

DIFFERENTIAL OBJECT MARKING IN APULIA: A DESCRIPTIVE OVERVIEW

LUIGI ANDRIANI
Universiteit Utrecht
l.andriani@uu.nl

Abstract

This article describes the distribution of Differential Object Marking in Apulia (Southeast Italy), where both Upper-Southern (Northern Apulian) and Extreme-Southern (Salentino) varieties are spoken. This first survey on DOM in Apulia presents evidence from both existing literature and an online questionnaire with native speakers. The latter tests a selection of referents sitting at different levels of the Definiteness Hierarchy, from personal pronouns to indefinite nouns, in order to ascertain whether specificity can(not) be considered the ultimate DOM-trigger in these varieties. In this respect, only animate direct object conveying new information are tested, whereas highly specific clitic-doubled topical structures are left for future research. In this first attempt at mapping the fine-grained microvariation of DOM throughout the Apulian peninsula, it appears that its distribution is very limited in Salentino, being restricted to personal pronouns, while Northern Apulian varieties display more extended DOM systems; these may be sensitive to minimally different (lexico-)semantic factors for triggering DOM at the lower levels of the Definiteness Hierarchy.

Keywords: differential object marking; northern Apulian varieties; Salentino varieties; microvariation; specificity; definiteness hierarchy.

1. Introduction

The distribution of Differential Object Marking (Bossong 1985, 1991; DOM henceforth), the marking of a subset of direct objects by means of a functional item (Latin preposition AD > *a*, in our case), has never been the object of a comprehensive micro-comparative study on the varieties spoken in the administrative region of Puglia/Apulia, southeastern Italy. Apulia includes within its borders two main Italo-Romance groups, namely upper-southern and extreme-southern varieties (USIDs and ESIDs, respectively), which, in turn, can be split in several other subgroups. This descriptive contribution attempts to provide an overview of DOM in a large selection of Apulian varieties, with the aim of enhancing our knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon, its distribution, and its microvariation. It will do so by introducing novel evidence from the written production of local authors and, in particular, from a questionnaire administered to native speakers from Apulia, so to enable a comparison with the exiguous material available in the specialistic literature on Apulian DOM (Manzini & Savoia 2005:§4.9 (M&S henceforth); Andriani 2015, forthc.; Ledgeway forthc.). Our main interest lies in the differing degrees to which DOM may be found, or *not* found, in the varieties of Apulia. Indeed, while the northern-central part of the region shows DOM in a variety of contexts, the southern part, Salento, shows a very limited distribution of the *a*-marking.

We will first introduce the linguistic varieties considered (§1.1) and provide some relevant background on the triggers of DOM (§1.2). In Section §2, we present and comment on a number of potential DOM environments – mostly testing specificity of referents across different levels of the Definiteness Scale – in a large selection of varieties from Apulia. Section §3 concludes by summarising the general tendencies of this first survey on the distribution of DOM in Apulian varieties.

1.1. The linguistic varieties of Apulia

With all the caution needed when dealing with the classification of non-standard language families, for our purposes we could subdivide Apulia in three major linguistic areas (for further internal subdivisions, see Valente 1975; Mancarella 1975; Loporcaro 1997, 2021):

- i. *northern Apulian*: USIDs spoken in the province of Foggia (FG);

- ii. *central Apulian*: USIDs in the provinces of Barletta-Andria-Trani (BT) and Bari (BA), as well as the northern part of the province Taranto (TA₁) and Matera (MT);
- iii. *Salentino*: ESIDs spoken in the province of Brindisi (BR)¹ and Lecce (LE), as well as the southern part of the province of Taranto (TA₂).



Map 1: The linguistic varieties of Apulia (adapted from Pellegrini 1977)

Groups (i) and (ii) constitute a linguistic continuum of fairly homogeneous linguistic varieties, i.e. USIDs, while the varieties in group (iii) belong to a separate Italo-Romance linguistic family, i.e. ESIDs. We necessarily have to limit ourselves to a few locations of these areas, so the data will have to be considered through a coarse-grained filter. Nonetheless, we shall attempt to identify the main trends and draw some broad generalisations on the distribution of DOM throughout the region.

1.2. DOM triggers

It is well established in the literature that DOM is sensitive to a wide array of factors (cf. Ledgeway, forthc.) related to the semantico-syntactic nature of the nominal expression (e.g. whether it is pronominal, (in)definite, animate, or specific), the degree of transitivity of the verb and the relative affectedness of the direct object (Torrego 1998; Næss 2004), and other information-structure-related triggers (e.g. whether the object is fronted and/or clitic-resumed; Iemmo 2010). Our survey will be primarily informed by the animacy (Silverstein 1976) and definiteness/specifity (Croft 1988; Aissen 2003:437; a.o.) scales, as discussed in the typological literature:

¹ The transitional area between USIDs and ESIDs was further blurred by the reorganisation of some municipalities within the provinces; for instance, the varieties of Fasano, Ostuni, Cisternino, and Ceglie Messapica, all in the province of Brindisi, are actually in a continuum with Apulo-Barese varieties, rather than being fully-fledged Salentino varieties.

Animacy: human > animate > inanimate

Definiteness: personal pro > proper N > definite NP > indefinite specific NP > non-specific NP

For our purposes, definiteness (cf. Lyons 1999) is mainly understood in syntactic terms, i.e. whether a referent shows an overt (definite or indefinite) determiner, or is determiner-less. The latter includes personal and demonstrative pronouns, as well as other types of pronouns (e.g. indefinite, numeral, and relative/*wh*-pronouns), proper names, and kinship terms with clitic possessives. These are usually marked by DOM in many (Italo-)Romance varieties (Rohlfs 1969:§632; 1971), as they identify highly definite and specific referents. In contrast, a high degree of optionality is found with referents modified by (in)definite articles, demonstratives, numerals, and quantifiers. This is generally attributed to the semantics of such referents which are at lower levels of the definiteness scale, i.e. (syntactically) definite vs indefinite nominal expressions, which may, in turn, identify specific vs non-specific referents. Specificity (cf. Enç 1991) can be understood as the identifiability of a referent which has been previously mentioned (anaphorically or logophorically), or has been introduced and will play a role in the new information provided (Guardiano 2010:85-86). Indeed, specificity is one of the main discriminating factors triggering DOM in many Romance varieties, as is the case in Spanish (Torrego 1998; Leonetti 2004, 2008; *i.a.*), Neapolitan (Ledgeway 2000, 2009), Barese (Andriani 2015, *forthc.*), and Sicilian (Guardiano 2010). For these reasons, our test focuses on specific vs non-specific definites (§2.3) and indefinites (§2.4) nouns.

Next to specificity, the affectedness of the direct object based on the action/event described by the transitive predicate has also been considered in the present study. In relation to transitivity, affectedness is broadly understood as “the degree to which an action is transferred to a patient” by Hopper & Thompson (1980:252-253).² Therefore, the object of a verb such as ‘to kill’ will show a higher degree of affectedness than that of the verb ‘to see’, and, hence, the *a*-marking will be favoured on the object of the former predicate. In other words, it is the transitive predicate that determines the affectedness of the object (but also typical of indirect recipient/goal objects; cf. Cuervo 2003; Pineda 2016, 2020; Manzini & Franco 2016; among others).³

One last major DOM-trigger is related to information structure, i.e. the discourse-related function and syntactic position of the referent in question. For instance, standard Italian allows its very limited appearance of DOM with fronted personal pronouns, usually resumed by a clitic in the sentence core and selected by certain predicate types, i.e. object-experiencer psych-verbs and causative constructions (cf. Berretta 1991). Indeed, topicalised constituents have been claimed to favour the *a*-marking in several Romance varieties (Leonetti 2008; Iemmo 2010), as topics prototypically involve a resumptive clitic pronoun, signalling the specificity of the DP/NP in question. For this reason, we purposefully only tested contexts where the direct object conveys pragmatically new information, i.e. Informational Focus (Belletti 2004; *a.o.*); however, new information may still occur in the sentential periphery and without resumptive clitic in the varieties considered here (Cruschina 2012; Andriani 2017:ch.2 for Barese). This allows us to see whether non-clitic-resumed nominal expressions admit the *a*-marking as much as topical contexts do, as reported in the literature. We leave topical information for future research, as this requires on-field testing in order to provide sufficient background information for the speakers to correctly frame the context.

2. DOM in Apulian varieties

² The literature on affectedness is vast and approaches it from different angles; see, *a.o.*, Næss 2004; Beavers 2011.

³ As also remarked in Andriani (*forthc.*, fn. 8), we ought to mention the ongoing debate on the nature of DOM and its relation to certain types of (di)transitive predicates (Pineda 2016, 2020) and indirect objects (cf. Manzini & Franco 2016, *et seq.*). Indeed, some of the verbs considered here, e.g. ‘call/hit/help/greet’, allow ACC vs DAT alternations in some languages, including late Latin and old Italo-Romance varieties (Sornicola 1997; cf. also §2.3). However, our synchronic data convincingly show that, in all modern Apulian varieties, these predicates behave as regular transitives selecting ACCUSATIVE objects (irrespective of whether these are *a*-marked or unmarked).

In this section we present and compare evidence of DOM in the varieties spoken in Apulia, drawn from different sources: the specialistic literature, some non-specialistic material from specific dialects, and an online questionnaire (to which respondents could either write or record their answers). The latter was completed by 62 native speakers from all over Apulia (21 females and 41 males aged between 27 and 75; mean age: 64.5) and included a 23-sentence translation task from Italian to their respective varieties. The 23 sentences featured 29 target direct objects presented in a randomised order, all referring to human entities, such as:

- n.3 personal pronouns (§2.1), as well as n.4 indefinite ones (§2.2);
- n.2 singular kinship terms modified by clitic possessives, but without definite articles (§2.1);
- n.3 proper names (§2.1);
- n.6 singular and n.6 plural definite (§2.3) and n.5 singular indefinite (§2.4) nominal expressions, all including [\pm specific] referents.

The main aim of the questionnaire was to understand to which degree specificity might play a role in triggering DOM at the lower levels of the definiteness scale, where most alternation is attested. Moreover, we tested a number of predicates involving different degrees of affectedness of their objects, ranging from low, e.g. ‘to see/know’, to high, e.g. ‘to kill/beat up’ (cf. Beavers 2011). While testing these variables, our secondary aim was also to identify whether any other environments or features could potentially act as triggers for DOM.

Before considering the data, some disclaimers are in order. Since our intent is to provide a *first* overview of the distribution of DOM in Apulian varieties, the results of this preliminary inquiry should be considered with caution, as they may not represent the exhaustive picture. Aside from the nature and aims of our test, there is extensive microdiatopic, as well as interspeaker and intraspeaker, variation when it comes to the *optional realisation* of DOM with referents sitting lower on the Definiteness Scale, or predicates favouring DOM or not. Hence, we should not always consider the presence/absence of DOM in absolute terms, but just as an indicator of its general behaviour.

Moreover, these speakers are all bilinguals in Italian and their own local variety. Although this paper is not concerned with contact-induced changes between dominant and minority languages, the sociolinguistic pressure of the (nearly) DOM-less Italian syntax on the local Italo-Romance varieties may also be a source of *optionality* between *a*-marked vs unmarked referents lower on the Definiteness Scale (for some initial micro-diachronic considerations on the retraction of Barese DOM, see Andriani, forth.).⁴ This allows speakers to produce both DOM and DOM-less options (in some contexts only) without major interpretative differences. As a result, the increasing adoption of the unmarked strategy of Italian in the local varieties may turn the *a*-marking into a semantically irrelevant element and, thus, obsolete. Such a contact scenario should be systematically taken into account when considering those referents showing alternation in our data sample, as contact-induced changes (in this case, in the direction of the dominant-language syntax) cannot be excluded in a bilingual environment. Indeed, the often-overlooked contact factor should urge us to consider the documentation of DOM in Apulian and other local varieties as a time-sensitive matter – if not a priority.

Nonetheless, the following subsections intend to provide some preliminary material to build a dataset of the occurrence of DOM, or lack thereof, in Apulian varieties – presented and discussed from North to South, and from East to West, in order to uncover any potential geographic continuum in the distribution of DOM in Apulia. This first overview will lay the foundation for future research and further expansion of the dataset, so to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the phenomenon.

2.1. Personal pronouns, proper names, and kinship terms

As observed in §1.3, personal pronouns rank the highest in the Definiteness Scale and are the most susceptible to bear DOM crosslinguistically (Comrie 1979, 1989), followed by proper nouns. To these, we add highly definite and specific kinship terms (cf. Silverstein 1976) without an overt determiner, but

⁴ This same retraction – but not the complete disappearance – of DOM has also been observed in a number of heritage/minority languages in contact with DOM-less dominant languages (Montrul & Bowles 2009 for Spanish-English; Montrul & Bateman 2020 for Romanian-English; Andriani *et al.* 2022 for Italo-Romance-English; a.o.).

modified by possessive clitic pronouns. These three types of referents in all Apulian varieties are the focus of this section.

