR and OC: the differential marker tracks an additional licensing operation on objects that have independent argumental status (and escape incorporation)
  - the differential marker is rather an argument licensing operation beyond Case

---

10 Two major strategies of nominal integration (Baker 1988, Chung and Ladusaw 2003, Legate 2014, Levin 2015, a.o.):

- RESTRICT (Chung and Ladusaw 2003): the nominal behaves like a predicate, of type <e,t>. It cannot saturate the predicate it is a syntactic argument of. The nominal will be interpreted as a restricted modifier under Restrict.
  - the result is semantic (pseudo)-incorporation; the object might escape case marking; no DOM

(i) If a is of type <e <e,t>> and b is of <e,t>

\[
[[a b]] = \lambda x. \lambda e. [[a]] & [[b]](x)
\]

a. \[\lambda v. vP \text{students} + v^0 [[vP \text{ students}]] \]

b. \[\lambda x. \lambda e. \text{hire}'(e)(x) & \text{students}'(x)]

(for the VP hire students)

FUNCTION APPLICATION (Heim and Kratzer 1998: 129)

If a is a bracketing node and \{b, c\} the set of its daughters, then for any assignment \(g\), a is in the domain of \([[[a]]]^{g}\)

iff both b and c are, and \([[b]]^{g}\) is a function whose domain contains \([[c]]^{g}\). In this case, \([[a]]^{g} = [[b]]^{g} \circ ([[c]]^{g})\)
III.1 Assumptions:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON/ANIMACY</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>[+PERSON] (= [+PARTICIPANT]) speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>[+PERSON] (= [+PARTICIPANT]) addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person [+human, + animate]</td>
<td>[+PERSONγ] (= [+PARTICIPANT])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Person and animacy (building on Harley and Ritter 2002)

- Other reflections of the [+PERSON] feature
  o Bernstein (2008), Longobardi (2008) - the D head hosts a [PERSON] specification, which is responsible for argumenthood, interpreted as [+PARTICIPANT]
  o [+PERSON] specification in more than one locus in the DPs
  o (micro-)variation with respect to the setting of [PERSON] in D
  o definites (whose morphology is largely homophonic with that of 3rd pronoun):
    ▪ referential definites: carry a [+PERSON] specification in D
    ▪ non-referential definites: only specified as a weak, [α PERSON] feature in D; treated as predicates, lacking argumental status12

(10)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{DP} \\
&D \quad [\text{PERSON}] \\
&[\text{PERSON}] \rightarrow <e> \\
&[\alpha \text{ PERSON}] \rightarrow <e,t> \\
&\gamma : \text{VAL}=M/F/N \\
&[\text{PERSONγ}] \rightarrow <e> \\
&= \text{semantic gender (animacy)}
\end{align*}
\]

11 Assumption also supported by the observation that differentially marked objects appear to trigger PCC-like effects (Ormazabal and Romero 2007, Cornilescu and Tigău 2017, Irimia 2018a, b, etc.).
12 See Espinal and Cyrino (2017) for recent discussion, and relevant references.
13 For convenience, we assume gender features are introduced on n, but nothing hinges on this.
- due to their pragmatic import, certain categories must be *visible* at the CI interface (Nichols 2001, Wiltshchko 2014, Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017, a.o.). Among these:
  - [+PARTICIPANT]
  - [+PERSON γ]

- as said above: the relevant structural nominals ensure CI visibility by entering into a (phi-) *relationship* with functional heads in the clausal spine (v, T, C, etc.) → *licensing*
  - given this Visibility Condition:
    - [+PERSON γ] cannot be subject to incorporation
    - [+PERSON γ] must be *licensed* – by entering into an obligatory relation with a licenser in the clausal structure
    - [+PERSON γ] can only be interpreted on a nominal that escapes incorporation

### III.2 The problem of Spanish definites

- (non-DOM) D is of the (semantically) weak type, undergoing incorporation (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, López 2012, Ormazabal & Romero 2013a, Alcaraz 2018, a.o.)

