**Differential Object-Marking in Romance (*ad*) and Chinese (*ba/jiang*): creative manipulation of inherent features:**

Introduction:

Western Romance *ad* (e.g. Spanish) and Chinese *ba/jiang:* two famous case-studies of Different Object-Marking (DOM) in the literature (Fábregas (2013), Li (2006))

They are also categorially different: W.Rom *ad* (P (allative/directional) > K(case: dative/accusative)), Chinese *ba/jiang* (lexical verb ‘to take’ > object marker)

Yet they share some striking similarities: animacy/referentiality (nominal argument), transitivity (> ‘affectedness’) (verbal properties)

Goal of the paper: compare and contrast W. Rom *ad* and Chinese *ba/jiang* and hereby discover the underlying features of DOM within a formal (Minimalist) framework

Western Romance DOM (*ad*):

DOM is not uniquely Spanish but pan-Romance (Rolhfs (1971), Nocentini (1994))

It is also historically pan-Romance in Medieval literature (Sornicola (1997, 1998))

W.Rom *ad* is hence a proto-Romance formation (Latin), and its formation can be closely correlated with the formation of Romance indirect object marking (*ad*) (Sornicola (1997, 1998), Tse (2013a, b, 2018)).

Proto-Romance/Latin *ad*:

A detailed examination of Latin *ad* reveals that it is attested with both bivalent (2-place) and trivalent (3-place) predicates, and *ad* can be reanalyzed as either direct object (K(accusative)) or indirect object (K(dative)) case-marker:

*Verba* (lexical verb) + *ad* + noun

A classic example of K(dative) is the following example (cf Adams (2013, 2016)):

1a) numquid aliu-d v-is patr-i nunti-ar-i

whether another-N.SG.ACC want-PRES.2SG father-DAT.SG report-INF-PASS

‘whether you want another thing to be reported to your father.’ (Plautus, *Captivi* 400)

1b) qu-ae **ad** patr-em v-is nunti-ar-i

which-N.PL.ACC to father-ACC.SG want-PRES.2SG report-INF-PASS

‘the things which you want to be reported towards your father’ (Plautus, *Captivi* 360)

In Tse (2013a, b), it is argued that a major determinant in the formation of W.Romance DOM is *verba videndi*. Similarly *ad*-PPs (e.g. *ad eram* (7a)) are attested with bivalent verbs and are concurrent with the morphological accusative marking direct object (*ver* (7b)) e.g.

2a) **ad** er-am revide-bo

AD mistress-ACC see.again-FUT.1SG

‘I shall see our mistress again…‘ (Plautus *Truculentus* 320)

2b) ver vid-e…

spring.ACC.SG see-IMPERATIVE.SG

‘Look at spring…’ (Plautus *Truculentus* 353)

This construction occurs throughout the history of Latin[[1]](#footnote-1) and is attested in all the branches of Romance which have prepositional objects marked by *ad*:

3a) guard-a **a** me

watch-IMPERATIVE AD me

‘Look at me…’ (*Vita e favole di Esopo* 19, 18) (Medieval Neapolitan)

3b) vid-i **a** Dido

see-PRET.1SG AD Dido

‘… I saw Dido.’ (*La istoria di Eneas*) (Medieval Sicilian)

3c) ver-é **a** la mugier…

see-FUT.1SG AD DEF.ART woman

‘I shall see the woman…’ (*El Cid* 228b) (Medieval Spanish)

3d) ve-r **a** Rainha da Grã-Bretanha

see-INF AD Queen of Great-Britain

‘to see the Queen of Great Britain.’ (*Prosa do Padre Antonio Vieira* 289) (Medieval Portuguese)

3e) yo veh-ia **a** Jesuchrist…

PRO.1SG see-IMPERF.1SG AD Jesus.Christ

‘I saw Jesus Christ…’ (The Sermons of Saint Vicent Ferrer 60) (Medieval Catalan)

4a) e-ius studi-o serv-ire addecet

him-GEN.SG zeal serve-INF be.proper

‘It is proper to serve his zeal.’ (Plautus *Amphitruo* 1004) (Latin)