Below, all direct objects appear boldfaced, and are underlined whenever the referent bears the *a*-marking (here and throughout). For reasons of space, only the examples taken from the literature are translated, whereas the translation of the elicited sentences is provided here:

- (a) ‘Gianni is waiting for **you** and **me** (= **us**), not **her**’ or ‘G. is only waiting for **me**, not **you**’;
- (b) ‘dad met **mum** in church’;
- (c) ‘Maria bumped into **Giovanni** and **Teresa** at the market, but didn’t say hi to **Giovanni**’, or ‘Teresa met **Giovanni** in the townsquare’.⁵

Foggia, FG

- 1) Mattinata, FG (Granatiero 1987:75)
 - a) Siende **a mme!**
‘listen to me!’
 - b) Chiéme **a mmàmmete!**
‘call your mum!’
 - c) He viste **a Mmarije?**
‘have you seen Maria?’
- 2) Carpino, FG
 - a) Giuvannə st'aspettann'**a me** e **a te**, nə st'aspettann'**a essa**
 - b) Patəmə a ccanəsciut'**a mamma** nd'a la chiesə
 - c) Taresə a ngundrat'**a Giuvanna** mmezz'alla chiazzə
- 3) San Marco in Lamis, FG (Angelapia Massaro, p.c.)
 - a) Giuannə **a mme** e **a tte** aspetta, no **a gghiessa**
 - b) Patəmə a canəsciut'**a mammà** int'la chiesa
 - c) Mariə a ncuntrat'**a Giuann'**e **Taresə** allu mərcatə, ma **a Giuanne** non l'a salutatə
- 4) Torremaggiore, FG (Tosto 2007:20)
 - a) ha vist'**a tté**
‘s/he saw you’
 - b) ha vist'**a ppàtəmə**
‘s/he saw my dad’
 - c) ha vist'**a Mməchélə**
‘s/he saw Michele’
- 5) San Severo, FG
 - a) i. **a jessa** a vedə (M&S 2005:II,506)
‘as for her, I see her’
 - ii. cɛ:mə **a jissə** (ibid.)
‘call him!’
 - b) cɛ:mə **a ffiçəma** (ibid.)
‘call my son!’
 - c) Mariə è truèt'**a Giuànnə** e **a Teresə** o mərchètə, ma **a Giuannə** nənn'u è salutatə
- 6) Lucera, FG
 - a) Giuannə stà spəttannə sckittə **a mmè**, e nnò **a ttè**
 - b) patəmə à canəssciútə **a mamma** nd'ā chjisa grannə
 - c) Marí à truuat'**a Giuannə** e **a Terésə** ammizz'ā chiazzə, e nn'ā salutat'**a Giuannə**

⁵ Since we are dealing with spoken varieties without a standard orthography, the N-C Apulian respondents used an impressionistic orthography, based on that of Italian, and either represented the typical unstressed [ə] as <e>, or omitted it altogether; in its stead, the author has introduced the grapheme <ə> throughout. For the other numerous types of centralised vowels, a dieresis has been used, e.g. <ä>.

- 7) Faeto, FG (Francoprovençal)⁶
- a) i. i rəmirə a l ɛnfannə ki rəmirə a ijə (Nagy 2000:113)
 - he looks DOM the child that looks DOM him
'he looks at the child who looks at him'
 - ii. viáw a isə (ibid.:96)
 - see.2SG.IMP DOM them
'see them!'
 - b) i. i alávə a truwà a sa non (ibid.:125)
 - she went to find DOM her grandma
'she went to visit her grandma'
 - ii. la fiʃéttə i statə pa sənti a sa mar (ibid:125)
 - the daughter she stood not hear DOM her mum
'the daughter didn't listen to her mum'
 - iii. dʒ awutáv a mun báj a fa lu bo (ibid.:87)
 - I helped DOM my dad to do the wood
'I was helping my father cut wood'
 - c) po i fand a san prosp (ibid.:134)
 - then they do.3PL DOM Saint Prospero
'then they do San Prospero (festival)'
- 8) Celle di San Vito, FG (Francoprovençal)
- a) Giuànnə gli éstə avardànn'a mi e a ti, e nun a igliə
 - b) mun pàjə i quanascitt'a mamma nchié la ghisə
 - c) Mariə i-a ncuntrà a Giuànnə e Terésə a lu mèrcatə, ma i-a pa salutà a Giuànnə
- 9) Foggia
- a) Giuànnə ste spøttannə a nuja, nen a gheddə
 - b) patəmə canuscì a mmammà nd'ā chisə
 - c) i. Mari a ngudrät'a Giuànn'e Terésə o mèrcatə, ma nenn a ssalutät'a Giuànnə
ii. agghi'affes'a Dio (Salvioni 1913:24)
'I've offended God'
- 10) Cerignola, FG
- a) Giuannə ste aspøttann'a mmò e ttò, non a gheddə
 - b) Attanəmə canuscè a mamma ind'a la chisə
 - c) Mari ngundré a Giuvann'e Tteròsə ou mèrcotə, ma non saluté a Giuvanna
- Bari, BA/Barletta-Andria-Trani, BT**
- 11) Trinitapoli, BT
- a) Giuànnə stè aspøttè a mmàie e a ttàie, nàumə a jèdde
 - b) Attanəmə canusscett'a mamme jind'alla chisə
 - c) Marei'o ngundröt'a Giuanna e Tarösə o mèrcotə, ma nan o salutöt'a Giuanna
- 12) Barletta, BT
- a) Giuénna sta'spettà a mmaj'e a ttà, non a jédde
 - b) atténəmə canuscitt'a mmammina nd'a chisə
 - c) Maréj'è ttruat'a Giuénnə e Nenittə o mèrcatə, ma nn'è salutat'a Giuénnə

⁶ Although Nagy treats the *a*-marked complements in (7) as 'indirect objects' (Nagy 2000:109-110), we consider these and all other examples as clear instances of transitive predicates (e.g. 'to look/find/listen/help') selecting DOM complements. Note also that some of the original glosses have been readapted here.

- 13) Canosa, BT
- a) vɛ:tənə a jiddə (M&S 2005:II,507)
‘they see him’
 - b) vɛ:tənə a ffratto (ibid.)
‘they see your brother’
- 14) Minervino, BT
- a) jaʃʃə camæ:tə a ttajə/jiddə (M&S 2005:II,507)
 - b) attànəmə canuscèi'a māmma iind'a la chiisə
 - c) Marè' o ngundræt'a Giuànnə e Terésə o mərcætə, ma a Giuànnə na l'o salutætə
- 15) Giovinazzo, BA
- a) sɔ ccame:tə a jiddə (M&S 2005:II,507)
 - b) sɔ ccame:tə a ssɔr-mə (ibid.)
 - c) Mari av'acchiét'a Giuanna e Taresə o mərchétə, ma non a salutétia Giuanne
- 16) Capurso, BA
- a) Giuannə sta spett'a mme e a tte, noun'a jèddə
 - b) tou i sì viste d'assi d'o camesànde a meggħierme e alla sóre? ‘did you see my wife and her sister coming out of the cemetery?’ (Pastore 2002:30)
 - c)
 - i. acchiötte a Masine o spunde ‘s/he found Tommaso on the corner’ (ibid.:19)
 - ii. u patrouñe chiamòtta a Fièluccie ‘the master called Raffaele’ (ibid.:29)
- 17) Mola, BA
- a) Giuannə ste spett'a mma e a tta, noun'a jeddə
 - b) iattànəmə canəsscégħi'a mmamma jènd'â chiisə
 - c) Sisinə ha'cchiat'a Giuanna nd'â chiazzə
- 18) Conversano, BA
- a) Giuannə ste spett'a mme e a tte, mic'a jiddə
 - b) dattanəmə canəssciö a mamma nd'a la chisə
 - c) Mari av'acchiète nd'o mərchétə a Giuanna ca stéivə chə Teréisə; a salutètia Téréisa, ma a Giuannə nòn l'a pənzètə pröpriə
- 19) Polignano, BA
- a) me vu a mme? ‘do you want me?’ (Bentley *et al.* 2014:33)
 - b) tu, gasse a mmàmete i vvìnè pi mmèje ‘you, leave your mum and come with me’ (CRSEC 2001:6)
 - c) Mari av'acchiét'a Giuannə i Sisinə o mərchétə, ma a Giuannə nann u a salutètə
- 20) Putignano, BA
- a) Giuannə ste spett'a mmi e a ttia, non'a jèddə
 - b) attanəmə canuscèi'a mamma nd'â chisə
 - c) Marè' o'cchiat'a Giuanna i a Teresə o mərcatə, ma nann o ssalutat'a Giuanna
- 21) Gravina, BA
- a) Giuannə ste spett'a mic'e a ticha, noun'a jèddə
 - b) attanəmə canuscì a mamma ind'alla chiessə
 - c) Mari è'cchiät'a Giuanna e a Teresa o mərchétə, ma nann è ssalutat'a Giuanna
- 22) Altamura, BA
- a) sɔ v:ist/k:jɛt/č:is a t:ai (Loporcaro 1988:269)
‘I've seen/found/killed you’

- b) attanəme canuscì **a mamma** jind'a la chisə
 c) sɔ v:ist/k:ɛt/č:is **(a) p:ep:in** (Loporcaro 1988:269)
 T've seen/found/killed Peppino'

Taranto₁

- 23) Mottola, TA₁
 a) Giuanne ste spett'**a mme** e **a tte**, noun'**a jèddə**
 b) attanəmə canuscì **a mamma** jind'a la chisə
 c) Marì av'acchièt'**a Giannə** e **a Tèrəsə** allu mərchətə, ma nan gi'à salutèt'**a Giannə**
- 24) Montemesola, TA₁ (Ciccotti 2013:59-60; Claudio Ciccotti, p.c.)
 a) **a me**, non **m'**ha chiamat nisciun!
 'no-one called me!'
 b) i. aiut **a mam't**
 'help your mum!'
 ii. salut'm **a nonn't**
 'say hi to your grandma!'
 c) Marì a vvist'**a Giannə** e **Teresə** a u mərcatə, ma non gi'à ssalutat'**a Giannə**
- 25) Taranto
 a) ajjə camə:tə **a iddə** (M&S 2005:II,507)
 'I've called him'
 b) ajjə camə:tə **a ffiłata** (ibid.)
 'I've called your son'
 c) Marì a'cchiat'**a Giann** e **Teresa** au mərcatə, ma non gi'a salutät'**a Giannə**

The first 25 northern and central Apulian varieties (N/C Apulian) from the areas of Foggia (1)-(10), Bari (11)-(22), and northern Taranto (23)-(25) show that DOM (nearly)⁷ always occurs with (a) personal pronouns, (b) kinship terms with an enclitic possessive – except for the proclitic ones (Nagy 2000:§5.1.5) in the two Francoprovençal varieties of Faeto (7) and Celle (8), and (c) proper names.

A very different picture arises from Salentino varieties, from the areas of Brindisi and Taranto (26)-(30), and Lecce (31)-(37):

Brindisi, BR/Taranto, TA₂

- 26) Mesagne, BR
 a) Gianni sta spetta **a mei** e **a tei**, noni **a edda**
 b) sirma canuscì **mama** ntra la chiesa
 c) Maria è ccuntratu **Giovanni** e **Teresa** allu marcatu, ma **Giovanni** no l'è salutatu
- 27) Oria, BR
 a) Gianni sta spetta **a mei** e **a tei**, noni **a edda**
 b) sierma canobbi **mama** ntr'alla chiesa
 c) Maria è ccuntratu **Giovanni** e **Teresa** allu mercatu, ma non c'è salutatu **Giovanni**
- 28) Latiano, BR
 a) Gianni scta scpetta **a mei** e **a tei**, noni **a edda**
 b) sierma canobbi **mama** ntra nna chiesa
 c) Maria é ncuntratu **Giovanni** e **Tiresa** allu mircatu, ma non c'è ssalutatu **Giovanni**
- 29) Cellino S.Marco, BR (De Angelis 2019:64; Loporcaro 2021)
 c) i. addʒu ntisu **la maría** ka parlava kullu ddʒovanni
 'I heard Maria speaking with Giovanni'
 ii. aggiu chiamatu **lu Giovanni**
 'I called Giovanni'

⁷ For Altamura (22), Loporcaro (1988:269) attests the optionality of DOM with all referents but 1SG and 2SG personal pronouns; however, this appears as an isolated case compared to the other varieties in (1)-(25).

- iii. sta ccercu **lu Carlu**
 'I'm looking for Carlo'

30) Lizzano, TA₂

 - a) i. a mei picca **mi** sta nghizza
 'I have little desire to do that (lit. it feeds me little)'
 - ii. a te, figghiu, la mamma **t'e** spittatu na vita intera
 'my son, your mum has been waiting for you an entire life'
 - b) i. Ttanima canusciu **mama** ntra na chiesa
 'i made even mum happy'
 - ii. puru a mama agghiuccuntintata
 'I made even mum happy'
 - iii. aggiu vistu **nonnima**
 'I've seen my grandma'
 - c) Teresa è cchiatu **Giuanni** sobbra la chiazza

Lecce, LE

- 31) Carmiano, LE (Loporcaro 2021:146)

c) add3u fu tʃsata **la maría**
 'I went to visit Maria'

32) Lecce

a) i. a jtu **a mmia**/**mia (Loporcaro 2021:147)
 'you saw me'

ii. **a mie** nu **me** cunvinci filu (Greco 2018:529)
 'you won't convince me at all'

iii. propiu **a tie** ieu sta spettàa (Greco 2018:521)
 'it is precisely you I was waiting for'

b) i. sta uardu **sirma** (Greco 2018:209)
 'I'm looking at my dad'

ii. sirma canubbe **màtrima** alla chesia

c) La Maria à ncuntratu lu **Sçianni** e la **Teresa** allu marcatu, ma nun à ssalutatu lu **Sçianni**

33) Calimera, LE (Ledgeway *et al.* 2019:13)

c) lu Pietru ntise **la Maria**
 'Pietro heard Maria'

34) Serrano, LE

a) lu Gianni sta spetta **a mmie** e **a ttie**, none **a quidda**⁸

b) sirama canusciu **matrima** intru alla chesia

c) la Teresa a ncuntratu lu **Giuvanni** alla chiazza

35) Otranto, LE

a) u Gianni **a nui** sta ne spetta, none **a idda**

b) sirima canusciu **mamma** alla chiesia

c) la Teresa aje cchiatu **u Giuvanni** alla chiazza

36) Maglie, LE

a) u Gianni sta ne spetta **a mie** e **a tie**, no **a idda**

b) jeri a María s'a ntisa fiacca e a chiamatu **marítusa**

c) a Teresia a cchiatu **u Giuanni** alla chiazza

37) Scorrano, LE (Presicce 2011)

a) **a mmie** m'ave vattisciati la nunna Vata

⁸ In contrast with the evidence from Serrano in (34a), Bentley *et al.* (2015:170) report the example from the neighbouring village, Martano, *are quiddbu/quiddha cu te iuta* (lit. 'it has that_{M/F} (person) that helps you'), where the demonstrative pronoun *quiddbu/-a* does not appear *a*-marked, while personal pronouns do. We believe that this limitation is due to the existential function of *aviri*.