(11) **SPANISH NON REFERENTIAL DEFINITES** (interpreted as <e,t>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Quine definite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Juan busca <strong>la mujer</strong> <strong>perfecta</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Juan is looking for the perfect woman.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Le enviaron <em>(a)</em> <strong>todos los enfermos</strong> a CL.DAT.SG DOM la doctora van Tan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘They sent all the sick people to doctor van Tan.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the availability of (11b – O&R’s 2b) is extremely restricted. Sentences like (11b– O&R’s 2b) are only grammatical with nouns such as sick people, soldiers, slaves, kids, etc.; nouns whose referents are regularly treated as entities lacking free will. The range of animate nouns that can appear without DOM in this context is, more or less, the same one that allows incorporation in polysynthetic languages (see Baker 1996 for details)” (Ormazabal and Romero 2013b)*

---

14 Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2007) - (some) Spanish D must be analyzed as being subject to incorporation, even as a clitic; in Spanish varieties accusative clitics can even resume predicates in existential sentences

(i) **DIALECTAL SPANISH – CLITICS IN EXISTENTIAL CLAUSES**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Hubieron dos estudiantes en la fiesta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘There were two students at the party.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Los hubieron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘They were.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, ex.2)

Alcaraz (2018) for Northern Castilian Spanish - definites are subject to incorporation (unless DOM-ed), the accusative clitic lo doubles an NP (not a DP) and is subject to incorporation.

15 Other examples:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>He <strong>encontrado</strong>(a) <strong>la niña</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I have found the girl.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>He <strong>encontrado</strong> <strong>la niña</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I have found the type of girl (you were looking for).’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(12)\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
[\alpha \text{ PERSON}] \rightarrow <e,t> \\
\text{weak (definite)} \\
\text{incorporation!} \\
\text{CRASH!!} \\
\text{licensing!} \\
\end{array} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[\gamma: VAL=M/F/N]} \\
\text{[+PERSON \gamma] \rightarrow <e>} \\
\text{= semantic gender (animacy)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Spanish pronouns:

(13)\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{weak [\alpha \text{ PERSON}] \rightarrow <e,t>} \\
\text{speaker?} \\
\text{incorporation!} \\
\text{Ø} \\
\text{- interpreted as a weak definite} \\
\text{(non-specific clitic, etc.)} \\
\text{- cannot be interpreted as a} \\
\text{[+ PARTICIPANT]!} \\
\end{array} \]

The animacy licensing strategy saves the derivation:

- [+PERSON \gamma] triggers a shift (strengthening) from [\alpha \text{ PERSON}] to [+ PERSON]\textsuperscript{16}

(14)\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
[\alpha \text{ PERSON}] <e,t> \rightarrow [+ \text{ PERSON}] <e> \\
\text{speaker} \\
\text{licensing!} \\
\text{[+PERSON \gamma] \rightarrow <e>} \\
\text{= semantic gender (animacy)} \\
\end{array} \]

(15) e ssi fuérides vençidos, non rebtede a nós and if be.COND.2PL defeated not blame.IMP.2PL DOM us ‘but if you are defeated you are not to blame us.’ (also other examples in Section IIa)

III.3 Additional licensing of DOM - Old Catalan and Old Romanian

- the crucial difference between OS and OC/OR is that in the latter two languages, D can be specified as [+PERSON]

(16)\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
[\alpha \text{ PERSON}] \rightarrow <e,t> \\
\text{incorporation!} \\
\text{[\gamma: VAL=M/F/N]} \\
\text{[+ PARTICIPANT]} \\
\text{- interpreted as a weak definite} \\
\text{- cannot be interpreted as} \\
\text{[+ PARTICIPANT]} \\
\end{array} \]

\textsuperscript{16} See also Cornilescu (1992), Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2007), Kučerová (2017), etc.
(17) \[
\begin{array}{c}
DP \\
\text{[+ PERSON]} \rightarrow <e> \\
\text{speaker} \\
\text{ licensing!}
\end{array}
\]

- pronoun can be interpreted
  [+ PARTICIPANT]
- differential marking is not necessary

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[\gamma; VAL= M/F/N]}
\end{array}
\]

a. aquella senyora, qui mira nosaltres... (OC, Curial e Güelfa, 15th c.)
   ‘That lady, who watches us…’

b. Va vindeca noi. (OR, CC^2.1581: 20)
   ‘He will heal us.’

