

Clitics on the move: from dependent marking to split marking

This paper is a first study of differential object marking (DOM) in nonstandardized Limeño Spanish contact varieties (LSCV). It explores the multiple effects of DOM (Aissen 2003) in LSCV, more specifically its correlation with patterns of information packaging with respect to secondary topic (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2007) and transitivity marking (Andrews 2007, Alsina 2001). Starting with the fact that Spanish already shows mixed marking, it argues that in nonstandardized varieties grammaticised non-agreeing object clitics promote split marking even further starting to display typical behaviour of Primary Object and Secondary Object (PO/SO) languages (Company 2001, Bossong 2003).

Differential object marking is used to optionally mark direct objects ranked for their prominency on two scales: animacy and definiteness or, on a Two Dimensional scale based on the interaction of both. What actually triggers DOM is language-specific and varies over time. For example Hebrew distinguishes between definite and indefinite, Turkish between specific and non-specific, Hungarian between human and animate, Papia Kristang, a Portuguese based Creole is sensitive to definiteness and 'humanness'. The DOM marker in Hindi (*-ko*) and Spanish (*a*) share a common locative origin, as well as similar diachronic and synchronic DOM behavior as they optionally mark specific direct objects with certain combinations of animacy and specificity properties. Optionality, in fact, may only be an appearance of optionality; for Spanish it is to be understood as marking at least two different kinds of objects correlating with the semantic properties of the object NP (animacy and specificity), with lexical semantics and information packaging. Under specificity conditions, direct object arguments admit a third-person pronominal clitic co-occurring with a coindexed lexical NP (clitic doubling). Of all Romance languages, Spanish, an SVO pro-drop language, displays the freest word order and also the most advanced diffusion and grammaticalization of the formative *a*, which also shows dative-accusative case syncretism. Specific targets of variation in LSCV are DOs that look like prototypical IOs (animacy and definiteness) and IOs that look like prototypical DOs (inanimacy). As expected, LSCV at this stage shows synchronic variation of canonical and non-canonical object marking producing conflictive analyses with regard to the syntactic distinction of objects.

In LSCV convergence of the following factors results in a complex picture. We find (A) coexistence of clitics as agreement markers [person, gender, number] with a typical human and specific object NP, as in the causative example in (1)

- (1) Y lo obligó así a su hijo ...
And DOCL_{mascSg} made-3Sg so DOM Poss son
'And thus (s)he forced her/his son to ...'

and (B) featureless forms reduced to person agreement by failure of coindexing (I am assuming an evolution of AgrPRO to non AgrPRO as in Bresnan 2001) and 'unusual' DOM meaning as in having spread to definite and indefinite inanimate object NPs and also liberal direct object clitic doubling with a non-agreeing clitic as exemplified in (2).

- (2) Lo frío a la cebolla.
DOCL_{mascSg} fry-1Sg DOM DET_{femSg} onion.
'I fry the onion.'

The non-agreeing clitic 'lo' in (2) fulfils a double function, it pragmatically marks together with DOM a secondary topic in focus position (lo = (TOP↑)). Secondly it acts as a transitiviser for the state-changing primary-transitive verb marking both the 'silent' agentive subject and a highly prototypical patient object argument representing the ultimate target of the transitivity (goal). This leads to multiple, simultaneously occurring semantic and pragmatic strategies in

object marking. The annotation in (3) formalizes the requirements for the grammaticised TOP marker 'lo'. It requires the presence of an object so it can function as a transitiviser and to also ascribe some topicality to that object.

(3) (^ OBJ) = (^ TOP)

(C) A further confusing factor is the coexistence of *loismo* (ACCmasc clitic subsuming fem), *laismo* (ACCfem subsuming masc) and especially increasing *leísmo* (DAT) producing **apparent** indirect object constructions as exemplified in the *leísmo* example in (4).

(4) Pero ya no le frito a la yuca.
But any not IOClSg fry-1Sg DOM DETfemSg cassava
'But I don't fry the cassava again.'

Leísmo together with the grammaticised differential object marker *a* pushes the dative (IO) further into the argumental space of the primary object, originally held by the accusative (DO). This eventually results in the accusative becoming the secondary object or OBJ_e, which is known as the thematically restricted object with cross linguistic preference for patients and themes (Bresnan and Kanerva 1989).

NonAgrPRO and liberal accusative clitic doubling in LSCV as in example (2) are typical monotransitive constructions in Andean Spanish (AS), a non-discrete variety that emerged during 500 years of contact with indigenous languages, mainly Quechua and Aymara. LSCV is mainly in contact with AS. In both we find evidence that the object marking process is pointing towards a trend to Primary Object/Secondary Object marking. Grammaticised clitics devoid of referential information evolve into topicality and transitivity marker and, when co-occurring with inanimate a-marked objects in transitive constructions, denote secondary topics. Ditransitive constructions are by and large not affected by such changes. The occurrence of secondary topic is not restricted to ditransitive constructions any longer but can be found in monotransitive clauses, as demonstrated in the example (2). A similar development can be found in Hindi, where *-ko* marking 'is determined by the topicality of the object' (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2007:38). I assume at this stage for LSCV a mixed typological configuration of ACC-DAT in monotransitive constructions and PO/SO in ditransitives. In these cases DOM cannot be explained in purely semantic terms (Aissen 2003); the new DOM theory by Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2007) is better equipped to deal with the fact that LSCV DOM is partly determined by information structure role.

References:

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. 'Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy'. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21:435-483
- Alsina, A. 2001. 'On the nonsemantic nature of argument structure'. *Language Sciences* 23:355-389
- Andrews, A. 2007. The major functions of the noun phrase. In Shopen, T. (ed). *Language Typology and syntactic description*. 2nd ed. CUP, 132-223
- Bossong, G. 2003. Nominal and/or verbal marking of central actants. In Fiorentino, G. (ed). *Romance Objects. Transitivity in Romance Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 17-49.
- Bresnan, J. 2001. The emergence of the unmarked pronoun. In *Optimality - Theoretic Syntax*. G. Legendre, J. Grimshaw and S. Vikner (eds). Cambridge MA :MIT Press. 113-142
- Bresnan, J. and Kanerva, J. 1989. Locative Inversion in Chicheŵa: A study of factorization of grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(1):1-50
- Company, C. 2001. Multiple dative-marking grammaticalization. Spanish as a special kind of primary object language. *Studies in Language* 25(1):1-47
- Dalrymple, Mary and Irina Nikolaeva. 2007. Topicality and nonsubject marking: Agreement, casemarking and grammatical function.ms. Oxford University