- ‘godmother Ada baptised me’
- b) **Fijuma**, quiddu spusatu, **Iu** mantegnu ncora jeu
‘my son, the married one, I still provide for him’

Among the three referents considered here, the only *a*-marked ones in Salentino are (a) personal pronouns (see also Ledgeway, forthc., for further details on some potential person-based distinctions), but not (b) kinship terms – one apparent exception is found in Lizzano, TA (30b.ii), where the fronted ‘my mum’ is the only case of *a*-marked determinerless kinship term – and (c) proper names. Indeed, proper names never appear *a*-marked in Salentino, irrespective of the frequent clitic resumption of the nominal expression. Moreover, Salentino varieties do not show any sensitivity to the absence (in northern Salento) or presence (in central-southern Salento) of the definite article with proper names; i.e. neither of the two options favours the *a*-marking. Within the broader contexts of ESIDs, Salentino varieties behave unlike the varieties in Calabria (De Angelis 2019; Ledgeway *et al.* 2019), where the absence of the definite article with masculine proper nouns favours DOM. Indeed, Salentino DOM is highly limited and somewhat similar to that of some Abruzzese varieties, e.g. Ariellese, where only 1SG-2SG personal pronouns are marked (D’Alessandro 2017), as well as other Italo-Romance varieties (M&S 2005:II,§4.9), including Italian, where the *a*-marking only surfaces with fronted personal pronouns (cf. Benincà 1988:156; Berretta 1991; Singh 2019). These varieties display conservative stages of DOM (cf. Ledgeway, forthc., for early (Italo-)Romance), which only surfaces with highly referential and specific personal pronominal objects, as these show no DOM with indefinite pronominal quantifiers (§2.2). In contrast, N-C Apulian varieties have a more extended DOM system, in which all determinerless referents are *a*-marked, similarly to Neapolitan (Ledgeway 2000, 2009) or Sicilian (Guardiano 2010).

2.2. Indefinite pronouns

In this section we discuss DOM in relation to indefinite pronouns, such as the existential and negative quantifiers ‘someone/anyone’ and ‘no-one’, the indefinite *wh*-pronoun ‘whom’, and numeral pronoun ‘one (person)’, which are less referential than the ones discussed in §2.1.

As for the pronominal quantifiers, the literature reports that in N-C Apulia ‘no-one’ will always be *a*-marked (38a-e), unlike ‘someone/anyone’ (38f-g):

- 38) **indefinite Q-pronouns: ‘someone/no-one’**
- a) Də lu pajesə mijə, no canosc’**a nisciune** chə cə chiamə accusci Carpino, FG
‘In my town, I know no-one who is called like that’
- b) n’imə ccisə mzi’**a nnisciuna** Torremaggiore, FG (Tondo 2008:16)
‘we never killed anyone’
- c) nan tsɔ ccamɛtə **a niʃʃeunə** Canosa, BT (M&S 2005:II,507)
- d) nann ajjə camma:tə **a nəʃʃeunə** Minervino, BT (ibid.)
- e) n ajjə camə:tə **a niʃʃu:nə** Taranto, TA (ibid.)
‘I called no-one’
- f) Canusce **quacchéduna** ca rracama? San Nicandro, FG (Ledgeway, forthc.)
‘do you know anyone who does embroidery?’
- g) dʒə kwanáj **kakunnə** ki parlə fajtar Faeto, FG (Nagy 2000:100)
I know someone that speaks Faetar
‘I know someone who speaks faetar’

Likewise, the animate object *wh*-pronoun ‘who(m)’ (39) appear to be *a*-marked across most varieties. Surprisingly, this same pronoun can even be *a*-marked in subject function (39g):

- 39) **WH-pronoun: ‘who’**
- a) **a cchenéije** che vé truwènne? Mattinata, FG (Granatiero 1987:75)
‘who are you looking for?’
- b) **a cchi(ja)** va’ truvanne? San Nicandro, FG (Ledgeway, forthc.)

- 'who are you looking for?'
- c) **a k'ki** 'cΞ:mə? San Severo, FG (M&S 2005:II,506)
- 'who are you calling?'
- d) ndovin'**a cchi** trovə? Foggia, FG
'guess who I found?'
- e) **(a t)tʃə** a cammætə? Minervino, BT (M&S 2005:II,507)
'who did you call?'
- f) Cristu cu **llu** scunocchja **a cci** nna vene qqua Ostuni, BR
'May Christ break to pieces who doesn't come here'
- g) **a ci** tenə artə, tenə partə Taranto, TA₁ (Rohlfs 1969:9)
'who has skills, makes a living'
- h) maliticu **a ci** ti violenta o **a ci** ti maltratta Lizzano, TA₂
'I curse who(ever) harms or mistreats you'
- i) **A cci** uèi? Lecce, LE (Ledgeaway, forthc.)
'who do you want?'

By contrast, the numeral object-pronoun 'one (person)' (40), parallel in use and function to the existential quantifier 'someone', appears to allow DOM especially in Apulo-Barese (40e-h), but does not seem to surface in other varieties:

40) **Numeral pronoun: 'one (person)'**

- a) Luwigge à spusate **una** d'u pajése sója San Nicandro, FG (Ledgeaway forthc.)
'Luigi has married someone from his village'
- b) chiamave **vune** d'i tanda crijatùre Lucera, FG
's/he called one of the many children'
- c) ci chiama **uno de li crïati** Foggia, FG (Salvioni 1913:28)
'he called one of his servants'
- d) e chiamò **un di li garzuún** Trinitapoli, BT (Salvioni 1913:30)
'he called one of his servants'
- e) vΞ:tənə **a jeuna** də kirə Canosa, BT (M&S 2005: II, 507)
'they see one of those (people)'
- f) na volde accedérne poùre **a joùne** Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:21)
'once they even killed one (person)'
- g) Vedette **a joùne** Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:37)
's/he saw one (person)'
- h) chiaméggie **a iëune** d'i sirve Mola, BA
'he called one of his servants'
- i) Chiamì **une** d'i servetûre Alberobello, BA (Melillo 1970:105-106)
'he called one of his servants'
- j) Chiamò **jjune** de li sîrve Mottola, TA
'he called one of his servants'
- k) annu ccisu **unu** fiaccu propiu Maglie, LE
'they killed a really bad one (criminal)'

In our survey of N-C Apulian and Salentino varieties, we tested both existential and negative pronominal quantifiers with different predicates, such as 'to kill' (41), 'to see' (42), and 'to know' (43). The rather unambiguous results are shown below:

41) **existential Q-pronoun: 'to kill someone'**

- a) s'i vucənanta fannə angorə casinə, oj'a'j'e'ccid'**a qualchedunə** Carpino, FG
- b) s'i vəcinə cundinuən'a ffé casinə, joscə accic'**a cchéduña** Mattinata, FG
- c) sə quissə vucənanta condinuan'a fà casinə, joj'accid'**a cacchedunə** S.Marco, FG
- d) si quillə accus'ta mme cundinuən'a fa burdellə, oggə accid'**a chacchevuna** Lucera, FG
- e) sə quiss'affianghə accundinu'a fà a cummèdiə, oggə agghi'a accid'**a quacchedöna** Foggia, FG
- f) sə chidd'o coustə cuntenuon'a fè caseinə, goscə acceit'**a quacchegouna** Cerignola, FG
- g) cə i vəcənandə fannə angourə casenə, jouscə accett'**a qualchejouna** Trinitapoli, BT

- h) cə u vəcənə n'a fenèscənə, jōscə j'a'ccit'**a quacchejounə** Barletta, BT
 i) cə u vecenàndə cundénu'a ffé jōsə, jōscə accéit'**a ngocc'hédëuna** Mola, BA
 j) cə u vəcənətə cundinuən'a fē la ióuse, jōscə égghi'accéid'**a qualchédounə** Conversano, BA
 k) c'i vicenə cundenuən'a fajə casenə, juəscə j'a'ccer'**a quachijonə** Putignano, BA
 l) cə le vəceinə condinuon'a fe la jousə, jōscə l'accidəc'**a qualchedunə** Gravina, BA
 m) cə chire da vəcine cundinuən'a fē frajassə, jōscə accitəc'**a nquachèdunə** Mottola, TA
- n) ci quiddi di costi continuano a ffa josa, osci ccidi **quarcheduno** S.Vito, BR
 o) ci li vicini cuntinuunu a fa casinu, osci ccìu **ncunùnu** Mesagne, BR
 p) ci quisti di costi fannu ncora rimori, osci scannu **ncunnunu** Latiano, BR
 q) ci li vicini continuunu cu fannu casinu, osci ccìu **ncununu** Oria, BR
 r) sçi li vicini contínuanu ffannu burdiellu, osçe ccìu **quarchetunu** Lecce, LE
 s) se li vicini fannu ncora tuttu stu rusciu, osci ccìu **qualchetunu** Serrano, LE
 t) se i vicini secutane cu fannu burdellu, osci ccìu **quarchedunu** Otranto, LE
 u) se quisti de coste nu la spicciare cu cridane, oçì ccìu **quarchedunu** Maglie, LE
 'If the neighbours keep being so loud, today I'll kill someone (intended: among them)'

42) negative Q-pronoun: 'to see no-one (among Teresa's sons)'

- a) allu matrəmoniə nn'ei vist'**a nəsciunə d'i figghiə də Taresə** Carpino, FG
 b) au spusalizziə nn'ei vist'**a nnəsciunə d'i figghiə de Térəisə** Mattinata, FG
 c) allu spusalizziə nn'ei vist'**a nisciunə dellī figghiə di Taresa** S.Marco, FG
 d) o spusalizziə n'agghiə vist'**a nisciunə d'i figghiə də Teresə** Lucera, FG
 e) au matrəmoniə nənn'agghiie vist'**a nisciunə d'i figghiə de Terèsə** Foggia, FG
 f) au matrmoniə non e vest'**a nisciounə d'i figghiə də Teròsə** Cerignola, FG
 g) o spusalizziə nan è vist'**a nəsscióuna d'i figghiə də Taròsə** Trinitapoli, BT
 h) ou spusalizziə nann'ei vist'**a nəsscióune d'i figghiə də Nenitta** Barletta, BT
 i) au sponzalézzìə na ssò vèst'**a nəsscēunə d'i félə də Tarësə** Mola, BA
 j) alla zéte non so vèst'**a nisscióuna d'i félə də Téréisa** Conversano, BA
 k) à zeitə nann è vest'**a niscionə d'i feilə də Teresə** Putignano, BA
 l) alla zeitə nan so vist'**a nəssciounə də lə figghiə də Teresə** Gravina, BA
 m) alla zitə nan gə agghiə vist'**a nisciunə də li filə də Teresina** Mottola, TA
- n) allu spusaliziu no agghiu vistu **nisciunu dli fili di Sisina** S.Vito, BR
 o) allu matrimognu non agghiu vištu **nisciùnu ti li fili ti Teresa** Mesagne, BR
 p) allu sposalizzio non ogghiu vištu **nisciùnu ti li fili ti Teresa** Latiano, BR
 q) allu spusalizziu no agghiu vistu **nisciunu ti li fili di Teresa** Oria, BR
 r) allu matrimoniu nun aggiu istu **nisciunu te li figghi te la Teresa** Lecce, LE
 s) allu sposaliziu nu aggiu vistu **nuḍḍu te li fiji te la Teresa** Serrano, LE
 t) allu matrimoniu nun aggiu vistu **nuḍḍu di fiji da Teresa** Otranto, LE
 u) allu matrimoniu nun aggiu vistu **nuḍḍu dī fiji dā Teresia** Maglie, LE
 'I didn't see any of Teresa's sons at the wedding'

43) existential > negative Q-pronoun: 'did you know anyone? I knew no-one'

- a) canusciv'**a cchächédùn'**alla riuniònə? No, n'ganuscèv'**a nnəsciunə** Carpino, FG
 b) canusciv'**a quacchedun'**alla riunione? No n'ganuscev'**a nisciune** Mattinata, FG
 c) canusciv'**a cacchedun'**alla riunione? No, non ganuscev'**a nisciunə** S.Marco, FG
 d) canusciv'**a chäcchevun'**à reunione? No, nən ganuscev'**a nisciunə** Lucera, FG
 e) canusciv'**a quacchedun'**alla riunonə? No, non ganuscev'**a nisciunə** Foggia, FG
 f) canusciv'**a quacchegoun'**alla runionə? Nónə, non ganusciov'**a nisciùne** Cerignola, FG
 g) canussciəv'**a qualchejoun'**alla riunione? Naumə, nan ganussciaiv'**a nəssciouñə** Trinitapoli, BT
 h) canusciv'**a quacchejoun'**à riuniónə? No, nan ganuscéiv'**a nəssciounə** Barletta, BT
 i) canəsciv'**a ngocchédëun'**alla reuniàunə? No, na ccanessciàiv'**a nəsscēuna** Mola, BA
 j) canəsciv'**a quacchedóuna** nd'a la riunióunə? Innóune, nan ganessciéiv'**a nisscióuna** Conversano, BA
 k) canusciv'**a quachion'**à riunione? No, nan ganuscev'**a nisciona** Putignano, BA
 l) canusciv'**a qualchedun'**alla riunione? No, nan ganusciài **a nəsciunə** Gravina, BA
 m) canusciv'**a nqualchèdun'**alla riunione? No, nan gə canuscèv'**a nisciunə** Mottola, TA

n) canuscivi qualchidunu alla riunione? No, no canusceva nisciunu	S.Vito, BR
o) canuscivi ncununu alla riunioni?	Mesagne, BR
p) canuscivi ncunnunu alla riunioni?	Latiano, BR
q) canuscivi quarchitunu ti la riunioni?	Oria, BR
r) canuscivi ncununu alla riunioni?	Lizzano, TA ₂
s) canuscii quarchetunu alla riunione?	Lecce, LE
t) canuscivi qualchetunu allu ncontru?	Serrano, LE
u) canuscivi quarchedunu alla riunione? No, nu canuscia nisciunu	Otranto, LE
v) canuscivi quarchedunu alla runione? No, nu canuscia ciuveḍdi	Maglie, LE
'Did you know anyone at the meeting? No, I knew no-one'	

Examples (41) to (43) highlight another sharp distinction between N-C Apulian vs Salentino varieties. While the former never fail to *a*-mark all instances of the two indefinite quantifiers, there is no trace of DOM in Salentino. From this, we gather that the pronominal nature of the indefinite element is not a sufficient DOM-trigger in Salentino, but it is N-C Apulian varieties, where it is likely lexicalised given its occurrence with all predicates. Interestingly, the speaker from Gravina doubles the Q-pronoun ‘no-one/anyone’ in (41l) with a clitic, suggesting that the pronoun indeed refers to a specific entity, i.e. someone among the neighbours. However, specificity does not play a role in these varieties as it may do in the case of ‘someone’ in Barese (Andriani, forthc.).