   (verb tracks subject agreement in OR)

   - 3rd person is more complicated; such entities can be both animate or inanimate
   - as the [+PERSON γ] strategy extended, it obligatorily affected 3rd p. animates, which also
     had a pronominal structure with [+ PERSON] in D
   - independent change: 3rd p. tonic pronouns become restricted only to animate entities^{17}

(18) \[
\begin{array}{c}
DP \\
\text{[+ PERSON]} \rightarrow <e> \\
\text{ n } \\
\text{ licensing!} \\
\end{array}
\]

- tonic pronoun can be interpreted
  as [+ PARTICIPANT]
- BUT must be animate
- differential marking is obligatory on 3rd p. animates

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[+PERSON γ] \rightarrow <e>}
\end{array}
\]

= semantic gender (animacy)

a. vós havets honrat a ell.
   ‘You have honored him.’

b. Surpa-l-va pre elu.
   ‘He will destroy him.’

IV. 1. Old Romanian – referential (definite) DPs can be clitic doubled without DOM

   - in OR referential DPs can appear clitic-doubled without DOM irrespective of animacy
   - clitic licensing: referentiality, familiarity, specificity, etc., irrespective of animacy
     o some Romanian varieties still preserve clitic-doubling with no DOM^{18} (see
       Mišeska-Tomić 2006, a.o.)

(20) AROMANIAN

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Lu} \\
\text{CL.ACC.M.3SG} \\
\text{see.AOR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

vidzu Belgradu(lu).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Belgrade(DEF.M.3SG)}
\end{array}
\]

‘S/he has seen Belgrade.’

(Mišeska-Tomić 2006, ex.272b)

^{17} See Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) for further discussion, as well as the examples in the Appendix (III).

^{18} Note that these are not clitic left-dislocated structures.
- non-prepositional clitic doubling seen in parallel with the prepositional accusative strategy (Mardale 2015, Hill and Mardale 2017, a.o.)

(21) OLD ROMANIAN
a. Rugăm 
tine…. (PO 9, Hill and Mardale 2017, ex.9a)
   beg.1PL you.ACC.SG
   ‘We beg you…’
b. Te cunosc 
tine. (PO 9, Hill and Mardale 2017, ex.9b)
   CL.ACC.2SG know.1SG you.ACC.SG
   ‘I know you.’
c. Te voiu aduce pre 
tine de acolo. (PO 9, Hill and Mardale 2017, ex.9d)
   CL.ACC.2SG FUT.1SG bring DOM you.ACC.SG from there
   ‘I will bring you from there.’

(22)

- connecting DOM to a secondary licensing operation (Irimia 2018a, b, c; see also Ledgeway et al. 2017) might also derive another fact that has resisted explanation – the presence, in Romanian, of both clitic doubling and DOM

- clitic doubling with non-pronominal DOM is not allowed in (standard) Spanish

(23) STABILIZATION OF DOM AND MODERN ROMANIAN
Am văzu-t-o pe femeie.
   have.1 seen-CL.ACC.F.3SG DOM woman
   ‘I have seen the woman.’ (see also Dobrovie-Sorin 1994)

IV. 2. Old Catalan – past participle agreement (PPA) facts

(24) OLD CATALAN: Participial agreement with DOM
   Jo crech que a[u]rà vists [a] mos fills
   I think that have.FUT.3SG seen.PST.PRT.M.PL DOM my children
   ‘I think that (s)he will have seen my kids.’ (Cartes Hipòlita - Estefania, 16th c.)

---

19 As is well known, explaining these patterns in terms of Kayne’s Generalization is problematic.
OLD CATALAN: Participial agreement without DOM

\[
\text{ella en aquest camí havia encontrats los apòstols}^{20}
\]

\[
\text{she in this way had found.PST.PRT.M.PL DEF.M.PL apostles}
\]

‘She had found the apostles in this way.’  

(Memorial pecador, 15\textsuperscript{th} c.)

- patterns of this type can be straightforwardly derived under additional licensing
- in both OC and OR, as well as MC and MR, non-DOM animate definites can have referential interpretations (as shown in the Appendix, II)

**TO CONCLUDE**

- D is subject to incorporation in OS – pronouns not possible without DOM
- some Ds do not undergo incorporation in OC, OR. Pronouns possible without DOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Obligatory Incorporation of (Non-DOM) D</th>
<th>Non-Incorporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>DOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>DOM/CLITIC DOUBLING/Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>DOM/PPA/Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Non-DOM definites and incorporation

**V. SOME REMARKS ON THE STATUS OF SCALES**

- These problems, as well as many others, have led to renewed debates about the nature of Scales (discussion in Næss 2004, Kiparsky 2008, von Heusinger et al. 2008, Carnie 2005 – ‘merely post-factum descriptive statements of grammatical tendencies’, a.o.)
- Lesson from our data: Scales do not operate in a static system; their interaction with narrow syntax (López 2012, a.o.), nominal integration strategies, and categorial feature composition is crucial

**THANK YOU!**

Comments are highly appreciated

---

\(^{20}\) Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2007): PPA can also signal lexical Case. While it is true that PPA is seen in existential clauses (EC) in OC (i), the data also clearly show that these ECs also allow overt definites. This indicates that they are more similar to the Italian-type existentials (Zamparelli 2000) or ECs that show accusative structural Case (as opposed to lexical cases like the partitive). But such ECs contain a richer structure that makes available licensing.

