

# Differential Object Marking in Barese: Old and new perspectives

Luigi Andriani

*Universiteit Utrecht*

\*\*\* *Draft accepted for publication in: Irimia, Monica-Alexandrina & Mardale, Alexandru (eds.), Differential Object Marking in Romance: Towards Microvariation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.*

## Abstract

This article describes the behaviour of Differential Object Marking in Barese in the light of a preliminary study conducted by the author, which is here refined and rectified thanks to sets of novel data. A variety of referents along the Definiteness Scale is considered and discussed, and these suggest that DOM in Barese is obligatory with highly specific and referential determiner-less elements, but it becomes optional, if not ungrammatical, with nouns modified by an overt functional element, e.g. (in)definite determiners, numerals, or quantifiers. Furthermore, two structural contexts block DOM in Barese, namely the co-occurrence of human direct and indirect objects, and whenever the DO is embedded under a perception verb.

**Keywords:** differential object marking, Barese, upper-southeastern Italo-Romance, Definiteness Scale, specificity.

## 1. Introduction

This article provides a description of the behaviour of Differential Object Marking (Bossong, 1985; DOM henceforth) in Barese, an upper-southern Italo-Romance variety spoken in Bari, Apulia. Previous preliminary studies, i.e. Andriani (2011; 2015), focused on a limited set of theoretical and

empirical factors of Barese DOM in comparison with Torrego's (1998) analysis of Spanish DOM. However, not all aspects of Barese DOM could be explored. This paper presents a more systematic study of DOM in Barese, so to obtain a complete and satisfactory overview of its fine-grained characteristics, while refining and complementing the previously established generalisations. Our overview will also allow us to better place the behaviour of the Barese DOM within highly variegated situation attested across (Italo-)Romance (for a comprehensive overview, see Manzini & Savoia, 2005; Ledgeway, this volume; for a first survey of DOM in the varieties of Apulia, see Andriani, in press).

On a par with most Italo-Romance varieties (excluding Marchigiano *ma* and Gallo-Sicilian *da*; Rohlf, 1969; 1971), Barese obligatorily marks human Direct Objects (DO) by means of the element *a* (< Latin AD). Note that the sole animacy feature, a canonical DOM-trigger, is not sufficient for DOM to surface in Barese, e.g. (1):<sup>1</sup>

- |     |                                       | [+HUMAN   | +ANIMATE                              | -ANIMATE]  |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| (1) | dʒu'wann                              | acca'mend | *(a) mma'riə <sub>ACC</sub> / (*a) la | 'gattə <sub>ACC</sub> / (*a) la 'lunə <sub>ACC</sub> |
|     | John                                  | looks     | DOM Mary                              | DOM the.F cat  |
|     |                                       |           |                                       | DOM the.F moon                                       |
|     | ‘John looks at Mary/the cat/the moon’ |           |                                       |  |

Indeed, the contrast between obligatory *\*(a)* and ungrammatical *(\*a)* marking with the transitive verb *acchiaməndà* ‘to watch/look at’ is mainly given by the semantic opposition between the [+human] DOs ‘Mary’ and the [+animate(/-human)] ‘cat’ (but see §3.3.2; also Manzini & Franco, 2016) and [-animate] feature of ‘the moon’. Moreover, clitic doubling is not a necessary condition for the Barese DOM to be licensed, as it happens in Romanian and most Spanish varieties, but the full DP may be resumed by a clitic in the relevant pragmatic context.