Let us now consider nouns with overt determiners, both definite (§2.3) and indefinite (§2.4) ones.

2.3. Nouns with definite determiners

It is with definite nominal expressions that the *a*-marking starts to weaken its occurrence in varieties where DOM is more extended. At these levels of the definiteness scale, [+specific] DPs, i.e. highly identifiable referents, would normally display DOM, while [-specific] ones would not (Torrego 1998; Ledgeway 2000; Leonetti 2008; López 2016; a.o.). In particular, the degree of specificity/identifiability of a referent is usually higher with singular DPs and lower with plural ones. Moreover, DOM may be favoured whenever a deictic element is present in the nominal expression. Indeed, a DP containing a demonstrative adjective should, in theory, be more specific than that a DP with a definite article, as the referent is more easily identifiable thanks to the deictic element.

2.3.1. Singular definite nouns

Bearing these premises in mind, we tested these three variables with different predicates in all varieties. We start presenting [+singular] DPs, with the first example involving the V-O sequence ‘to call the husband’:

44) ‘to call the husband’: DP _[+singular/+specific]	
a) aìrə Marijə c'è səndutə mmalamèndə e òu chiamét' u marità	Mattinata, FG
b) ierə Maria jè sənduta malə e a cchiamat' allu marità	S.Marco, FG
c) aírə Maríje nn'è statə bbonə e a cchiamat' u marítə	Lucera, FG
d) aírə Maríe s'è sənditə malamendə e a cchiamät' u marité	Foggia, FG
e) aírə Marì s'o səndoutə malamendə e o cchiamòt' u marètə	Cerignola, FG
f) ajìrə Mariə sə səndéttə malaménde e chiamétt' o maréta	Trinitapoli, BT
g) ajírə Maré nan s'è sənditə bbonə e chiamitt' u marètə	Barletta, BT
h) ajírə Mariə na ss'à səndéutə bbonə e à cchiamét' u maréitə	Mola, BA
i) Mari ajíre s'a səndóutə brottə e a cchiamèt' u maretə	Conversano, BA
j) ajerə Marejə s'i ndeisə brottə i o cchiamat' u maretə	Putignano, BA
k) ajírə Mari s'è səndoutə bruttə e jè cchiamät' o maretə	Gravina, BA
l) ajírə Mariə na ss'é səndutə e à cchiamètə lu maritə	Mottola, TA
m) ieri Maria è avutu nu mancamentu e è cchiamato lu maritu	S.Vito, BR
n) ieri Maria s'è sintùta brutta ed è cchiamatu lu maritu	Mesagne, BR
o) ieri Maria s'è ssintuta fiacca ed è cchiamatu maritasa	Latiano, BR

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| p) Maria ieri no s'è sintuta bona e è cchiamatu maritusa | Oria, BR |
| q) ieri Maria s'ae ntisa fiacca e a ccchiamatu maritusa | Lecce, LE |
| r) ieri la Maria se ntise fiacca e chiamau maritusa | Serrano, LE |
| s) ieri a Maria s'a ntisa fiacca e a ttuccatu chiama maritusa | Otranto, LE |
| t) ieri a Maria s'a ntisa fiacca e a cchiamatu maritusa | Maglie, LE |
- 'Yesterday Maria felt sickly and called her (lit. the) husband'

The first highly [+specific] referent considered is ‘the husband’, a kinship term with an intended possessive interpretation, i.e. ‘Maria’s/her husband’. Indeed, most Salentino varieties (44o-t) allow the 3SG enclitic possessive with ‘husband’ (*maritu-sa/marita-sa*), while, in N-C Apulian and some N Salentino varieties, this referent can only be expressed with a definite article. However, irrespective of the expression of the DP, DOM was only produced by speakers from S.Marco (44b), Trinitapoli (44f), and Gravina (44k).

These same three varieties select DOM with a [-specific] singular kinship DP, ‘one’s (lit. the) son⁹ with a ‘kind’-referring interpretation (cf. Brugé & Brugger 1994:8):

45) ‘to hit the son’: DP [+singular/-specific]

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| a) (na vòlətə la mammə dèvə mazzə au figghiə p'addrəzzərələ) | Mattinata, FG |
| b) prima na mamma menava allu figghia pə farlu mparà | S.Marco, FG |
| c) na vótə na mammə frəcavə də taccaratə u figghiə pə mbararlə a'ducazziónə | Lucera, FG |
| d) na votə na mammə menävə də taccaratə u figghiə pə mbararlə ¹⁰ | Foggia, FG |
| e) prèimə na mammə manòv'u fegghiə chə nzəgnarlə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) prémə na mammə manàiv' o figghiə chə ddallə l'aducazziàumə | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) na mémmə cresəmav'u figghiə chə farl'assì bərəfétte | Barletta, BT |
| h) aquannən jaivə tannə na mammə mazziaiv'u fegghiə p'addrəzzauə | Mola, BA |
| i) (è timbə də prémə na mammə ngə déivə mazzèt'è félə pə mbarangə l'aducazziúnə) | Conversano, BA |
| j) preimə na mammə mazziaiv'u fegghiə pə dangə l'aducazzionə | Putignano, BA |
| k) (preimə na mammə sunai a nu figghiə p'aducallə) | Gravina, BA |
| l) (primə ma mammə ngə devə mazzètə allu figghiə chə lu fè mməzzè) | Mottola, TA |
| m) na vota na mamma mazziava lu figghiu cu lu ndrizzava | S.Vito, BR |
| n) nna vota la mamma talia lu figghiu cu lu educava | Mesagne, BR |
| o) tiempu angretu nna mamma talia lu figghiu cu nci mmizza l'educazioni | Latiano, BR |
| p) prima na mamma strigghiava, vattia lu figghiu cu lu mpara | Oria, BR |
| q) (prima le mamme attianu li figghi cu lli mpàranu cristiani) | Lecce, LE |
| r) (alli tiempi passati na mamma vattia nu fiju cu nu lu fazza ddivintare scustumatu) | Serrano, LE |
| s) (na fiata e mamme li vattiane li fiji cu li mparàvane) | Otranto, LE |
| t) a ttiempi la mamma vattia u fiju cu lu ndrizza | Maglie, LE |

'In the past, a mum would hit her (lit. the) son to educate him'

Although many speakers rendered ‘to hit’ with the ditransitive expression *dà mazzatə a*, ‘to take a swing at (lit. to give blows to)’ requiring a dative complement (cf. Pineda 2016, 2020), we notice no major differences with the preceding context in (44), even though the object in (45) is highly affected. This suggests that specificity does not necessarily play a role in any of these varieties, whether they did or did not produce DOM. Indeed, the speaker from Gravina is the only one who employs DOM with the same [-specific] DP ‘the son’ in the generic sentence (not included here) ‘a mum would like to hear from her (lit. the) son everyday’ *sə sāpə ca na mamma volə send'o figghia tutt'i dì*. We could argue that, in Gravina, DOM may actually be sensitive to a feature [+kin] of the DP. The same could be hypothesised

⁹ However, the sentence from Gravina (45k) was translated with an indefinite noun ‘a son’, on a par with the sentence from Serrano (45r), alongside the generic plural ‘the sons’. This indeed shows the interpretative contrast with the preceding example in (44).

¹⁰ Note that one recorded informant from Foggia doubles the direct object *u figghiə* with a clitic *u*, i.e. *primə na mamma u palliāvə u figghiə*, yet this does not trigger DOM.

for Trinitapoli and S.Marco, except that ‘to hear from the son’ does not trigger DOM, while ‘to beat the son’ does, suggesting that some predicates (“to beat/call”), but not others (“to hear from”), may be responsible for the presence of DOM.

Moving on to singular referents other than kinship terms, we consider two other [+specific] common nouns with different predicates, namely ‘to get to know the son of a famous singer’ (46) and ‘to call the local doctor’ (not included):

- 46) ‘to get to know the son of a famous singer’: DP_[+singular/+specific]
- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| a) aìerà Mari òu canèsciut'u figghiə də nu candandə famòusə | Mattinata, FG |
| b) jerə Maria a canèsciutə lu figghiə də nu candandə famosə | S.Marco, FG |
| c) aire Mari a canusciut' <u>o figghiə də nu candandə chə vacə pə nnumənata</u> | Lucera, FG |
| d) airə Maria a canèsciöt'u figghiə də nu candandə famösə | Foggia, FG |
| e) airə Mari o canousciout'u fegghiə də nu candandə famòusə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) ajìerà Mari o canessciót' <u>o figghiə də nu candandə famòusa</u> | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) ajirə Marèj'è canusciout'u figghiə də nu candandə famóuse | Barletta, BT |
| h) ajirə Mari à ccanèsscèut'u fegghiə də nu candandə famëusə | Mola, BA |
| i) ajirə Mari a canèsciout'u fègghiə də nu candandə famóuse | Conversano, BA |
| j) ajerə Marej'o canisciot'u fegghiə də nu candandə mportandə | Putignano, BA |
| k) ajirə Mari è canèsciout'u figghiə də nu candandə famousə | Gravina, BA |
| l) ajirə Mari à canisciutə lu figghiə də nu candandə famòsa | Mottola, TA |
| m) ieri Maria è canusciutu lu figghiu di nu cantante famoso | S.Vito, BR |
| n) ieri Maria è canusciutu lu figghiu ti nnu cantanti famosu | Mesagne, BR |
| o) ieri Maria è ccanusciutu lu figghiu ti nnu cantanti famosu | Latiano, BR |
| p) ieri Maria è canusciutu lu figghiu ti nu cantanti famosu | Oria, BR |
| q) ieri la Maria à' ccanusciutu lu figghiu te nu cantante famosu | Lecce, LE |
| r) ieri la Maria ave canusciutu lu fiju te nu cantante famosu | Serrano, LE |
| s) ieri a Maria aje canusciutu u fiju de nu cantante famosu | Otranto, LE |
| t) ieri a Maria a canusciutu u fiju de nu cantante famosu | Maglie, LE |
| ‘Yesterday Maria met the son of a famous singer’ | |

Despite the specificity of the referents in question, most speakers from N-C Apulia and Salento did not select DOM in these contexts.¹¹ DOM is instead produced in the varieties from Lucera (46c), the only variety marking the DP in the sentence *Giuannə a vist'a nu criaturə pə nderrə e a chiamat'o dottóra d'u pajiesə* ‘Gianni saw a child on the ground and called the local doctor’, and from Trinitapoli, but only in the context shown in (46f). While for Trinitapoli the [kin] feature may be invoked again, for Lucera the optionality of the *a*-marking becomes evident, as ‘to hit the son’ and ‘to call the husband’ did not trigger DOM, while ‘to get to know the son of a singer’ and ‘to call the doctor’ did.

Although we could expect DOM with the [+specific] DPs discussed above, its absence in most varieties may be due to the predicates ‘to get to know’¹² and ‘to call’, which somehow better resist the *a*-marking compared to other predicates such as ‘to greet/help/kill’, as we shall observe below.

2.3.2. Plural definite nouns

¹¹ This includes Faetar, where a similar example shows the unmarked referent ‘the doctor’: [dʒə ve:jə a kiammá **lu mmjédəkə**] ‘I’m going to call the doctor’ (Nagy 2000:40). We exclude that DOM is blocked by the predicate ‘to call’, as we find the same predicate with an *a*-marked (at least in Nagy’s transcription) quantified plural referent: [i átə kiāmá **a do síndə soldá**] ‘he called two hundred soldiers’ (Nagy 2000:70). The only distinctive feature between these sentences may be related to the TAM values of the same predicate ‘I go to call’ vs ‘they have called’.

¹² The predicate (*ac)canòsse* can be interpreted with different meanings on the basis of its aspectual specification (cf. Vendler’s (1967) aspectual classes): the stative ‘to know’ and activity ‘to get to know’ (as well as ‘to recognise (someone)’), where the latter would favour DOM (cf. Torrego 1998:31-33 for Spanish). However, even though the latter meaning was tested, most of these varieties did not show such sensitivity.

Moving onto [+plural] definite DPs, we begin with a highly specific referent ‘(to wash) the sons’, again, with a possessive interpretation, i.e. ‘her sons’:

- 47) ‘**to wash the sons**: DP_[+plural/+specific]
- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| a) aiərə Mari òu sciacquét'i figghiə pəll'acquə də merə | Mattinata, FG |
| b) ierə Maria a llavatə li figghiə cull'acqua lu marə | S.Marco, FG |
| c) aírə Mari a llavat'i figghiə pəll'acquə d'u marə | Lucera, FG |
| d) aírə Mariè a llavat'i figgħie chell'acquə də marə | Foggia, FG |
| e) aírə Mari o llavòt'i figghiə chell'acquə d'u morə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) ajìərə Marìa lavétt'i figghiə chell'acquə d'u morə | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) ajire Marèjə lavétt'i figghiə chell'ècqua salàtə | Barletta, BT |
| h) ajirə Mari à llavèt'i fegghiə chell'acquə də mérə | Mola, BA |
| i) ajirə Marì a llavètə tott'i fēlə chell'acquə d'u mérə | Conversano, BA |
| j) ajirə Marej'o llavat'i feilə cull'acquə d'u marə | Putignano, BA |
| k) ajirə Mari è llavat' alla figghiə pəll'acquə d'u märə | Gravina, BA |
| l) ajìre Marì à llavètə li filə chell'acquə də mérə | Mottola, TA |
| m) ieri Maria è llavatu li fili cull'acqua di mari | S.Vito, BR |
| n) ieri Maria è llavàtu li fili cull'acqua ti mari | Mesagne, BR |
| o) ieri Maria llavau li fili cull'acqua ti mari | Latiano, BR |
| p) ieri Maria è llavatu li fili cull'acqua ti mari | Oria, BR |
| q) ieri la María à llaatu li figghi cull'acqua te mare | Lecce, LE |
| r) ieri la Maria llavau li fiji cull'acqua te lu mare | Serrano, LE |
| s) ieri a Maria aje llavati i fiji cull'acqua de mare | Otranto, LE |
| t) jeri a María cull'acqua de mare l'a llavati i fiji | Maglie, LE |
- ‘Yesterday Maria washed her (lit. the) sons with seawater’

While nearly all speakers produce the unmarked DP ‘the sons’, the only case with DOM is, again, Gravina (47k). As hypothesised above, this may signal that this variety tends to *a*-mark phrasal kinship terms, e.g. ‘one’s husband/son(s)’, but not other types definite common nouns, or at least not with predicates such as ‘to call’ and ‘to get to know’ (46k).

