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The empirical issue

Speakers of Friulian in Argentina display Differential Object Marking (‘DOM’, in Italo-Romance: prepositional realisation of DOs) in their grammar, both in elicited and spontaneous data:

(1) Quand che lo ài vidut, no lo ai
when that him= have.1SG see.PTCP NEG him= have.1SG
vidut a lui, ai vidut, ai vidut
see.PTCP DOM him, have.1SG see.PTCP have.1SG see.PTCP
a me ma... me mari...
DOM my mother my mother
‘When I saw him, I didn’t see him, I saw my mother.’
The theoretical puzzle

Friulian spoken in Italy is not traditionally described as a language exhibiting DOM, therefore either either:

- language contact contributes to the creation of a brand new structure in the speaker’s grammar, or
- the speaker’s grammar already includes some structural properties that allow for the emergence of DOM

I will argue for the second option.
Language variation perspective

Three varieties of Friulian:

- \textit{Friulian}_1: spoken in the Italian region of Friuli Venezia Giulia
- \textit{Friulian}_2: spoken in Buenos Aires by Friulian immigrants
- \textit{Friulian}_3: spoken and learnt in Buenos Aires by their descendants

Homeland/Baseline/Heritage language/speakers perspective set aside
Our focus

- How emergence / extension of DOM happens in Friulian$_1$, Friulian$_2$ and Friulian$_3$
- How this can contribute to our understanding of DOM
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DOM features

All Romance and Semitic languages with grammemic replacement have one feature in common: not all direct objects are marked as accusatives, but only a part of them, sometimes even only a small fraction. In my terminology I would say that the new system of object marking has become differential, in sharp contrast to the preceding one Bossong (1991: 151).
DOM features

All Romance and Semitic languages with grammemic replacement have one feature in common: not all direct objects are marked as accusatives, but only a part of them, sometimes even only a small fraction. In my terminology I would say that the new system of object marking has become differential, in sharp contrast to the preceding one Bossong (1991: 151).

DOM, thus:

- relies on morphological realisation (grammemic replacement)
DOM features

All Romance and Semitic languages with grammemic replacement have one feature in common: not all direct objects are marked as accusatives, but only a part of them, sometimes even only a small fraction. In my terminology I would say that the new system of object marking has become differential, in sharp contrast to the preceding one Bossong (1991: 151).

DOM, thus:

- concerns only DOs
DOM features

All Romance and Semitic languages with grammemic replacement have one feature in common: not all direct objects are marked as accusatives, but only a part of them, sometimes even only a small fraction. In my terminology I would say that the new system of object marking has become differential, in sharp contrast to the preceding one Bossong (1991: 151).

DOM, thus:

- affects only a subgroup of DOs *(differential)*
DOM features

All Romance and Semitic languages with grammemic replacement have one feature in common: not all direct objects are marked as accusatives, but only a part of them, sometimes even only a small fraction. In my terminology I would say that the new system of object marking has become differential, in sharp contrast to the preceding one Bossong (1991: 151).

Direct Objects (DOs) are expected to form a natural class (morpho-syntactically) in a given language. If a language presents different morphological realisations of DOs, this constitutes DOM.
Psych verbs

Following Belletti and Rizzi (1988) I assume three classes of psych verbs:

- **Class I** - *Gianni fears this*. - Experiencer, Theme
- **Class II** - *This worries Gianni*. - Theme, Experiencer (Object Experiencers, ‘OEs’, e.g. Belletti (2018a))
- **Class III** - *This pleases Gianni*. - Theme, Experiencer / Experiencer, Theme (Italian) (Dative Experiencers, ‘DE’)

Following Belletti and Rizzi (1988) I assume three classes of psych verbs:
OEs as DOM

The proposal put forth here starts from the assumption that *a*-marked Object Experiencers (‘OEs’) can be instances of DOM. This is not excluded by the definition given by (Bossong 1991).

(2) Italian, adapted from Berretta (1989: 18)

A te non entusiasmano, le carote cotte.
DOM you not excite.3PL the carrots cooked

‘As for you, cooked carrots do not thrill you.’
Three main DOM systems in Romance

DOM in Italo-Romance exhibits at least three distinct behaviours, each of which can be labelled as DOM₁, DOM₂, DOM₃. Friulian varieties display each of these DOM *types*. 
A-marking of dislocated Object Experiencers

(3) Friulian$_1$

A  lui, la situazion covid lu preocupe unevore.