(i) ve[n]gren al loch on era \textit{estada la bataya} (damont dita)

\(\text{come.PST.3PL to.DEF.M.SG place where be.IMPF be.PST.PRT.F.SG DEF.F.SG battle above said}

‘They arrived to the place where there had been the battle.’  

(Versió catalana de la crònica de Jaume I, 14\textsuperscript{th} c.)

DOM co-occurrence with (independent) PPA is also seen in other Romance varieties, as well as outside Romance.
CORPORA

OLD CATALAN

*Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic (CICA)*, J. Torruella (dir.), junt amb Manel Pérez Saldanya i Josep Martines. [www.cica.cat](http://www.cica.cat)

OLD ROMANIAN


ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Pino Longobardi, Julie Goncharov, Adam Ledgeway, Alexandru Mardale, M. T. Espinal, Manuel Pérez-Saldanya, Cristina Guardiano, the audiences at Going Romance 31, LSRL 48, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, and various anonymous reviewers for their comments, feedback and discussion.

Funding:

**Monica Alexandrina Irimia**: This work has been partly supported by the ERC Advanced Grant # 295733 LanGeLin (PI Giuseppe Longobardi), as well as by a research grant offered by the Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia.

**Anna Pineda**: This work has been supported by the postdoctoral research fellowship Beatriu de Pinós (2014 BP_A 00165, Secretaria d’Universitats i Recerca del Departament d’Economia i Coneixement de la Generalitat de Catalunya), the postdoctoral research fellowship Juan de la Cierva-incorporación (IJC1-2016-30474, Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spanish Government) and the research project FFI2014-56968-C4-1-P (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spanish Government).
Levin, Ted. 2015. Licensing without Case. PhD dissertation. MIT.
APPENDIX

I. An instantiation of the other counterexample to the Scales is that OC DPs show DOM to the exclusion of personal pronouns. The earliest Catalan texts also show that the a-marking did not necessarily consolidate first with strong pronouns and then appeared in DPs. See the contrast in (1):

(1) [NB: proper nouns in Old Catalan take a “definite” article]

a. darem a aquells [l]icènsia de peynorar vós
   give.FUT.IPL to them permit to fine.INF you.2PL.HONORIFIC(=SG)
   ‘We will give them permit to fine you.’

b. com en Ca[ste]let, saig, volgués peynorar a· n
   since the Castelet, executioner, want.SBJV.PST.3SG fine.INF DOM the
   Ramon Sanç, lo dit Ramon dix a aquel que
   the mentioned Ramon tell.PST.3SG to that.one that
   no·l peynoràs,
   no him.ACC fine.SBJV.PST.3SG
   ‘Since Castelet, executioner, wanted to fine Ramon Sanç, the above-mentioned Ramon told to that one not to fine him.’

We do not provide a full formal analysis for this counterexample here, as we focus more on the issue with 3rd person pronouns. However, we believe that the account proposed for 3rd person pronouns can be extended to the other classes.

II. In Catalan and Romanian, the equivalents of (11b) do not necessarily have an incorporated-like reading:

(2) He trobat la nena. Modern Catalan
   have.1SG found the girl
   = ‘I’ve found the specific girl.’
   ? ‘I have found the type of girl you were was looking for.’

(3) Am găsit fata. Modern Romanian
   have.1 found girl.DEF.F.SG
   = ‘I have found the specific girl.’
   ? ‘I have found the girl.

III. 3rd PERSON TONIC PRONOUNS RESTRICTED TO ANIMACY (AS OBJECTS)

(4) L-am văzut pe el. Modern Romanian
   CL.ACC.M.3SG-have.1 seen DOM he.ACC
   = ‘I have seen him.’
   * ‘I have seen it.’

(5) L’he vist a ell. Modern Catalan
   CL.ACC.M.3SG-have.1 seen DOM he
   = ‘I have seen him.’
   * ‘I have seen it.’