However, the following example, testing the same predicate-complement pair ‘to wash the sons’, this time in a generic context, suggest that something else is at stake in some varieties:

- 48) ‘**to wash the sons**: DP_[+plural/-specific]
- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| a) na vòlətə li mmammə sciacquèvən'i figgħie ammiəzzə la chiazzə dlu paēisə | Mattinata, FG |
| b) ində lu passatə li mammə lavavan' allī figghiə ammezzə la chiazza lu paiesə | S.Marco, FG |
| c) na vótə i mammə lavaven'i figghiə ammizz'u larəchə | Lucera, FG |
| d) na votə lə mammə lavaven'i figghiə nd'ā chiazzə d'u paése | Foggia, FG |
| e) prèimə i mammə lavavən'i fegghiə a la chiazzə du paeisə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) prémə i māmmərə lavàven'i figghiə mmézz'alla chiazzə d'u pajésə | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) na vólətə i mmémmə lavavən'i figghiə nd'ā piézzə | Barletta, BT |
| h) nəfallànnə i māmmərə lavàvən'i fegghiə jènd'ā chiazzə d'u paiéisə | Mola, BA |
| i) è timbə də prémə, i māmmərə lavéivən'i fēlə mminz'alla chiazzə d'u paiēsə | Conversano, BA |
| j) appremə i mammərə lavavən'i feilə nd'ā chiazzə d'u paesə | Putignano, BA |
| k) primə lə mammə lavàinə la figghiə mennz'a la chiazzə d'u paeisə | Gravina, BA |
| l) primə li mammərə lavavənə li file mmìnż'a la chiazzə də lu paisə | Mottola, TA |
| m) na vota li mammi lavavunu li fili mmienza alla chiazza dlu pajsı | S.Vito, BR |
| n) nna vota li mammi llavàunu li fili alla chiazza ti lu paisi | Mesagne, BR |
| o) tiempu angretu li mammi llavaunu li fili ntra lla chiazza ti lu paisi | Latiano, BR |
| p) prima li mammi llavaunu li fili ammienzu alla chiazza | Oria, BR |
| q) prima le matri llàanu li figghi alla chiazza te lu paise | Lecce, LE |
| r) alli tiempi passati le mamme llavavane li fiji ammienzu alla chiazza te lu paese | Serrano, LE |
| s) prima le mamme i fiji li llavavane alla chiazza | Otranto, LE |

- t) na fiata e mamme alla chiazza dû païse li lavàvane **i fiji**
 'In the past, mums would wash their (lit. the) sons in the town square'

Maglie, LE

In (48), the variety of S.Marco (48b) is the only one *a*-marking the direct object in this context, while the other varieties which showed DOM quite consistently, such as Gravina and Trinitapoli, do not do so. For Trinitapoli, it seems that the [+plural] feature of the DP may block DOM, witness also the next tested referent in (49). For Gravina and S.Marco, while we cannot discard idiolectal variation, we could speculate on some sort of sensitivity to the imperfective aspect of the predicate 'to wash' (rather than the (a)telicity of the predicate, as proposed in the literature). While in Gravina [+plural] referents lose the *a*-marking because of the imperfectivity (and genericity) of 'to wash' vs (47k) above, the variety of S.Marco responds in the opposite way to the imperfectivity of the generic event by *a*-marking the DP, at least with this specific predicate (but see also the generic event in (45b) 'a mum would hit **her son** to educate him', where the affected [+singular] kinship term is *a*-marked).

More [+specific/+plural] common nouns were tested, i.e. '(one's/)the friends' (49), this time as a complement of the verb 'to greet':

49) 'to greet the friends': DP_[+plural/+specific]	
a) primə də partə, Giuann'òu salutéto l'amica	Mattinata, FG
b) prima də jircənə, Giuann'a salutat' alli cumbagna	S.Marco, FG
c) primə də partə, Giuann'a salutat'i cumbagnə	Lucera, FG
d) primə də partə, Giuann'a salutat'i cumbägnə	Foggia, FG
e) premə də partə, Giuvann'o salutöt'i cumbagnə	Cerignola, FG
f) prémə de partə, Giuànn'o salutötə l'améca	Trinitapoli, BT
g) prèimə də scerasinnə, Giuénne salutitt' a tutt'i cumbégnə	Barletta, BT
h) preimə də scerasennə, Giuannə salutegghi' all'améisca	Mola, BA
i) (prémə də partə, Giuannə s'o salutètə chə tòtt'i cumbagnə)	Conversano, BA
j) preimə də partə, Giuann'o salutat' all'ameisca	Putignano, BA
k) preimə də partə, Giuann'è salutat' allə cumbagna	Gravina, BA
l) primə də partə, Giuann'à salutètə l'amècəra	Mottola, TA
m) prima di partiri, Giuvanni è salutatu l'amici	S.Vito, BR
n) prima cu parti, Giuvanni è salutatu l'amici	Mesagne, BR
o) prima cu parti, Giuanni è ssalutatu l'amici	Latiano, BR
p) prima cu parti, Giuanni è salutatu li cumpagni	Oria, BR
q) prima cu pparte, lu Sciuanni à ssalutatu li amici	Lecce, LE
r) prima cu pparta, lu Giuvanni ave salutatu l'amici	Serrano, LE
s) prima cu parte, u Giuvanni aje salutati l'amici	Otranto, LE
t) prima cu parte, u Giuanni a salutatu tutti l'amici	Maglie, LE

'Before leaving, Giovanni said goodbye to his (lit. the) friends'

While DOM is once again absent in Salentino (49m-t), we see that five N-C Apulian varieties present the *a*-marking, namely S.Marco (49b), Barletta (49g),¹³ Mola (49h), Putignano (49j), and Gravina (49k). These exact same varieties (bar that from Barletta) selected DOM in the generic, imperfective sentence 'before going to war, the husbands would say goodbye to their wives', in which the same predicate 'to greet' selects the [+plural] DP the(ir) wives'. Leaving aside the hypotheses put forth above concerning certain features at play in the individual dialects, it is likely that these varieties show DOM in these two contexts because of the predicate 'to greet/say goodbye', prototypically requiring a human object, which is *a*-marked by virtue of the selectional requirements of the verb. Indeed, Andriani (forthc.) reports a Barese example with this same verb in which even the proper name of a local TV broadcaster is *a*-marked, e.g. *salut'a Telenòrba!* 'say hi to Telenorba!', somewhat unexpectedly given the inanimate referent (albeit it is a proper noun).

¹³ However, the speaker from Barletta included the quantifier 'all', a potential DOM-trigger at least in Barese (Andriani, forthc.), but not in Salentino, cf. (49t).

A similar hypothesis can be put forth for the object of the predicate ‘to help’, tested in the generic sentence ‘one has to help friends in need’, where DOM surfaces in those few (Apulo-Barese) speakers who did not paraphrase their translations with a passive or ditransitive construction:

- 50) ‘help the friends’: DP[+plural/-specific]
- a) i. bəsogn’aitallall’ameisca ca stonnə ndəffəcoldè Mola, BA
 - ii. all’ameisca ca tenənə dabbəsugnə, l’am’ajutējə Mola, BA
 - b) besogn’ajutà ai amësca ca stonnə ndəffəcoldè Conversano, BA
 - c) aiot’all’ameisca ca jàvənə dabbəsugnə Putignano, BA
 - d) Bəsogn’aitè alla cumbagna ndəffəcoldè Gravina, BA
- ‘One has to help friends in need’

Importantly, ‘to help’ is among the verbs appearing in Sornicola’s (1997:72) list of dative-selecting verbs in Latin and early Romance (cf. also Ledgerway 2009:831-832), together with ‘to call’. Note also that some of the informants render a few of the sentences with a doubled object clitic, which signals topicality and specificity; in the cases from Mola, clitic doubling of the dislocated (50a.ii) or *in-situ* (50a.i) object triggers the presence of DOM (but this is never the case in Salentino). While it could be argued that DOM is favoured with definite DPs precisely when it involves clitic-resumed topical information, we leave this issue open for future research.

2.3.3. Definite human and animate nouns

The data discussed so far largely confirm what is reported in the literature, namely that this section of the definiteness scale shows extensive alternations between *a*-marked and unmarked direct objects. We observed that this alternation is not necessarily due to the specificity of the referent, but to the predicates which select the DP, or, possibly, their perfective vs imperfective aspect. Below we show some examples in which both singular and plural DPs occur in similar contexts to the ones we tested and show consistency with our findings:

- 51) ‘to call’
- a) ha chiam3t’e(/i) figghiə Torremaggiore, FG (Tosto 2007:20)
‘s/he called the sons’
 - b) hanne chiamate allu jettabbande San Severo, FG
‘they called the town crier’
 - c) Lu patre [...] chiamàje **tutta la gente de servizie** Foggia, FG (Salvioni 1913:25)
‘the dad called all the servants’
 - d) ‘cɛmə (a) li xwanneuna Canosa, BT (M&S 2005:II,507)
‘call the boys’
 - e) alla fine, chiémēi’u **méràite** Molfetta, BA (Zaza 1996:15)
‘at the end, she called her husband’
 - f) Pó chiamòtte **u figghie** Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:59)
‘later s/he called her/his son’
 - g) Dì gràzzie ché nè sò chiamàte **i uardiàne** Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:39)
‘Be thankful that I didn’t call the custodians’
- 52) ‘to see’
- a) A mamme vedéve **u figghie** suie redutte tutte pelle e ssanghe Foggia, FG (Valente 1975:66)
‘the mum would see her son all skinny and covered in blood’
 - b) tou **i** sì viste d’assì [...] a megghièrme e **alla sóre?** Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:30)
‘did you see my wife and her sister going out?’
 - c) vedétte **u proprietàrie** du llùoche ch’arrevéve Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:39)
‘he saw the owner of the place coming’
 - d) o camesànde s’avònna vedè **i fèmene** allanoùte? Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:28)
‘at the cemetery one has to see naked women?’
 - e) nu ppozzu vitire **li fiji mei** Scorrano, LE (Presicce 2011)
‘I can’t see my sons’

53) other predicates

- a) U chènè mòccëchë **a u straccètë** San Severo, FG
 'a dog bites the beggar'
- b) U cœnè muzzichèjë **u strazzætë** Foggia, FG (Fidanza 1992)
 'a dog bites the beggar'
- c) i dritte s'ajutene da pe llóre, **ê mangħjaréile i** ajute Criste Grumo, BA (Colantuono 2005:144)
 'the smart ones help themselves, Christ helps the dumb ones'
- d) Pe scì acchié **j àlde parjiende** Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:27)
 'to go visit the other relatives'
- e) S'essi pigghiatu **lu giovini** ca a tittu tuni Lizzano, TA₂
 'If only I had taken the guy you said'
- f) lu previti è ddittu ca, **li scinnuti, li** sposa la matina prestu Lizzano, TA₂
 'the priest said he marries eloped couples in the early morning'

From the varied range of examples above, we note how some N Apulian varieties, such as that of San Severo, consistently show DOM in all contexts, i.e. [+specific] (51b) and [-specific] (53a) DPs, whereas C Apulian (53c) is more prone to have DOM when the DPs are clitic-resumed (but not Salentino (53f)). This might again suggest that doubling structures favour DOM with definite referents, but they are not always a prerequisite for the *a*-marking to occur.

A particular case of extended DOM with definite DPs, selected by different predicates, is found in Faetar:

54)

- a) **dʒ e viáw a la fiλə ki tu kwanáj** (Nagy 2002:114)
 I have seen DOM the girl that you know
 'I saw the girl you know'
- b) alórrə sa marə i manáttə **a 1ənfán** (ibid.:123)
 then her mum she sent DOM the child
 'so her mum sent her (lit. the) child'
- c) non **dʒə tə purtá a lu tʃəstíəl də la pits** (ibid.:130)
 grandma I you brought DOM the basket with the pizza
 'Grandma, I brought you the basket with pizza'
- d) lu patrúŋ cmáttə **a lo sèrve** (Kattenbusch 1982:297)
 the lord called DOM the servants
 'the lord called the servants'
- e) **dʒi viáw tuttə la fiλ/ tutto lo kwattrá** (Nagy 2002:82)
 I see all the girls all the boys
 'I see all the girls/the boys'

Not only are the human common nouns 'the girl' (54a) and 'the child' (54b), both involving the same features [+singular/+specific], *a*-marked, but also inanimate referents, as the [+singular /+specific] DP 'the basket with pizza' (54c). While this instance of DOM is unexpected (albeit not impossible, e.g. Apulo-Barese migrants from Casamassima, BA, in New Jersey, USA; Andriani, Perlin & Kaufman, forthc.:§4.4), we would not expect either the quantified [+plural] DPs 'all the girls/boys' (54e) to be unmarked, while the referent 'the servants' (54d) is. However, since interspeaker variation cannot be excluded, further research is needed to ascertain these fine-grained distinctions.

Before moving onto demonstratives, we report what is found in the literature for [-human/+animate] DPs, such as animals:

55) **DP[-human/+animate]**

- a) ha chiam3t' **e(/i) cavalla** Torremaggiore, FG (Tosto 2007:20)
 's/he called the horses'

b)	cɛ:mə 'call the dog!'	a u kɛ:nə	San Severo, FG (M&S 2005:II,506)
c)	I vit he saw	a lu law DOM the wolf	Faeto, FG (Nagy 2002:127)
	'he (i.e. the hunter) saw the wolf'		
d)	u loupe s'ó mangiôte 'the wolf ate the sheep'	la pucherédde	Trinitapoli, BT
e)	sɔ ccame:tə 'I've called the dog'	u ke:nə	Giovinazzo, BA (M&S 2005:II,507)
f)	aquanne acciteche 'when I kill the pig'	u pùorche	Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:63)
g)	La lupe s'a mangiate 'the wolf ate the sheep'	lu pecherille	Polignano, BA (CRSEC 2001:52)
h)	ajjə camə:tə 'I called the dog'	u kə:nə	Taranto, TA1 (M&S 2005:II,507)
i)	allora vidde 'then he (the hunter) saw the wolf'	lu lupu	Squinzano, LE (Bentley <i>et al.</i> 2014:38)

While C Apulian and Salentino varieties (55d)-(55i) tend not to mark such referents (however, for some counterexamples in Barese see Andriani 2015, forthc.), the marking tends to appear more often in N Apulian (55a-b), including Faetar (55c).