DOM him the situation covid him= worry.3SG a.lot

‘As for him, the COVID situation worries him a lot.’
DOM₁: *preoccupare* verb class

(4) OEs in Friulian₁

a. **A** me/ te/ lui/ Marco, il discors di Conte no DOM me/ you/ him/ Marco the speech of Conte not mi/ ti/ lo à persuadût par nuje. me/=/ you/=/ him= have.3SG persuade.PTCP for nothing ‘Conte’s speech did not persuade me/ you/ him/ Marco at all.’

b. Ma e je nome une bestie. **A** me/ te/ lui/ Marco but it= is only a beast DOM me you him Marco no mi/ ti/ lu spavente migo! NEG me= you= him= frighten.3SG at.all ‘It’s just a bug. As for me/ you/ him/ Marco, it doesn’t frighten me/you/him at all!’
DOM₁ is *reduced* DOM

Limited to dislocated OEs. It involves neither Theme DOs (5) nor OEs *in-situ* (6)

(5) adapted from ASIt - Atlante Sintattico d’Italia

As to vidut Ø to barba?
Have.2SG you= see.PTCP your uncle

‘Have you seen your uncle?’

(6) adapted from Grant Dizionari Bilengâl Talian Furlan

Il conciert al à entusiastât Ø il public.
the concert it.CL.NOM have.3SG excite.PTCP the public

‘The concert thrilled the public.’
A-marking of dislocated Theme DOs

(7) Friulian_2

Parcè che a mi el fret no mi iude.
because that DOM me the cold not me help.3SG

‘Because the cold doesn’t help me.’
DOM$_2$ is limited to dislocated DOs

Theme DOs are not $a$-marked when $in$-$situ$

(8) Friulian$_2$

Tu tu sintis $\emptyset$ chists giovenis ch’e son in you you= hear.2SG these young.PL that.they= be.3PL in radio...
radio

‘You hear these young people who are on the radio.’
A-marking of Theme Direct Objects independently of their position

(9) Friulian₃

E an clamat a me mari, che no si and have.3PL call.PTCP DOM my mother that not one=
feveli plui il furlan.
speak.SBJV.3SG anymore the Friulian

‘And they called my mother, so we should no longer speak Friulian.’
Again DOM$_3$

(10) Friulian$_3$

Quand che lo ài vidut, no lo ai when that him= have.1SG see.PTCP NEG him= have.1SG vidut a lui, ai vidut, ai vidut see.PTCP DOM him, have.1SG see.PTCP have.1SG see.PTCP a me ma... me mari cun la polente e cul fil DOM my mother my mother with the polenta and the strand par tagliare.
to cut.INF

‘When I saw him, I didn’t see him, I saw my mother with the polenta and the string to cut it.’
Towards an analysis

A-marking of OEs. Following Belletti and Rizzi (1988) I assume three classes of psych verbs:

- Class I - *Gianni fears this.*
- Class II - *This worries Gianni.* OEs, e.g. Belletti (2018a)
- Class III - *This pleases Gianni.* - DEs
Hypotheses for OEs

Two hypothesis for OEs:

H$_1$ they merge in the VP as DPs
H$_2$ they merge in the VP as PPs
OEs merge as DPs

Following (Iwata 1995; Landau 2010; Pesetsky 1995; Reinhart 2000, 2001, 2002), class II-verbs are treated as transitive verbs

(11) Class II - adapted from Belletti and Rizzi (1988: 291)

Questo preoccupa Gianni.
\textbf{this} worry.\textbf{3SG} Gianni

‘This worries Gianni.’
The structure of class II psych verbs - $H_1$

OEs merge directly in the VP as its DP complement - without an intervening preposition (Reinhart 2000, 2001, 2002)

OEs project the same structure as any other DOs
I follow the analysis by López (2009) on information structure where the notion of topicality is reduced to two primitive features: anaphoricity \([±a]\) and contrastiveness \([±c]\).

- Anaphoricity: the element refers to a previous local antecedent
- Contrastiveness: opens up a quantificational domain.