---

<sup>1</sup> While the numbered examples are presented in (simplified) IPA, the examples in the running text are largely based on Italian orthography, except for the adoption of schwa <ə>.



him’ (2) and ‘to my son’ (3a). However, the syncretic DATIVE-LOCATIVE clitic *ngə* in (3) becomes the only available option whenever it resumes the complement of heavy prepositions *vəcìnə a* ‘close to’ or *mbàccə a* ‘in front of’, thus ruling out the combination [\*ACCUSATIVE clitic – heavy DATIVE P+argument]. Indeed, the alternation between transitive and intransitive pattern can be considered a characteristic property of the ‘permissive’ argument structure of Barese verbs, and found in other southern Italo-Romance varieties.<sup>2</sup>

Once these basic properties of Barese are defined, we can (re)consider the findings in Andriani (2011; 2015) on Barese DOM, integrating these with broader sets of data<sup>3</sup> and focusing on issues which were not addressed in previous studies. For reasons of space, we will only briefly summarise (and rectify, when needed) Andriani’s findings as initial background information to provide a finer-grained description of the properties of Barese DOM. In particular, here we consider the semantic specifications of the different DO-referents, the verb classes which allow or (inherently) force DOM, and the pragmatico-syntactic contexts of its occurrence, to conclude that Barese DOM is essentially lexicalised with highly referential and specific referents, while it is optional with referents lower on the Definiteness Scale (see Section 2).

The paper is organised as follows: Section 2 briefly summarises the findings in Andriani (2011; 2015); in Section 3, we scrutinise novel sets of referents at different levels of the Definiteness Scale, while bearing in mind verb class and information structure of the contexts in which the *a*-marking

---

<sup>2</sup> In this respect, beside the resumption of human referents with ACCUSATIVE clitics in intransitive contexts (e.g. (2), (3a), as well as with *scrivə a* ‘to write to’, *(ar)rəspònne a* ‘to answer to’, *tələfonə a* ‘to phone-call’, and so forth; see Andriani, 2011, chs 3-4), Barese and other southern Italo-Romance varieties are well known to allow prototypically unaccusative verbs, such as *trasi/assi* ‘enter/exit (unaccusative)’, to take an agent/causer external argument and be interpreted as ‘to put in(side)/take out(side)’.

<sup>3</sup> The Barese data presented here mainly stem from spontaneous conversations, including some freely available audio-visual material, as well as my own field notes (2011-2017) collected from speakers from different areas of the city (mainly Bari vecchio, Japigia, Libertà, Madonnella, and San Paolo). The modern data are compared to those found in written sources – mainly dialogues – from early 1900, to check whether any changes have taken place.

surfaces (or not); in Section 4, we discuss two syntactic contexts blocking Barese DOM; Section 5 summarises our findings on Barese DOM, and draws some conclusions on its behaviour.

## 2. A preliminary overview on Barese DOM

In the preliminary study by Andriani (2011; 2015), the properties of Barese DOM are discussed in comparison with Torrego's (1998) description and analysis of DOM (among other related phenomena) in peninsular Spanish. She identifies six main properties which trigger, block, or favour DOM, namely: (i) ability to be doubled by clitics; (ii) specificity of the DO; (iii) shift of the aspectual classes of the verb; (iv) agentivity of the subject; (v) animacy and (vi) (degree of) affectedness of the DO. Of these six properties, Andriani (2011; 2015) argues that only three are relevant in Barese, i.e. the agentivity of the subject, and the humanness and specificity of the DO. In contrast, the three remaining properties do not seem to trigger DOM in Barese. Moreover, Andriani adopts Ledgeway & Lombardi's (2005) partition of *adverb spaces* within the clause in order to determine the position of the *a*-marked DO, which is not higher than the *vP*, as it follows the *vP*-adverb *bbù(é)nə* 'well' (cf. Cinque, 1999). Hence, Andriani concludes that specificity (Enç, 1991; Diesing, 1992; Chomsky, 1995, p. 352; Torrego, 1998, p. 14) is the ultimate trigger for the Barese *a*-marking (i.e. D-feature checking against *v* and subsequent raising to Spec-*vP*), in line with Torrego's (1998) and Ledgeway's (2000) analyses for Spanish and Neapolitan DOM, respectively.