2.3.4. Definite nouns introduced by Demonstratives

The last definite context we consider involves singular (56) and plural (57) DPs modified by a distal demonstrative encoding deictic force (and, hence, an increased degree of specificity/identification), which is absent in DPs with definite articles:

- 56) ‘to meet that handsome guy’: Dem+NP_[+singular/+specific]
- a) Mari òu canəsciutə **cuddu bbèlla ggiòvənə** alla fèstə dlu paëisə Mattinata, FG
 - b) Maria a canəsciutə **ddu bellə uagliola** alla festa lu pajesə S.Marco, FG
 - c) (Mari à canussciútə nu bbèllə uagliónə è fèstə d'aüstə) Lucera, FG
 - d) Mari a ccanəsciutə **quillu bbèlla uagliönə** à fèstə u paèsə Foggia, FG
 - e) Mari o canoscioutə **quiddə bellə uaglionə** a la festə d'u paëisə Cerignola, FG
 - f) Mari o canəssciót' **a ccüddə bbellə uagnàumə** alla fèstə d'u pajésə Trinitapoli, BT
 - g) Maré canuscitt' **a cuddə bbèlla uagnónə** à fista patronale Barletta, BT
 - h) Mari à ccanəsscëut' **a ccodə bbélə uagnauna** alla fèsta grannə Mola, BA
 - i) Mari a canəsciút' **a còddə bélə uagnónə** alla fèsta patronale Conversano, BA
 - j) Marej'o canisciot' **a curə bellə uagnona** à festə d'u paesə Putignano, BA
 - k) Mari è canəsciout' **a cuddu bellə uagnounə** alla festə d'u paeisə Gravina, BA
 - l) Mari à canisciutə **curə bellə uagnònə** alla fèsta grannə Mottola, TA
 - n) Maria è canusciutu **cuddu beddu vagnoni** alla festa S.Vito, BR
 - o) Maria è canusciutu **curu bbeddu vuagnone** alla festa di paisi Mesagne, BR
 - p) Maria è ccanusciutu **cuddu bbeddu vagnoni** alla fèsta ti lu paisi Latiano, BR
 - q) Maria è canusciutu **cuddu beddu vagnoni** alla festa ti lu paisi Oria, BR
 - r) la Maria à ccanusciutu **ddu beddu striù** alla fera Lecce, LE
 - s) la Maria canuscìu **ddu beddu carusu** alla festa te lu paese Serrano, LE
 - t) a Maria a canusciutu **ddu beddu vagnone** alla festa du paese Otranto, LE
 - u) a Maria **ddu beddu fiju** alla festa l'a canusciutu Maglie, LE
- ‘Maria met that handsome guy at the village fair/festival’

- 57) ‘to meet those few people’: Dem+NP_[+plural/+specific]
- a) u sìnəc'òu affrundétə quédda picchə də crəstiénə c'u vulèvənə canoscə Mattinata, FG
 - b) lu sinnəc'a ncundratə ddi pochə crəstianə chə lu vulevənə canoscə S.Marco, FG
 - c) u sinec'à ngrundatə **quilli quattə crəstianə** c'u vulévənə canossce Lucera, FG
 - d) u sinnec'a ngudräte **quilli quattə crəstiänə** ca u vulevənə canossce Foggia, FG

- e) u sennac'o ngundrótə **chiddə quattə crəstiònə** ca u vulevənə canoscə
f) u sìnac'o ngundröt' **a cchiddə picchə crəstiònə** ca u vulàvənə canòsscə
g) u sinneč'a ngudrat' **a cchiddə picchə crestianə** ca vulevənə səndinzə
h) u sènac'à ngundrët' **a chèdə quattə crəstiënə** ca u velévəne canóesscə
i) u sénac'av'acchiat' **a chiddə e quattə crəstiënə** ca u velévənə canösscə
j) u senac'o'cchiait' **a cherə pecchə crəstiònə** ca u vulevənə canoscə
k) (U sinnachə s'av'acchiätə pə kiddə pikkə crəstiänə ca u vulàinə canoscə)
l) (Lu sinachə s'av'acchiëtə chə chirə picchə crəstiënə ca lu vulavənə canoscə)
- m) lu sinnacu è sci'ncuntratu **quiddi picca cristiani** ca lu vuli'canuscevunu
n) lu sinducu è ccuntratu **quiddi picchi criştiani** ca lu vuliunu canoscunu
o) lu sinnucu è cuntratu **quiddi picca cristiani** ca lu vuliunu canoscunu
p) lu sinnucu è ccuntratu **quiddi picca cristiani** ca lu vuliunu canusciunu
q) lu sìndecu ae ncuntratu **dđi picca nunni** ca ulianu llu canuscenu
r) lu sinnacu ncuntrau **dđi picca cristiani** ca uline cu lu canuscane
s) u sinnicu a ncuntratu **dđi picca cristiani** ca uliane lu canùscune
t) (u sindicu s'a truvatu cu **dđi picchi cristiani** ca uliane lu canuscene)
‘The mayor met those few people who wanted to know him’

Cerignola, FG
Trinitapoli, BT
Barletta, BT
Mola, BA
Conversano, BA
Putignano, BA
Gravina, BA
Mottola, TA
S.Vito, BR
Mesagne, BR
Latiano, BR
Oria, BR
Lecce, LE
Serrano, LE
Otranto, LE
Maglie, LE

We observe that only Apulo-Barese varieties (57f-j) allow DOM with DPs headed by a demonstrative, while the remaining varieties, i.e. N Apulian¹⁴ (57a-e) and Salentino (57m-t), do not. These results are in line with what the specialistic literature reports, i.e. that DOM is present (and obligatory in many varieties, e.g. Barese; Andriani, forthc.) whenever the DP is introduced by a demonstrative adjective:

58) **Demonstrative+NP**

- a) u pátrə mq ćaňnévə **a stu figgə** ke sə nə jérə jútə Foggia, FG (Melillo 1970)
‘The dad was crying for this son who had left’
- b) jajə camæ:tə **a kkwerə fəmənə** Minervino, BT (M&S 2005:II,507)
‘I called that woman’
- c) sɔ vvistə **a kkur ɔmə** Canosa, BT (ibid.)
‘I saw that man’
- d) sɔ ccame:tə **a kkuddə tsəttsiə** Giovinazzo, BA (ibid.)
‘I called that chap’
- f) nan zi ngannénne **a stu figghie** Trinitapoli, BT
‘do not trick this son’
- g) la luna **a cchessa pizzeca** redinne stè tremende Ostuni, BR
‘the laughing moon is looking at this pizzica’
- h) **sta mugghieri**, addo cazzu l'agghiu sci ccugghiuta Lizzano, TA₂
‘this wife, where the hell did I fetch her?’
- i) ma addò cazzu l'agghiu ncuntrata **sta signora** Lizzano, TA₂
‘where the hell did I meet this lady?’

While C Apulian varieties (58b-g) *a*-mark DPs with demonstratives, including the humanised traditional dance ‘pizzica’ (58g), Salentino does not even allow DOM with clitic-resumed fronted DPs (58h). However, we see that also the dialect of Foggia (58a) *a*-marks a referent with a proximal demonstrative clitic ‘this son’, which did not surface with distal-demonstrative forms in our sample (see also footnote 12). This can either be due to the distal vs proximal semantic of the demonstrative, or simply to the recent loss of *a*-marking in this context. Instead, Francoprovençal Faetar and Cigliàje seem to behave more similarly to Apulo-Barese and unlike their surrounding N Apulian varieties, as singular (59)-(60) and plural (61) DPs with demonstratives are *a*-marked:

¹⁴ It is worth noting that, for the variety of Foggia, one (recorded) informant produced sentence (63), §2.4, as *Giannə ha rristsə stu criatura pə nderra* ‘Gianni saw **this** boy on the ground’, where ‘child’ is introduced by a proximal demonstrative clitic ‘this’ without DOM. However, the same informant also produced *agghiə canəsciunt'a quilla* ‘I met **that** (person)’, where the demonstrative pronoun is *a*-marked, on a par with personal (and indefinite) pronouns.

- 59) maría i atə viáwa **sa fiλə** kə piεro l atə dəná lu livr
 Maria she has seen DOM this girl that Piero her has given the book
 'Maria saw the girl that Peter gave the book to'
 Faeto, FG (Nagy 2002:114)
- 60) dəsturbə pa **a ssa dʒenn!**
 disturb.2SG.IMP not DOM this people
 'do not disturb these people!' Celle, FG
- 61) dʒ offrí d ajutá **a si kristián**
 I offer of help DOM these people
 'I offer to help these people' Faeto, FG (Nagy 2002:88)

Let us now move onto the last referents considered, i.e. indefinite NPs, the lowest in the definiteness/specification scale (Diesing 1992; Torrego 1998; Leonetti 2004, 2008; a.o.).

2.4. Nouns with indefinite determiners

When we turn to indefinites, the literature reports high optionality of DOM-marking:

- 62) **Indefinite NP_[+singular]**
- a) nu paisane mìe ha visto **a nu criature** che ce chiamave Franchine Carpino, FG
 'a fellow-villager saw a child called Franchino'
 - b) 3 e viáw **na finnə** do un kwatrá Faeto, FG (Nagy 2002:85)
 I have seen a woman with a boy
 'I saw a woman with a boy'
 - c) e sse mettéte a ssérve **a nu segnaure** de kudde paése Barletta, BT (Melillo 1970:79)
 'he started serving a lord from that village'
 - d) jajə camæ:tə **na fəmənə** Minervino, BT (M&S 2005:II,507)
 I called a woman'
 - e) sɔ vvistə **(a n)nu ɔmə** Canosa BT (ibid.)
 'I saw a man'
 - f) sɔ ccame:tə **(a n)nu mənɪnnə** Giovinazzo BA (ibid.)
 'I called a child'
 - g) acchiòtte da nànze **nu uardiéne** notturne ca canesciéve Capurso, BA (Pastore 2002:61)
 'he found in front of him a nightwatch whom he knew'
 - h) jóune [...] s'ha peggjéte **a nnu sargènde** Polignano, BA (CRSEC 2001:8)
 'a person took a sergeant (as a fiancé)'
 - i) ajjə came:tə **a nnu kristiənə** Taranto, TA₁ (M&S 2005:II,507)
 'I called a person'
 - j) stamatina stè spittava **nu cristianu** Lizzano, TA₂
 'this morning I was waiting for a person'
 - k) aggiu visctu **na firminna** Squinzano, LE¹⁵
 'I saw a woman'
 - l) nunn aggiu mai vista **na cristiana** àcita comu a ttie Scorrano, LE (Presicce 2011)
 'I've never seen a person as bitter as you are'

The distribution of DOM with indefinites can be patchy: while optionality is attested in Apulo-Barese, e.g. Canosa (62e) and Giovinazzo (62f), possibly due to specificity (cf. also Andriani 2015, forthc.), the remaining varieties either never have DOM, i.e. Salentino (62i-j), or tend to generalise it to all indefinites, e.g. Carpino (62a), perhaps with certain predicates in particular.

Our survey of indefinites begins with the sentence 'Gianni saw a child on the ground and called the local doctor', discussed in §2.3 for the definite DP 'the local doctor' and now partly shown below in (63). We observe the absence of DOM with the indefinite NP 'a child/boy' in most Apulian and Salentino varieties; the only three cases surface in N-C Apulian, namely in Mattinata (63a), Lucera (63c), and Trinitapoli (63f):

¹⁵ Recording available at [<https://www2.hu-berlin.de/vivaldi/>].

- 63) ‘to see a child/boy’: NP_[+specific]
- a) Giuann’òu uist’**a nnu uagnònà** pø ndèrrø Mattinata, FG
 - b) Giuann’a vistø **nu mèninna** pø nderra S.Marco, FG
 - c) Giuann’a vist’**a nu criatura** pø nderrø Lucera, FG
 - d) Giuann’a vvistø **nu criatura** pø nderrø Foggia, FG
 - e) Giuann’o vestø **nu criatourà** nderrø Cerignola, FG
 - f) Giuànn’o vist’**a nnu criatòura** ndèrrø Trinitapoli, BT
 - g) Giuènn’è vvistø **nu criatourà** ndèrrø Barletta, BT
 - h) Giuann’à vvèstø **nu peccanènnà** scèttetø ndérrø Mola, BA
 - i) Giuann’a vèstø **nu uègnèngiddà** ndèrrø Conversano, BA
 - j) Giuann’o vestø **nu piccennà** stènnoutø nderrø Putignano, BA
 - k) Giuann è vistø **nu criatura** nderrø Gravina, BA
 - l) (Giuann’à vistø lu piccinnø ndèrrø) Mottola, TA

 - m) Giuvanni è vistu **nu piccinnu** nterra S.Vito, BR
 - n) Gianni è vištu **nnu piccinnu** nterra Mesagne, BR
 - o) Sciani è vviſtu **nnu piccinnu** nterra Latiano, BR
 - p) Gianni è vistu **nu piccinnu** anterra Oria, BR
 - q) lu Gianni à bbistu **nu piccinnu** anterra Lecce, LE
 - r) lu Gianni cchiau **nu vagnuneddu** anterra Serrano, LE
 - s) u Gianni aje vistu **nu piccinnu** nterra Otranto, LE
 - t) u Gianni a vistu **nu vagnuneddu** nterra Maglie, LE

‘Gianni saw a (specific) child lying on the ground [...]’