Dislocations bear \([+a]\). CLLD and CLRD differ for \([±c]\). Thus, only \([+a]\) is relevant for DOM.
A feature checking system

López (2009) accounts for disclocations using a system of feature checking. Dislocated constituents occupy fixed positions:
- **CLRＤ**: edge of vP [+_a][-c]
- **CLLD**: edge CP [+_a][+_c]
The proposal advanced here is that the spell out of DOM₁ in Friulian₁ takes place when the DO:

- bears Experiencer Theta role
- checks [+a]
DOM$_2$ checks [+a]

Recall now DOM$_2$ in Friulian$_2$: Themes are $a$-marked when dislocated.

In this case, I assume the same proposal by López (2009) but argue that the spell out of DOM is the result of [+a] checking.

In the system proposed by López information structure does not affect DOM, analysed as a case marker in Spanish.

Furthermore, the spell out of DOM$_2$ is not limited to Experiencers.
DOM₃ marks accusative Case

DOs are *a*-marked both in topic position and *in-situ*.

The trigger for *a*-marking is neither information structure nor theta specification.

DOM₃ is instead a marker of (accusative) C/case (as in Brugè and Brugger (1994); López (2012); Ledgeway et al. (2019); Torrego (1998) a.o.).
Interim summary: H1

OEs merge as DPs. Friulian varieties display different types of DOM:

\[ \text{DOM}_1 \text{ lexicalises: Experiencer, [+a]} \]

\[ \text{DOM}_2 \text{ lexicalises: [+a]} \]

\[ \text{DOM}_3 \text{ lexicalises: accusative Case} \]
The structure of class II psych verbs - $H_2$

Experiencers always merge as PPs, both in Class II (OEs) and Class III (DEs) psych verbs.

In the case of Class II the empty preposition plays a role in (accusative) case assignment, just as it has been proposed for Double Object Constructions (e.g., Kayne (1984), Baker (1988)) where an empty preposition introduces the goal argument.

(13) OEs merge as PPs

```
VP
  \ 
V   PP
  \ 
ØP  DP
```
OEs are peculiar objects

This idea is supported by the fact that OEs indeed do display a different behavior compared to Theme DOs (Belletti and Rizzi 1988).
The behaviour of OEs is different than Theme DOs

Consider the data by Belletti and Rizzi (1988: 325) about extraction:

(14) DOs of Class I are transparent to extraction

Il candidato di cui questa ragazza apprezza i sostenitori.

the candidate of whom this girl like.3sg the supporters

‘The candidate of whom this girl likes the supporters.’

(15) DOs of Class II are opaque to extraction

* Il candidato di cui questa prospettiva impaurisce i sostenitori.

the candidate of whom this perspective frighten.3sg the supporters

* ‘The candidate of whom this perspective frightens the supporters.’
A possible derivation for Experiencers

(16) DP gets Accusative Case

FP

John VP

kissed DP

Mary

- DP needs case by the verb
- The verb assigns accusative case to the DO
A possible derivation for Experiencers

- DP needs case by the verb
- The verb assigns accusative case to the DO
- The Experiencer DP, however, cannot get case because it is shielded off by the PP (ex. 13, here as 17)

(17) OEs merge as PPs

\[
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V PP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ØP DP}
\]
Experiencer in *preoccupare*

In the case of *preoccupare*:

- The ØP incorporates in the V (under adjacency), yielding (18)
- The PP becomes transparent, so the DP can get case

```
VP
   /\     /\          
  DP   V'  PP
     /\     /\        
    la guerra V ØP DP
                         |
                    Gianni
```
Experiencer in *preoccupare*

In the case of *preoccupare*:

- The ØP incorporates in the V (under adjacency), yielding (18)
- The PP becomes transparent, so the DP can get case

(18) Incorporation in *preoccupare*

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{la guerra} \rightarrow \text{ØP}_i \text{V} \\
\text{preoccupare} \quad t_i \quad \text{DP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{Gianni}
\]
Experiencer in *piacere*

In the case of *piacere* incorporation is not possible because of lack of adjecency: the DP doesn’t have case and the derivation crashes.

![Diagram](image.png)
Experiencer in *piacere*

In the case of *piacere* incorporation is not possible because of lack of adjacency: the DP doesn’t have case and the derivation crashes.

To prevent this, the preposition lexicalises (see 19). This is possible because it is not case-governed (*piacere* is unaccusative).