Although syntactic definiteness (see Lyons, 1999) constitutes a basic component in Andriani's work when discussing the specificity of the referents, the interplay of the former with the latter is not always explicitly addressed (among other factors). For this reason, in Table 1, we adapt and combine the Animacy, Definiteness, and Specificity Scales discussed in Aissen (2003, p. 437) and von Heusinger & Kaiser (2005, p. 38) in order to represent Andriani's (2011; 2015) findings:

**Table 1: Preliminary summary of the distribution of DOM in Barese**

Specificity	+ SPECIFIC			– SPECIFIC	
	+DEFINITE			– DEFINITE	
Anim. / Def. >	pronoun	proper N	+ def. NP	+ spec. NP	– spec. NP
HUMAN	+	+	+	+	–
ANIMATE	+	±	± (+hum)	–	–
INANIMATE	–	±	–	–	–

The results in Table 1 will be updated (see Table 4, §5) after the scrutiny of our new set of Barese data. However, as soon as we consider a larger typology of referents, as well as a finer-grained selection of syntactic and pragmatic contexts, Barese DOM appears to have a more limited distribution than initially investigated.

### 3. A new overview of Barese DOM

Bearing in mind Table 1, we shall reconsider the following variables when reassessing the occurrence of Barese DOM in our small database (cf. Bossong, 1982, pp. 580–581; 1991, p. 159):

(i) *inherent/lexical* properties of the D(P)/NP, i.e. [animacy [humanness]], [singular/plural], [kin], [pronoun]; (ii) *non-inherent/referential* properties of the D(P)/NP, i.e. (in)definiteness and specificity/identification. While our discussion will particularly focus on the semantic properties above, we will also be paying attention to the pragmatic function of the DO, i.e. whether a Topic or a Focus (cf. Rizzi, 1997; Belletti, 2004; Cruschina, 2012; among many others), and its discourse-related deixis within the interlocutors' Common Ground knowledge; the type of (di)transitive *v*P-configuration, and the *thematic/eventive* structure of the transitive (complex) predicate.

### 3.1. Pronouns with human referents

We begin our survey from pronouns, as the presence vs absence of DOM with pronouns vs non-pronouns, respectively, is a cross-linguistically robust and well-attested tendency in differential-marking systems (Comrie, 1989, p. 195).

#### 3.1.1. Personal pronouns

Indeed, Barese personal pronouns are all obligatorily *a*-marked, which also triggers the lengthening of the following (semi-)consonant. These phono-syntactic flags allow the Barese pronominal system to disambiguate between NOMINATIVE from ACCUSATIVE(/DATIVE) tonic pronouns in all persons, except [1SG] and [2SG], which have distinct morphological forms (boldfaced in Table 2).

**Table 2: NOMINATIVE vs ACCUSATIVE(/DATIVE) personal pronouns in Barese**

	[1SG]	[2SG]	[3SG]	[1PL]	[2PL]	[3PL]
NOM	<b>'ji</b>	<b>'tu</b>	'jiddə <sub>M</sub> /jəddə <sub>F</sub>	'nu	'vu	'lorə
ACC(/DAT)	<b>a 'mmɛ</b>	<b>a 'ttɛ</b>	a 'jjiddə <sub>M</sub> /'jjəddə <sub>F</sub>	a 'nnu	a 'vvu	a 'llorə

Barese DOM is obligatory with *discourse-participant* 1<sup>st</sup>- and 2<sup>nd</sup>-person pronouns (4)-(8), including the polite form *səgnəri* (< (vəs)səgnəri < *vostra signoria* ‘your lordship’) (8), as well as *non-discourse-participant* 3<sup>rd</sup>-person pronouns (9)-(10) – unlike in the neighbouring dialect of Altamura, where Loporcaro (1988, p. 269, fn. 3) attests the optionality of the *a*-marking with 3<sup>rd</sup>-person pronouns, or Ariellese, where only *discourse participants* are marked (D’Alessandro, 2017):

- (4) mə 'pɔrtə a 'mmɛ e ppas'kwinə  
 1SG brings DOM me and Pasquina  
 ‘he takes me and Pasquina (with him somewhere else)’

(5) a 'mmɛ | a bbarə'veccə | mə ca'mavənə 'ddʒuljə də lə zgaʎ'ʌottə  
 DOM me at Bari vecchio 1SG called.IMPV.3PL Giulia of the fritters  
 'in Bari Vecchia, I was called Giulia of the polenta fritters'

(6) (a 'ttɛ) 'vol a 'ttɛ ?  
 DOM you wants DOM you  
 'does he want (to be with) you?'