Likewise, we retested the same exact V-O pair in another contexts, where we tried to enhance the level of identification/specificity of the indefinite NP ‘a child/boy’ by means of the relative clause ‘who wanted to enter the house’, but the results did not change:

- 64) ‘to see a child/boy’: NP_[+specific]
- a) mammà c’è scandatø quann’ा vist’**a nu criatura** chø valé trascì à casø Carpino
 - b) mammø c’è spavendétø quann’òu uist’**a nnu uagnònà** chø vulèvø trasi jindrø Mattinata
 - c) mammà a avutø paiura quann’ा vistø **nu meninna** chø cø vuleva fèccà intø la casa S.Marco
 - d) mamm’ा pagghiatø u malø quann’ा vist’**a nu criatura** chø vulevø trasi dind’à casø Lucera
 - e) mammà s’è scantatø quann’ा vistø **nu criatura** ca vulevø trasi nd’â cäsø Foggia
 - f) (mamm’o sckandotø quann’o vest’u criatourø ca vulòvø trasi nd’la còsø) Cerignola
 - g) mamm’o sckandötø quann’o vist’**a nnu criatòura** ca vulàivø trasi nd’ca ccösø Trinitapoli
 - h) mammin’è sckandatø quann’è vvistø **nu criatourà** ca ulévø trasi a ccäsø Barletta
 - i) mammø s’è ssckandet’acquann’à vvèstø **nu peccanènnà** ca vulàivø traséghìø jènd’acchësø Mola
 - j) mammø s’è aldarèt’acquann’à vèstø **nu uagnèngiddà** ca valéive trasi jènd’alla chèsø Conversano
 - k) mammø s’è assurmat’aqquann’o vestø **nu piccennà** ca vulevø trasejø nd’â casø Putignano
 - l) mamm’è spandatø quann’è vistø **nu zaraffà** ca vulài trasi nd’ca ccäsø Gravina
 - m) (mammø s’è assurmètø quann’ा vistø lu piccinnø ca vulèvø trasi nd’â chèsø) Mottola

 - n) mamma s’è mpaurita quannu è vistu **nu piccinnu** ca vuli’traseva nta casa S.Vito
 - o) mamma s’è spantata quandu è vištu **nnu vagnoni** ca vulia trasi ntra casa Mesagne
 - p) mama sbravintau quannu veddi **nnu piccinnu** ca vulia ttrasi ntra casa Latiano
 - q) mama s’è pigghiata paura quannu è vistu **nu vaggnioni** ca vulia trasia tru casa Oria
 - r) mama s’è pigghiata paura quannu è vistu **nu piccinnu** ca vuli trasia ntra casa Lizzano
 - s) mama s’ae mpaurata quandu à bbistu **nu piccinnu** ca ulia ttrasa ntru ccasa Lecce
 - t) mamma se mpaurau quandu vitte **nu vagnone** ca ulia cu trasa intru a casa Serrano
 - u) mamma s’è mparuata quandu a vistu **nu vagnone** ca ulia trase ccasa Otranto
 - v) (mamma, quannu a vistu ca nc’era nu vagnuneddu ca ulia trase ntru casa, s’è sciuntata) Maglie
- ‘Mum got scared when she saw a (specific) child/boy who wanted to enter the house’

Once again, the only varieties marking DOM on the indefinite, yet [+specific] referent ‘a child/boy’ are in the northern-most part of Apulia, i.e. Carpino (64a), Mattinata (64b), and Lucera (64d) (S.Marco (64c) excluded), and C Apulian from Trinitapoli (64g). These varieties also *a*-mark the same indefinite, kind-referring NP ‘a child/boy’ when [-specific] and in a generic context, while all remaining varieties accept the bare variant:

65) ‘to see a child/boy’: NP_[-specific]

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| a) la nànnə cə la sèndə quannə vèit’ a nnu uagnòuna də chiangə | Mattinata, FG |
| b) tattuccia cə nə preja quannə vedə nu meninna chə chiagnə | S.Marco, FG |
| c) a mammanonnə i ven’u currivə quannə ved’ a nu criatura chə chiagnə | Lucera, FG |
| d) nanonnə sə ndənəriscə quannə vedə nu criatura ca chiagnə | Foggia, FG |
| e) la nonnə sə chəmmovə quannə vodə nu criatourə ca chiangə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) nonònne sə chəmmòuvə quannə vait’ a nnu criatóura ca chiangə | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) a nónnə sə mètt’ a cchièngə quannə vatə nu criaturə ca chièngə | Barletta, BT |
| h) nononnə s’acchəlombə aquannə vaitə nu pəccənènnə ca chiangə | Mola, BA |
| i) la nonnə sə dəspièscə acquannə vēidə nu menènnə a chiangə | Conversano, BA |
| j) a nonnə s’emozionescə quannə verə nu piccennə ca chiangə | Putignano, BA |
| k) la nonnə sə mett’ a chiangə quannə vädə nu criatura ca chiangə | Gravina, BA |
| l) Nonnə sə dəspièscə quannə vètə nu piccinnə ca ste chiangə | Mottola, TA |
| m) la nonna si cummuvescia quannu veti nu piccinnu ca chianci | S.Vito, BR |
| n) la nonna si commòvi quandu veti nnu piccinnu ca chiangi | Mesagne, BR |
| o) alla nonna li veni sempri lu chiantillu quannu veti nnu piccinnu ca chiangi | Latiano, BR |
| p) la nonna li scappunu li lacrimi quannu veti nnu piccinnu ca chiangi | Oria, BR |
| q) la mamma rande se cummoe quandu ite nu piccinnu ca chiange | Lecce, LE |
| r) la nonna chiange sempre quandu vite nu vagnuneddu ca chiange | Serrano, LE |
| s) a nonna se nnutica quandu vide na criatura ca change | Otranto, LE |
| t) a nonna s’emuziona quannu vide nu piccinnu ca chiange | Maglie, LE |
- ‘Grandma is always moved when she sees a(ny) child crying’

From the examples above, showing the same specific (63)-(64) and non-specific (65) indefinite NP selected by the verb ‘to see’, it is evident that specificity does not seem to be playing a central role in any varieties. Indeed, these either mark the NP in all cases examined, or they do not, irrespective of specificity.

This scenario is confirmed by the indefinite referent ‘a criminal’ selected by the verb ‘to kill’, which would imply a higher level of affectedness of the object:

66) ‘to kill a dangerous criminal’: NP_[+specific]

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| a) quédda uàrdi’òu dittə c’ajirə ànn’accis’ a nnu crəmənélə prəchəlusə | Mattinata, FG |
| b) dda wuardi’ a ditte chə jerə ann’accisə nu crəmənalə pəricolosə | S.Marco, FG |
| c) quillu uardi’ à dittə c’ajirə à ccisə nu sortə də dəlinguèndə | Lucera, FG |
| d) u guàrdi’ a ditte c’ajirə ann’accis’ a nu crəmənalə pəricolösə | Foggia, FG |
| e) Quedda guardi’o dettə c’ajirə ann’acceisə nu crəmənòlə pərəculòsə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) Cüddə vigel’o ditte c’ajirə onn’accés’ a nnu dəlinguèndə pərəculóusə | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) U poləzziótt’ è ddittə c’ajirə ann’accisə nu malamində | Barletta, BT |
| h) Chéda uàrdi’ a ddettə c’ajirə an’accéisə nu crəmənélə pərəchəlëusə | Mola, BA |
| i) Chédda uardi’ a dèttə c’ajire ann’acciəsə nu malvuvéndə pəricolóusə | Conversano, BA |
| j) Chera guardi’o dettə c’ajirə on’accesə nu malacarnə pərəchəlousə | Putignano, BA |
| k) Chedda uardi’ è dittə c’ajirə ann’acceis’ a nu malavətousə pericolousə | Gravina, BA |
| l) Chera uardi’ à dittə c’ajire an’acciəsə nu malacarnə pərəchəlusə | Mottola, TA |
| m) Quera uardia è dittu ca jeri annu ccisu nu delinquenti piriculoso | S.Vito, BR |
| n) Quedda uàrdia è dittu ca ieri annu ccisu nnu criminali piriculòsu | Mesagne, BR |
| o) Quedda uardia è ddittu ca ieri onnu ccisu nnu filandrinu tangilusu | Latiano, BR |
| p) Quedda uardia è dittu ca ieri onnu ccisu nnu bruttu criminali | Oria, BR |

- q) d̥da uardia à ddittu ca ieri annu ccisu **nu criminale periculosu** Lecce, LE
 r) d̥da guardia ave dittu ca ieri ane ccisu **nu latru fiaccu fiaccu** Serrano, LE
 s) d̥da guardia a dittu ca ieri annu ccisu **nu criminale pericolosu** Otranto, LE
 t) (d̥da guardia a ittu ca jeri annu ccisu unu fiaccu propiu) Maglie, LE
 ‘That policeman said that **a dangerous criminal** was killed yesterday (lit. they killed **a criminal**)’

Compared to the sentences with ‘to see a child/boy’, ‘to kill a [+specific] criminal’ allows DOM in more Apulian varieties (but never Salentino ones), namely those of Foggia (66d) and Gravina (66k), beside those of Mattinata (66a) and Trinitapoli (66f), which *a*-marked all indefinites hitherto considered. Crucially, the same verb-object pair ‘to kill a criminal’ with [-specific] interpretation sees an increase in the occurrence of DOM from five to seven N-C Apulian varieties, i.e. Mattinata, Foggia, Cerignola, Trinitapoli, Barletta, Mola, and Gravina:

- 67) ‘**to kill a criminal**: NP_[-specific]
- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| a) nn’è ggiustə ca la puləzz’accit’ a nnu dəlinguenda senza fē u procèssə | Mattinata, FG |
| b) non è justə ca la polizzia accidə nu dəlinguenda senza processə | S.Marco, FG |
| c) nn’è juste si a puluzzei’accidə nu dəlinguenda senza prucissə | Lucera, FG |
| d) nn’è michə giustə s’ a pulizi’accid’ a nu mariula senza fa u prucissə | Foggia, FG |
| e) nənn’è giustə ca la puləzz’accid’ a nu crəmənəla senza nu processə | Cerignola, FG |
| f) nann’è ggiüstə cə la pulezzéi’accét’ a nnu dəlinguénda senza pruciessə | Trinitapoli, BT |
| g) nann’jè ggiæstə cə la polizzi’accit’ a nnu malamində sìntza procissə | Barletta, BT |
| h) na jē ggiöstə ca i gendarmə accéitən’ a nnu malandreina sénz’u praciessə | Mola, BA |
| i) nann’i giostə ca i guardi’accèdənə nu malvuvénda senza mang’u procéssə | Conversano, BA |
| j) nann’jè giostə c’ a pulzzei’acerə nu malacarna senza processə | Putignano, BA |
| k) nann’è giustə cə la puləzz’accit’ a nu malavətousə senza fē u processə | Gravina, BA |
| l) na jé giostə cə la pulizi’accitə nu malacarna senza fē lu prucissə | Mottola, TA |
| m) no è na cosa giusta ci la polizia ccidi nu delinquente senza pruciessu | S.Vito, BR |
| n) non è ggiuſtu ci la polizia cciti nnu criminali senza pruciessu | Mesagne, BR |
| o) no è gghiūſtu ci li uardi cciunu nnu filandrīnu senza prucessu | Latiano, BR |
| p) la polizia nno po’ccitiri nnu criminali senza processu, nno eti giustu | Oria, BR |
| q) nu bbè ggiustu s̥ci la polizzia ccide nu criminale senza prucessu | Lecce, LE |
| r) nun ete ggiustu se le guardie ccitune nu latru senza nu processu | Serrano, LE |
| s) a polizia nu pote ccidire nu criminale senza lli face u processu | Otranto, LE |
| t) nun è giustu a polizia cu ccide nu dilinquentə senza cu li face u prucessu | Maglie, LE |
- ‘It’s unfair if the police kills **a(ny) criminal** without a trial’

From the perspective whereby [+specific] indefinites are more prone to be *a*-marked, the steep increase in the marking of a [-specific] NP is unexpected. Allegedly, for those varieties which did not *a*-mark the specific referent ‘a dangerous criminal’, i.e. Cerignola (67e), Barletta (67g), and Mola (67h), such a behaviour might only be ascribed to the imperfectivity of the generic event in (67) vs the perfectivity of the punctual event in (66). This type of trigger was already proposed in §2.3 for definite DPs with certain predicates and, indeed, this aspectual sensitivity seems to only be relevant with the predicate ‘to kill’ (67), but not ‘to see’ (65). Hence, we could argue that the type of predicate and, in particular, its (im)perfective aspect, may actually be decisive for DOM to occur with referents lower on the definiteness scale, yet highly affected.

Our results are confirmed by those varieties present in the recordings of Aesop’s fable *la tramontana e il sole*¹⁶ ‘the North Wind and the Sun’ (68) and the *Parabola del figliuol prodigo* ‘the Parable of the Prodigal Son’ (69):

- 68) ‘**to see a bypasser**: NP_[+specific]

¹⁶ Recordings available at [https://www.lfsag.unito.it/ark/trm_map.html]. For some transcriptions of these recordings, see also [https://fgranatiero.wordpress.com/]. See also Romano (2019) for Salentino, from which some of the transcriptions in (67) are taken.

a)	quand'ècce vedèren' <u>a nu crestiane</u>	Mattinata, FG
b)	decchire i viarund un pellerinne	Celle, FG
c)	quanne vedèrene <u>nu ppassande</u>	Andria, BT
d)	quanne vedèren' <u>a nu crestiéne</u>	Bisceglie, BT
e)	Quanne vederen' <u>a nnu crestiane</u>	Martina Franca, TA
f)	Quanne vider <u>a nnu passande</u>	Taranto, TA = Statte, TA
g)	Quannu videru <u>nna cristiana</u>	Francavilla Fontana, BR
h)	Quandu iddera <u>nu cristianu</u>	Lecce, LE
i)	Quandu vittera <u>nu cristianu</u>	Galatina, LE
j)	Quanno ànno vistu <u>nu cristianu</u> 'when they saw a bypasser/person (who was arriving)'	Maglie, LE

(69) **'to call a servant': NP[-specific]**

a)	Chiamase nu serve	Castelluccio Valmaggiore, FG (Melillo 1970:63-64)
b)	Chiamò nu servitor	Molfetta, BA (Salvioni 1913:32)
c)	e cchiamò ne sèrve	Matera, MT (Caratù 1981:85)
d)	Chiamau nu sirvitori 'he called a servant'	Brindisi, BR (Salvioni 1913:35)

In these two contexts, the two predicates ‘to see’ and ‘to call’ take the animate complements ‘a person/bypasser’ and ‘a servant’, respectively – however, note that indefinite *nu crestiane* ‘a person’ is more likely to be *a*-marked on a par with its pronominal counterparts ‘one’ or ‘someone’ (cf. also Andriani 2015 for Barese). While with the verb ‘to call’ there is no trace of DOM (69), with ‘to see’, the *a*-marked indefinite objects appear in Mattinata (68a), consistent with our findings, and in the area of Taranto (68e-f), as reported by M&S (2005:II,507). In Apulo-Barese, there is more alternation, as Bisceglie (68d) patterns with our results for Trinitapoli, both on the Adriatic coast, while Andria (68c) is more similar to what M&S report for Minervino (62d) and Canosa (62e) varieties, the three in the hinterland of the BT province. Instead, all Salentino speakers who recite the story do not show any instances of DOM with this specific referent.