4b) perché non poss-o **ad** tal signor serv-ire

because NEG can-1SG.PRES AD such lord serve.INF

‘… because I cannot serve such a lord.’ (Medieval Neapolitan)

4c) serv-ir **a**-l Campeador

serve-INF AD-DEF.ART Campeador

‘to serve the Campeador.’ (*El Cantar del mio Cid* 1369) (Medieval Spanish)

4d) …para serv-ir **a** tão ilustres senhor-es

in.order serve-INF AD so distinguished.PL sir-PL

‘… in order to serve such distinguished guests.’ (*Ciganita* 35) (Medieval Portuguese)

This proto-Romance *ad* must have been concurrent with the morphological dative in the direct object relation, which is empirically supported (4e)) (cf *credere* + dative/*ad-*PP, *obtemperare* + dative/*ad-*PP (Adams (2013:292)):

4e) **ad** cuius imperi-um cael-um terr-a

AD REL.PRO.GEN power-ACC.SG heaven-NOM.SG earth-NOM.SG

mari-a servie-bant

sea-NOM.PL serve-IMPERF

‘… whose power heaven, earth and the seas served.’ (Jerome Letter 82.3) (Latin)

Furthermore, there are certain predicates that are ambiguous between trivalency and bivalency from Latin to Romance e.g. Latin/Romance *clamare* (Sornicola (1997:72-73)):

5a) clam-o mihi ipse:

shout-PRES.1SG me.DAT myself

numer-a ann-os tu-os

count-IMPERATIVE.2SG year-ACC.PL your-ACC.PL

‘I shout to myself: count your years!’

(Seneca, *Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium* 27) (Latin)

5b) **ad** me omn-es clam-ant

AD me.ACC all-NOM.PL shout-PRES.3PL

Ianua culp-a tu-a est

Ianua fault.FEM.NOM.SG your.FEM.NOM.SG be.PRES.3SG

‘Everyone shouts at me: Door, it is your fault!’ (Catullus 67:14) (Latin)

Latin *clamare* ‘to shout’ is a three-place predicate, as it is attested with three arguments: an agent (<*ego>* ‘I’ (5a), *omnes* (5b)), an experiencer (*mihi* (5a), *ad me* (5b)), and a theme/proposition (*numera annos tuos* (5a), *Ianua culpa tua est* (5b)). In (proto-)Romance, \**clamare* ‘to call’ is a two-place predicate and is only attested with two arguments in Romance (agent, experiencer) (Meier (1948:123)):

5c) **a** Minaya Albar Fáñez e **a** Per Vermudoz

AD Minaya Albar Fáñez and AD Per Vermudoz

los llam-ó

them call-PRET.3SG

‘He called them… Minaya Albar Fáñez and Per Vermudoz.’ (*El Cid*, 1894-1895) (Medieval Spanish)

5d) allora Elia chiamoe **a** Dio

then Elia call-PRET.3SG AD God

‘Then Elia called God.’ (Fra Giordano) (Medieval Italian)

5e) appressu clam-au **a** lu primu vinchituri

then call-PRET.3SG AD DEF.ART first wave

‘Then he called the first wave.’ (*La istoria di Eneas* 91, 46) (MedievalSicilian)

Latin *ad*-PP, which is functionally equivalent to the third argument in Latin *clamare* (5a)-b)), is re-analysed as the second argument in proto-Romance \**clamare* (5c-e)) i.e. direct object.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Similar patterns can be found with *verba petendi* e.g.

6a) Moyses ora-bat ad Dominum

Moses beg-IMPERF.3SG AD Lord

‘Moses was begging the Lord.’ (*Libri Maccabaorum* 2.10)

6b) veni-am… ad Domino poposce-bat

mercy-FEM.ACC.SG AD Lord demand-IMPERF.3SG

‘He was begging the Lord for mercy’ (*Chronicon Salernitanum* 11)

Although *verba petendi* are trivalent (12b)), it can also be used bivalently by omitting the theme (12a)). There is therefore a synchronic alternation between inanimate direct objects (*veniam* (12b))and animate direct object marked by *ad* (*ad Dominum* (12a)),[[3]](#footnote-3) which foreshadows Romance *verba petendi* which take inanimate objects (13a-b)) and animate objects (marked with *ad*) (13c-e)):