(7) ka 'nu | a 'vvu 'stam a aspət'ta  
 that we DOM you.PL stand.1PL to wait  
 '(make it quick,) it is you we're waiting for'

(8) e a ssəŋŋə'ri | fə tə ka'nəʃfə ? (Solfato, 2008, 13)  
 and DOM you.POL who 2SG knows  
 'and who are you supposed to be (lit. 'who knows you')?'

(9) 'mo ca'mam a 'jjɪddə e ssən'dimə f a ndravə'nutə (Solfato, 2008, 29)  
 now call.1PL DOM he and hear.1PL what has occurred  
 'now we'll call him (here) to understand what's happening'

(10) mənə'malə ka 'tɛŋg a 'jjɛddə/ 'llorə  
 less-bad that have.1SG DOM she they  
 'luckily I have got (people like) her/them'

It is clear from the examples above that personal pronouns bear DOM irrespective of their pragmatic functions, be those Clitic Right (4) and Left (5 and 8) Dislocations, as well as non-clitic-resumed high (7) and low (9)-(10) informational/contrastive Foci. Crucially, two important points concerning Barese DOM ought to be highlighted:

- i. it is obligatory with personal pronouns in complement position of predicates which normally do not trigger DOM, i.e. possessive *tənə* 'to have' in (10), or *fā* (*lə figghia*) 'to have



(children)', e.g. *facì a mmè* '(mum) had **me**' (see examples (40), §3.3.1, and (78), §3.5). This suggests that it is the personal pronoun forcing DOM regardless of the type of verb;

- ii. While the [1SG] personal pronoun *a mme* in the coordinated pair in (4) is *a*-marked, as well as resumed by the doubling clitic pronoun *mə*, the second conjunct *Pasquina* remains unmarked (even if it is a proper noun; cf. §3.1.3). A preposition-less second conjunct would not be the allowed with a dative complement, e.g. *Giuànnə ha ddàtə n'anìəddə a mme e \*(a) Pasquina* 'John gave a ring **to** me and **to** Pasquina'.

### 3.1.2. Demonstrative pronouns

On a par with 3<sup>rd</sup>-person pronouns with animate referents, demonstrative pronouns – whose NOMINATIVE vs ACCUSATIVE forms are shown in Table 3 – are obligatorily *a*-marked, as exemplified in (11)-(14):

**Table 3: NOMINATIVE vs ACCUSATIVE(/DATIVE) demonstrative pronouns in Barese**

	<i>this</i> [3SG]	<i>that</i> [3SG]	<i>these</i> [3PL]	<i>those</i> [3PL]
NOM	'kʊssə <sub>M</sub> /'kɛssə <sub>F</sub>	'kʊddə <sub>M</sub> /'kɛddə <sub>F</sub>	'kɪssə	'kɪddə
ACC(/DAT)	a 'kʊssə <sub>M</sub> /'kɛssə <sub>F</sub>	a 'kʊssə <sub>M</sub> /'kɛssə <sub>F</sub>	a 'kɪssə	a 'kɪddə

- (11) 'siənd                      **a**        'kɛssə/ 'kɛddə/        'kɪddə

listen.2SG.IMP        DOM this.F        that.F        those

'listen to this /that /those'

- (12) k    ak'si    **la**        'mɛttən        **a**        'kɛdde |    kəm'ma        tra'motə        (Solfato, 2008, 15)

that    so    her    put.3PL        DOM that.F        godmother earthquake

'because this is how they nickname her: madam earthquake'

- (13) 'tu |    'kom        **u**        aw'wand        **a**        'kʊddə

you    as        him    grab.INF        DOM that.M

‘as soon as you put your hands on him’

(14) e    tʃə    s    u    'av a sər'ca    a    'kkoddə    'ʃiənd 'annə? (Solfato, 2008, 19)

and who    self    him    has-to suck.INF    DOM    that.M    hundred years

‘and who’s going to stand him for a hundred years?’