(19)  *Piacere*  

```
  vP
 /   \
V'    PP
    /   \   a Gianni
   /     \     
V     DP
    |      |
  piace la pasta
```
Dislocations

One option is to say that Movement frees the preposition from being case-governed, so it can lexicalise. At this point, the DP can get case and and the derivation is safe.

\[(20)\] Tentative structure for dislocations

```
CP
  PP
  \[A_i\]
  vP
  \[questo\]
  \[DP\]
  \[Gianni_j\]
  \[V\]
  \[PP\]
  \[lo preoccupa\]
  \[t_i\]
  \[t_j\]
```
Passivisation as a test for accusative Case

Although OEs display different behaviour than Theme DOs, they can be passivised, hence they receive accusative case:

(21) Gianni è preoccupato dalla situazione.
    ‘Gianni is worried by the situation.’
Adjectival vs syntactic passivisation

Belletti and Rizzi (1988) argue that passivisation of OEs is adjectival rather than syntactic:
Three pieces of evidence

- a cliticisation in reduced relative clauses
- b *venire* passives
- c irregular participial forms
Cliticisation in reduced relative clauses

In Italian only verbal passives allow cliticisation in reduced relative clauses:

(22) Adapted from Belletti and Rizzi (1988: 309,310)

a. La notizia che gli è stata comunicata
   the news that him= be.3SG stay.PTCP comunicata / comunicatagli.
   communicate.PTCP / communicate.PTCP.him=
   ‘The news that was communicated to him.’

b. La sola persona che ne è affascinata
   the only person that ne= be.3SG fascinate.PTCP / fascinate.PTCP.ne=
   ‘The only person who is fascinated by it.’
Cliticisation in other verbs of class II

Consider other verbs:

(23)  

a. La sola persona persuasane.
    the only person persuade.PTCP.ne=

b. La sola persona preoccupatane.
    the only person worry.PTCP.ne=

c. (?) La sola persona spaventatane.
    the only person frighten.PTCP.ne=

d. (?) La sola persona convintane.
    the only person convince.PTCP.ne=
Venire passives

In Italian *venire* is only allowed by verbal passives (examples adapted from (Belletti and Rizzi 1988: 310):

(24) Verbal passives - Class I

Gianni viene temuto da tutti.
Gianni come.3SG fear.PTCP by everybody

‘Gianni is feared by everybody.’

(25) Adjectival passives - Class II

* Gianni viene preoccupato da tutti.
  Gianni come.3SG worry.PTCP by everybody

‘Gianni is worried by everybody.’
Venire passives with other verbs

Again, consider other class II verbs:

(26) a. Gianni (adesso) viene persuaso da sua sorella
    Gianni now come.3SG persuade.PTCP by his sister
    (a votare per te).
    to vote.INF for you

b. Gianni (poi) viene spaventato dal lupo.
    Gianni then come.3SG frighten.PTCP by the wolf

c. Gianni (probabilmente) viene convinto da sua sorella
    Gianni probably come.3SG convince.PTCP by his sister
    (a fare da modello).
    to do.INF from model
Irregular participial forms

Some verbs of Class II psych verbs take an irregular participial form:

(27) * Sono stufato / stancato / entusiasmato dalle sue idee.
       be.1SG bored.PTCP / tire.PTCP / excite.PTCP by.the their ideas

‘I am tired excited by his ideas.’

But again, other verbs display regular participial morphology:

(28) Sono preoccupato / convinto dalle sue idee.
       be.1SG worry.PTCP / convince.PTCP by.the their ideas

‘I am worried / convinced by their ideas.’
H2: (O)Es merge in the VP as PPs

Interim summary: H2

(O)Es are merged as PPs
- they exhibit different behavior wrt Theme DOs
- the preposition is realised morphologically with DEs of Class III
- OEs can be passivised (although B& R argue it is adjectival, but see passivisation of Goal DPs: He was given the book.)
An independent process

Argentinian Spanish structural DOM: independent of object position and semantic features of the DP (Di Tullio et al. 2019)

Figure: DOM in complex syntactic configurations in Friulian2 in Argentina
The diachronic perspective

The typology of DOM presented includes three tclasses: DOM$_1$, DOM$_2$ and DOM$_3$. Here it is argued that:

- these stages reflect a grammaticalisation process (Traugott 2011)
- Friulian varieties synchronically display all of them
Previous proposals: Iemmolo (2010)
The grammaticalisation of AD

Iemmolo (2010) building on Pensado (1995) proposes the following grammaticalisation path for DOM in Romance:

\[(29) \text{ allative marker} > \text{topic marker} > \text{dative marker} > \text{(differential) object marker}\]

AD starts as a locative preposition and, in the first stage of the change, develops as a marker of dislocated DOs then it grammaticalises into a marker of DOM
Previous proposals: Belletti 2018

*a*-Topics

Belletti (2018a): diachronic developmental path where *a*-marking start as a Topic marker of OEs in the Left Periphery and is further grammaticalised into a full Case marker.