7a) supplic-arono **ad** Giove che lor de-sse un re

beg-PRET.3PL AD Jove COMP PRO.3PL give-IMPERF.SUBJ a king

‘They were begging him to give them a king.’ (Medieval Neapolitan)

7b) **a** vui preg-u ki…

AD PRO.2PL beg-PRES.1SG COMP

‘I beg you to…’ (*La istoria di Eneas* 80, 86) (Medieval Sicilian)

7c) yo rueg-o **a** Dios e a-l Padre Spiritual

PRO.1SG beg-PRES.1SG AD God and AD-DEF.ART Father Spiritual

‘I beg God and the Spiritual Father.’ (*El Cid* 300) (Medieval Spanish)

7d) preg-à **a** Déus

Pray-PRES.3SG AD God

‘She prays to God…’ (The Sermons of Saint Vicent Ferrer 104) (Medieval Catalan)

7e) preg-amo **a** te

Beg-PRES.1PL AD PRO.2SG

‘We beg you…’ (*Galeota, Lettere* LXXX 40) (Medieval Neapolitan)

7f) je prie **a**-ux soleils que…

I beg AD-ART.PL

‘I beg them to….’ (Medieval French)
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1. E.g.

   1) … vereor, ne… nunc ad Caecilianam fabulam spectet

   fear-PRES.1SG COMP now AD Caeilian-FEM.ACC.SG play-FEM.ACC.SG watch-PRES.SUBJ.3SG

   ‘I fear that… he may now watch the play of Caecilius.’ (Cicero *ad Atticum* 1.16.6)

   2) patriae quoque vellet ad oras respicere

   fatherland-GEN.SG also want-IMPERF.SUBJ.3SG AD shore-ACC.PL look.back-INF

   ‘… he also wanted to look back at the shores of her homeland…’ (Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* 11.546)

   (cf Gregorius Magnus *Epistulae* 3.39-40)

   3) ips-e farinarius **ad** ipso Vern-o nonquam aspe-xissit

   self-MASC.SG baker-NOM.SG AD self-ACC Vernus-ACC never look-3SG.PERF

   ‘The baker never looked at the Vernus’ (Merovingian documents, XXXII) (Vielliard (1927:200)) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The bivalency of (proto-)Romance \**clamare*  is anticipated in Latin examples where the direct object is omitted e.g.

   1) ego autem **ad** Deum clama-vi

   PRO.1SG but AD God-ACC.SG shout-PERF.1SG

   ‘But I shouted (something) to God.’

   OR ‘But I called God.’ (Latin Vulgate Bible, *Exodus* 14.15) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The use of *ad* with *verba petendi* corresponds to *ab* in classical Latin, as they were confused due to sound change (Westerbergh (1956:255)):

   1. … ab ips-a eius-que prol-em veni-am poposce-bat

   AB PRO-FEM.ABL.SG PRO.GEN.SG-and son-ACC.SG mercy-ACC.SG demand-IMPERF.3SG

   ‘… she was begging for her son and mercy from the church’ > ‘she was begging the church for her son and mercy.’

   In (pre-)classical Latin, *verba petendi* can take *ab-*PPs with or without the direct object (cf Meier (1948:122)):

   1. numquam abs te petam

   never AB PRO.2SG beg-FUT.1SG

   ‘I shall never beg (anything from) you.’ (Plautus *Bacchides* 1144)

   Furthermore, the person being begged can be passivized, which indicates that it occupies the direct object relation:

   1. Agryripp-us exorar-i… poterit ut sinat sese

   Agryrippus-NOM.SG beg-INF.PASS can-FUT.3SG COMP allow-PRES.SUBJ.3SG REFL.PRO

   alternas cum ill-o noctes h-ac fru-i

   alternate-FEM.PL with DEM.PRO-ABL.SG night-FEM.PL DEM.PRO-FEM.ABL.SG enjoy-INF

   ‘Agryrippus can be induced into allowing himself to share her with him on alternate nights…’

   (Plautus *Asinaria* 916) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)