3. Conclusion

This contribution provided a first mapping of the occurrence of DOM across the varieties of Apulia by considering a selection of nominal expressions at different levels of the definiteness scale, and paying particular attention to their specificity, as well as the selecting predicates. While Salentino shows a very limited distribution of DOM, N-C Apulian varieties present the *a*-marking in a larger number of contexts. In particular, the following broad tendencies can be gathered from this preliminary survey:

- i. personal pronouns form a compact, lexicalised class with which DOM is essentially obligatory across all Apulian and Salentino varieties, as expected from the typological and diachronic literature on DOM.
- ii. specificity may be a crucial DOM-trigger for the highly referential expressions, such as proper names and kinship terms, as they identify unique referents, but it does not seem to be relevant for the selection of DOM at the lower levels of the definiteness scale, as we observed with the many [-specific] *a*-marked referents.
- iii. The types of predicate involved seem to play a role in the selection of DOM: more instances were recorded for the verbs ‘to greet/help/kill’, whereas other transitive predicates, e.g. ‘to see/call/meet/wash’, showed a much more limited distribution of DOM. Differences in the *a*-marking across varieties can be ascribed to the higher affectedness of the object (typical of verbs involving transfer), as well as the (im)perfectivity of the action/event; however, some (vestigial) factors of lexical/etymological nature, i.e. dative-selecting predicates, should not be discarded either (cf. footnote 3).
- iv. In those N-C Apulian varieties where DOM is present at the lower levels of the definiteness scale, the internal composition of the DP/NP does not seem to be crucial. Indeed, while determinerless referents tend to be *a*-marked more often than those with an overt determiner, within the latter group, we do not observe that definite DPs (bar kinship terms) are more

marked than indefinite NPs, as it would be predicted from the definiteness scale. This allegedly suggests that the *a*-marking may indeed fulfil the semantico-syntactic role of the missing determiner in determinerless nominal expressions, on a par with what happens with indefinite NPs, where their D-layer is not lexicalised by any element. In definite expressions, we possibly see a lower occurrence of DOM (with certain predicates) because definite articles and demonstratives (in N Apulian especially) already match the semantic features expressed by the *a*, i.e. referentiality and definiteness, hence, they can resist the *a*-marking (cf. Müller 1971 for a similar proposal on the development of DOM in early Romance). Crucially, we have also briefly observed that DOM is favoured with clitic-doubled, topical definite nouns, which might be the reason behind the low frequency of the *a*-marking with non-clitic-doubled DPs, while indefinites, which prototypically convey new information, do not require doubling to be *a*-marked.

- v. As for determiners, we uncovered a divide between N and C Apulian varieties, in that DPs with demonstratives only seem to be *a*-marked in C Apulian varieties, and never in N Apulian varieties (except for Foggia); similarly, indefinite NPs appear more often *a*-marked in N Apulian, than in C Apulian varieties.

Further research is needed to shed light on other potential DOM-triggers, by testing more environments where DOM may occur, i.e. clitic-resumed topicalised constituents, embeddings, as well as a wider array of predicates (such as that in Pineda 2016, 2020) and other types of objects, such as different types of quantified DPs. Moreover, the role of language contact between these varieties and Italian should also be carefully assessed in relation to the optionality in the realisation of DOM at the lower levels of the definiteness hierarchy, where we find the highest degree of alternation between *a*-marked and unmarked direct objects.

LUIGI ANDRIANI
Universiteit Utrecht

Department of TLC / Taalwetenschap – UiL OTS,
Faculty of Humanities,
Universiteit Utrecht,
Trans 10, 3512JK,
Utrecht,
Països Baixos
L.andriani@uu.nl

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions, and the tireless Onkar Singh for having shared his thoughts with me on the final version of this paper. In such a difficult period for on-field research, my heartfelt gratitude goes to all my informants, as well as the mediators who helped me reaching more Apulian native speakers: Luigi Conte, Gianni Pipoli, Nicola Ruggiero, and Giovanni Tortorella. This research was made possible by the European Research Council under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (grant agreement CoG 681959_MicroContact). All errors and imprecisions are the author's sole responsibility.

References

- Aissen, J. (2003) «Differential Object Marking: iconicity vs economy», *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 21(3), p. 435-483.
Andriani, L. (2015) «Semantic and Syntactic Properties of the Prepositional Accusative in Barese», *Linguistica Atlantica* 34(2): 61-78.
Andriani, L. (2017) *The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari*. University of Cambridge, PhD dissertation.

- Andriani, L. (Forthcoming) «Differential Object Marking in Barese: Old and new perspectives», in M. A. Irimia & A. Mardale (eds.), *Differential Object Marking in Romance: Towards Micravariazione*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Andriani, L., R. D'Alessandro, A. Frasson, B. van Osch, L. Sorgini & S. Terenghi (2022) «Adding the microdimension to the study of language change in contact. Three case studies», *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 7(1).
- Andriani, L., R. Perlin & D. Kaufman (Forthcoming) «Dialetti in diaspora: loss and retention in Italian New York», in F. Goglia & J. Hayek (eds.), *Italian(s) abroad: Italian language and migration in the cities of the world*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Beavers, John (2011) «On Affectedness», *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 29, p. 335-370.
- Belletti, Adriana (2004), «Aspects of the Low IP Area», in L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 16-51.
- Benincà, Paola (1988) «L'ordine degli elementi della frase. Costruzioni con ordine marcato degli elementi», in L. Renzi (ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume 1: La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale*, Bologna, il Mulino, p. 129-194.
- Bentley, D., F. M. Ciconte & S. Cruschina (eds.) (2014). *I dialetti d'Italia: fiabe, favole e racconti*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
- Bentley, Delia, Francesco M. Ciconte & Silvio Cruschina (2015) *Existentials and Locatives in Romance Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Berretta, Monica (1991) «Note sulla sintassi dell'accusativo preposizionale in italiano», *Linguistica*, 31, p. 211-232.
- Bossong, G. (1985) *Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den Neuiranischen Sprachen*, Tübingen, Narr Verlag.
- Bossong, G. (1991) «Differential Object Marking in Romance and Beyond.», in D. Wanner & D. A. Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Urbana-Champaign, April 7-9, 1988*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 143-170.
- Brugé, Laura & Gerhard Brugger (1994) «On the accusative *a* in Spanish», *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4(1), p. 2-43.
- Caratù, Pasquale (ed.) (1981) *I dialetti della Lucania: la parabola del figliuol prodigo nei dialetti italiani*, Bari, Università degli Studi.
- Ciccotti, C. (2013) *Studio comparato sull'uso dell'accusativo preposizionale in spagnolo, italiano e dialetto di Montemesola*, University of Bologna, Bachelor's thesis.
- Comrie, B. (1979) «Definite and animate objects: a natural class», *Linguistica Silesiana*, 3, p. 15-21.
- Comrie, B. (1989) *Language Typology and Linguistic Universals: Syntax and Morphology*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Croft, W. (1988) Agreement vs. case marking and direct objects. In M. Barlow & C. Ferguson (eds.), *Agreement in Natural Languages: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*, Stanford, CA, Center for the Study of Language and Information, p. 159-179.
- CRSEC = Centro Regionale dei Servizi Educativi e Culturali Monopoli – Polignano a Mare (2001) Tuppe tuppe lu pertengine. Antichi canti raccolti a Polignano a Mare. *Quadernetti del C.r.s.e.c. n.3*. Monopoli, BA, Vivere.
- Cruschina, S. (2012) *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*, Oxford & New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cuervo, M. C. (2003) *Datives at large*, MIT, PhD dissertation.
- D'Alessandro, R. (2017) «When you have too many features: auxiliaries, agreement, and clitics in Italian varieties», *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 2, p. 50.
- De Angelis, A. (2019) «Articolo espletivo e marcatura differenziale dell'oggetto nel dialetto reggino di San Luca», *L'Italia Dialettale*, 80, p. 59-76.
- Diesing, M. (1992) *Indefinites*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Enç, M. (1991) «The Semantics of Specificity», *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, p. 1-25.
- Fidanza, O. (1992) *I proverbi del terrazzano*. Ms., Bari, Istituto di Antropologia culturale.
- Granatiero, F. (1987) *Grammatica del dialetto di Mattinata*, Foggia, Edigraf.
- Guardiano, C. (2010) «L'oggetto diretto preposizionale in siciliano. Una breve rassegna e qualche domanda», in J. Garzonio (ed.), *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* ("Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia"), 11, p. 83-101.

- Hopper, P. J. & S. A. Thompson (1980) «Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse», *Language*, 56(2), p. 251-299.
- Iemmolo, G. (2010) Topicality and differential object marking: Evidence from Romance and beyond. *Studies in Language*, 34, p. 239-272.
- Kattenbusch, D. (1982) *Das Frankoprovenzalische in Südtalien. Studien zur synchronischen und diachronischen Dialektologie*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr.
- Ledgeway, A. (2000) *A comparative syntax of southern Italian dialects: A Minimalist approach*, Oxford, Wiley.
- Ledgeway, A. (2009) *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Ledgeway, A. (Forthcoming), Parametric variation in Differential Object Marking in the Dialects of Italy. In M. A. Irimia & A. Mardale (eds.), *Differential Object Marking in Romance: Towards Microrvariation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Ledgeway, A., N. Schifano & G.S Silvestri (2019) «Differential object marking and the properties of D in the dialects of the extreme south of Italy», *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 4(1), 51.
- Leonetti, M. (2004) «Specificity and differential object marking in Spanish», *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), p. 75-114.
- Leonetti, M. (2008) «Specificity in clitic doubling and in differential object marking», *Probus*, 20, 33-66.
- López, L. (2016) (In)definiteness, Specificity, and Differential Object Marking. In S. Fisher & C. Gabriel (eds.), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, p. 241-266.
- Loporcaro, M. (1988) *Grammatica storica del dialetto di Altamura*, Pisa, Giardini.
- Loporcaro, M. (1997) Puglia and Salento. In Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*, London, Routledge, p. 338-348.
- Loporcaro, M. (2021) *La Puglia e il Salento*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Lyons, C. (1999) *Definiteness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mancarella, Gian Battista (1975) *Salento*, Pisa, Pacini.
- Manzini, M. R. & L. M. Savoia (2005) *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa (3 vol.)*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Manzini, M. R. & L. Franco (2016) «Goal and DOM datives», *Natural Language and Linguist Theory*, 34, p. 197-240.
- Melillo, M. (ed.) (1970) *I dialetti di Puglia: la Parabola del Figliuol Prodigio nei dialetti italiani*, Rome, Archivio etnico linguistico musicale.
- Montrul, S. & M. Bowles (2009) «Back to basics: Differential object marking under incomplete acquisition in Spanish heritage speakers», *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12, p. 363-383.
- Montrul, S. & N. Bateman (2020) «Differential object marking in Romanian as a heritage language», in A. Mardale & S. Montrul (eds.), *The Acquisition of Differential Object Marking*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 283-312.
- Müller, B. (1971) «Das morfem-markierte Satzobjekt der romanischen Sprachen (Der sogenannte präpositionale Akkusativ)», *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 87, p. 477-519.
- Næss, Å. (2004) What markedness marks: the markedness problem with direct objects, *Lingua*, 114, p. 1186-1212.
- Nagy, N. (2000) *Faetar*, Munich, Lincom.
- Pastore, G. (2002) *Lessico caprese*, Bari, Levante.
- Pellegrini, G. B. (1977) *Carta dei dialetti d'Italia*, Pisa, Pacini.
- Pineda, A. (2016) *Les fronteres de la (in)transitivitat. Estudi dels aplicatius en llengües romàniques i basc*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Món Juïc.
- Pineda, A. (2020) «From Dative to Accusative. An Ongoing Syntactic Change in Romance», *Probus. International Journal of Romance Linguistics*, 32(1), p. 129-173.
- Presicce, G. (2011) *Il dialetto salentino come si parla a Scorrano*. Available at [<http://www.dialettosalentino.it>]
- Rohlfs, G. (1969) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Turin, Einaudi.
- Rohlfs, G. (1971) «Autour de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes: concordances et discordances», *Revue de linguistique romane*, 35, p. 312-334.
- Romano, A. (2019) «Prima descrizione della continuazione intonativa nelle versioni salentine de “La tramontana e il sole”», *Studi linguistici salentini*, 37, p. 43-58.
- Salvioni, C. (1913) «Versioni pugliesi della parabola del “Figliuol Prodigio”», *Apulia*, 1-2, p. 20-36.

- Silverstein, Michael (1976) «Hierarchy of features and ergativity», in R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, Atalantic Highlands, NJ, Humanities Press, p. 112-171.
- Singh, O. (2019) *The Emergence of Differential Object Marking in Spoken Northern Italian – A Syntactic Investigation*, Univeristy of Cambridge, MPhil thesis.
- Sornicola, R. (1997) «L'oggetto preposizionale in siciliano antico e in napoletano antico. Considerazioni su un problema di tipologia diacronica». *Italienische Studien*, 18, p. 66-80.
- Torrego, E. (1998) *The Dependencies of Objects*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Tosto, E. (2007) *Studi sul dialetto di Torremaggiore (Foggia). Quaderno 2*, Florence, Centro A-Z.
- Tosto, E. (2008) *Studi sul dialetto di Torremaggiore (Foggia). Quaderno 4*, Florence, Centro A-Z.
- Valente, Vincenzo (1975) *Puglia*, Pisa, Pacini.
- Vendler, Z. (1967) *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.
- Zaza, M. (1996) *U ndrettiene/il passatempo: prose dialettali con testi italiani*, Molfetta, BA, Edirespa.