Left periphery: [+a] encodes psychological involvement of the DO in the event: OEs preferred *a*-Topics in Italian (Belletti 2018b: 452, 453).
The grammaticalisation of DOM

The intuition that DOM results from the grammaticalisation of left dislocated DOs is shared.

Here, we propose a grammaticalisation path that builds on Iemmolo (2010) and Belletti (2018a) but is only concerned with marking of accusative objects:

(30)  

a  Dislocated Accusative Experiencers >

b  Dislocated Accusatives >

c  Accusatives

The three minimum steps that involve the grammaticalisation of DOM based on the data under investigation.
a - Dislocated Accusative Experiencers

$\text{DOM}_1$ emerges as the marking of a small subgroups of dislocated DOs: OEs

(31) $\text{DOM}_1$ in Friulian$_1$

$\text{A me, la situazion covid mi preocupe unevore. DOM me the situation covid me= worry.3SG a.lot}$

‘As for me, the COVID situation worries me a lot.’
b - Dislocated Accusatives

DOM₂ includes dislocated DOs, it is reanalysed as a marker of information structure (if Themes merge as KP, DOM=K)

(32) DOM₂ in Friulian₂

Parcè che a mi el fret no mi iude.
because that DOM me the cold not me= help.3SG

‘Because the cold doesn’t help me.’
c - Accusatives

DOM₃ marks accusatives irrespective of their position; it is reanalysed as a marker of Case (If KP, DOM=K)

(33) DOM₃ in Friulian₃

E an clamat a me mari, che no si and have.3PL call.PTCP DOM my mother that not one=
feveli plui il furlan. speak.SBJV.3SG anymore the Friulian

‘And they called my mother, so we wouldn’t speak Friulian anymore.’
How does grammaticalisation of DOM (30) combine with grammaticalisation of a (29)?

Hypothetically:

(34) allative marker > (O)Es marker > dative marker > dislocated Themes > accusatives

But this was not checked in diachronic data! It is a matter for further research.
How DOM grammaticalises

Grammaticalisation is possible because of the peripheral position occupied by CLLDed objects - edge of vP.

*Phase edges appear to constitute points of particular significance in language change, contact, and acquisition by providing a “way in” for elements that have not been (fully) formally integrated into the projecting structure (Biberauer 2018: 22)*
Structure matters

- DOM\(_1\) marks dislocated Experiencer but perceived merely as marking dislocated DOs by the acquirer - edge CP, hence DOM\(_2\) can emerge
Structure matters

- DOM$_1$ marks dislocated Experiencer but perceived merely as marking dislocated DOs by the acquirer - edge CP, hence DOM$_2$ can emerge

- In DOM$_2$ similarly, position of the DO less and less relevant. The acquirer generalises the marking to all accusatives, hence emergence of DOM$_3$
Structure matters

- DOM$_1$ marks dislocated Experiencer but perceived merely as marking dislocated DOs by the acquirer - edge CP, hence DOM$_2$ can emerge

- In DOM$_2$ similarly, position of the DO less and less relevant. The acquirer generalises the marking to all accusatives, hence emergence of DOM$_3$

- DOM$_3$ not in edge position anymore. Full integration of DOM in the structure
From PP to KP

- In DOM$_1$ $a$-marking starts out as a PP projected by OEs
- In DOM$_2$ $a$-marking lexicalise PP on Theme
- In DOM$_3$ $a$ spells out KP
Concluding remarks

- Three different types of DOM presented here (DOM₁, DOM₂, DOM₃) found in different varieties of Friulian (respectively Friulian₁, Friulian₂, Friulian₃)
- Two hypotheses for the synchronic analysis
  - H1 based on OEs merging as DPs: unifies DOs
  - H2 based on (O)Es merging as PPs: unifies Experiencers in object position
- The three DOM types presented reflect stages of an ongoing grammaticalisation process, hence synchronically DOM displays a different distribution in languages
- The formal aspects of the grammaticalisation process can be integrated: they are linked to the position that the DOs occupy in the syntactic structure (edge CP, edge vP)
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