

Differential Object Marking: Nominal and Verbal parameters:

While Differential Object Marking (DOM) is seemingly determined by the same homogeneous set of semantic and discourse factors that apply to the nominal and verbal domains cross-linguistically (Serzant and Witzlack-Makarevich (2018)), their diverse diachronic origins suggest microvariations that may be spelt out so as to reveal different underlying mechanisms. Latin/Romance *ad* and Chinese *ba* represent two well-attested grammaticalization pathways in being derived from lexical prepositions and verbs respectively, and although both show DOM tendencies in selecting animate/referential objects and strongly transitive/telic verbs (see Nocentini (1985) for Romance and Li (2006) for Chinese), they also display collocational differences which may be traced back to their denominal and deverbal origins respectively. Latin/Romance *ad* is originally a directional allative preposition which inherently selects definite/specific objects in the sense of ‘destination’ (1a) as well as human/animate ‘recipients/beneficiaries’ of two/three-place verbs (1b-d) (Adams and de Melo (2016)) whereas Medieval Chinese *ba* ‘to take/hold’ is reanalyzed as a preverbal element in restructuring contexts where the second verb phrase has a telic transitive verb and an object pronoun that is coreferential to the object of *ba* (1e) (Feng (2002)):

- 1a) ad era-m revide-bo
AD mistress-ACC.SG see.again-FUT.1SG
‘I shall revisit our mistress (at her home).’ (Plautus *Truculentus* 320)
- 1b) ad cuius imperi-um cael-um terr-a mari-a servie-bant
AD REL.PRO.GEN power-ACC heaven-NOM.SG earth-NOM.SG sea-NOM.PL serve-IMPERF.3PL
‘... whose power heaven, earth and seas served.’ (Jerome *Epistulae* 82.3)
- 1c) ego autem ad Deu-m clama-vi
I but AD God-ACC.SG shout-PERF.1SG
‘But I shouted (something) to God.’ > ‘I called God.’ (*Sacra Biblia, Exodus* 14.15)
- 1d) Moyses ora-bat ad Dominum
Moses beg-IMPERF.3SG AD Lord
‘Moses was begging the Lord.’ (*Libri Maccabaorum* 2.10)
- 1e) Wu ba gaohuang yong ren ci zhi
Wu BA Emperor use blade stab him
‘Wu took the Emperor and stabbed him with a blade’ > ‘Wu stabbed the Emperor with a blade.’ (*Qian Han Shu pinghua: shang*)

However, although *ad* does show signs of telicising the verb by adding a natural endpoint to the event as well as imposing ‘affectedness’ on the verb when used with verbs of vision (1a) where *ad* subtly changes the meaning of the verb from ‘to see’ to ‘to visit’ with a designated object of destination (*ad eram* ‘the mistress’), Romance *ad* has generalised to marking all human/animate (2a) and/or referential objects (2b) even of atelic verbs:

- 2a) conozc-o *(a) este actor
know-PRES.1SG AD this actor
‘I know this actor.’ (Spanish) (Heusinger and Kaiser (2011:604))
- 2b) app-o vis-tu a custu / cussu
have-PRES.1SG see-PERF.PTCP AD this / that
‘I saw this/that.’ (Sardinian) (Floricić (2003:253))

Ba, on the other hand, is compatible with all telic transitive verbs, even if the object is inanimate and indefinite so long as it is quantised (2c) (Rosen and Ritter (2000)):

- 2c) ta ba yi ge jihui cuoguo-le
he BA one CL opportunity miss-ASP
‘He missed an opportunity.’ (Liu (1997:94))

The nominal and verbal parameters of DOM may hence be extended to diachrony, since while Latin/Romance *ad* is more nominally-driven in being analogised to all human/animate/referential objects of (a)telic verbs (2a-b), Chinese *ba* is more verbally-driven as it is used with all telic transitive verbs selecting (in)animate/(non-)referential objects.

References:

- Adams, J. and de Melo, W. (2016): ‘*Ad* versus the dative: from early to late Latin’, in Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Early and Latin Latin: Continuity or Change?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 87-131.
- Feng, S-L. (2002): ‘Prosodic structure and the origin of *ba* construction’, in Triskova, H. (ed), *Tone, Stress and Rhythm in Spoken Chinese, Journal of Chinese Linguistics monograph* 17:119-168.
- Floricić, F.(2003) : ‘Notes sur l’accusatif prépositionnel en sarde’. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 98(1):247-303.
- Heusinger, and Kaiser (2011): ‘Affectedness and Differential Object Marking in Spanish.’ *Morphology* 21(3/4):593-617.
- Li, A. (2006): ‘Chinese *Ba*’, in Everaert and van Riemsdijk (eds), *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Blackwell, pp. 374-468.
- Liu, F-H. (1997): ‘An Aspectual Analysis of *ba*’, *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6:51-99.
- Nocentini, A. (1985): ‘Sulla genesi dell’oggetto preposizionale nelle lingue romanze’, in *Studi linguistici e filologici per Carlo Alberto Mastrelli*, Pisa, pp. 299-311
- Ritter, E. and Rosen, S. (2000): ‘Event structure and Ergativity’, in Tenny, C. and Pustejovsky, J. (eds), *Events as Grammatical Objects*, CSLI publications, pp. 187-237.
- Serzant, I. A. and Witzlack-Makarevich, A. (2018): ‘Differential argument marking: patterns of variation’, in Serzant, I. A. and Witzlack-Makarevich, A. (eds), *Diachronic typology of differential argument marking*, LangSci Press, pp. 1-40.