The spatio-temporal, discourse, or affective deictic component encoded in demonstratives (cf. for Barese: Andriani, 2017, ch. 3, §4) reinforces the highly specific interpretation of the elliptical animate referents, thus favouring the *a*-marking, irrespective of predicate type or discourse function. This is also the general tendency of demonstrative adjectives modifying overt human nouns (§3.3.1), which appear *a*-marked more often than their counterparts with definite articles (§3.3.2) – arguably due to demonstratives’ deictic force, which favours the interpretation of the referent as specific.

### 3.2. Kinship terms and proper names

We now look at other elements without overt determiners, which usually refer to unique, highly referential entities, such as proper names, as well as kinship terms modified by an enclitic possessive. We begin by considering the latter, namely a closed set of kinship terms modified by a [1SG]-[2SG] enclitic possessive (cf. Andriani 2017, ch. 3, §3.1.2). Egerland (2013, p. 82) characterises these referents as inherently definite and specific (i.e. unique), whose semantics and pragmatics are comparable to that of proper names (cf. also Longobardi, 2005). For this reason, kinship terms with enclitic possessives of the type [N<sub>KIN</sub>+Poss<sub>CL</sub>] – except for (18) where the possessive is understood – are always *a*-marked in Barese:

(15) mi    j    a pər'ta    'pur a    mməj'ʃerə-mə ?    (Solfato, 2008, 42)

me    have-to bring.INF    also    DOM    wife-my

‘should I bring my wife too?’

- (16) 'mammə arrəma'ni ʃʃok'kat a vvə'de a 'ssrɛggə-mə  
 mum(-my) remained shocked to see.INF DOM father-in-law-my  
 'my mum was astounded when she saw my father-in-law'
- (17) nɔ lla 'pɔttəsə tə'ne aŋ'gor a 'mmamə-tə  
 not her can.3SG keep.INF still DOM mum-your  
 'I cannot keep your mum (with me) any longer'
- (18) 'dopə də 'dɛʃ 'annə sɔ 'vvist a 'mmamm e ppa'pæ  
 after of ten years am seen DOM mum(-my) and dad(-my)  
 'only after ten years could I see (my) mum and dad'
- (19) mənɔ'malə ka 'tiən a 'ffɪjə-tə  
 less-bad that have.2SG DOM son-your  
 'luckily you've got your son (with you)'

Once again, the *a*-marking is present in every pragmatic context, i.e. focused or topical information. Moreover, the marking persists in (19) with *tənɛ* 'to have, possess', as observed in (10) for personal pronouns, but disappears on second-coordinate conjuncts (18).

As for proper names, it is well-known that these are among the prototypical *a*-marked referents in most Romance varieties exhibiting DOM, and this generalisation is also confirmed for Barese by both old (Andriani, 2011; 2015) and new data:

- (20) u wəŋ'jonə 'jacc a kko'linə  
 the boy finds DOM Nicola.DIM  
 'the boy bumps into Nick'
- (21) si 'vvist a 'rrina ?  
 are.2SG seen DOM Rina  
 'have you seen Rina (over there)?'

- (22) paskwa'reddə | a vva'tottfə ɔnn arrə'statə  
 Pasqua.DIM DOM Vito.DIM have.3PL arrested  
 'Pasquina, they've arrested Vito!'
- (23) e ppər'ʃe u si allas'satə 'tu | a 'bbruno ?  
 and why him are.2SG left you DOM Bruno  
 'and why did you leave Bruno, then?'
- (24) 'camu-wə (ad) andʒe'linə  
 call.2SG.IMP-him DOM Angelo.DIM  
 'call him(,) Angelino'
- (25) 'rina | sa'lut a ttəle'nərbə  
 Rina greet.2SG.IMP DOM Telenorba  
 'Rina, say hi to (the camera of) Telenorba!'

In the examples above, both clitic-resumed (23 and 24) and non-clitic-resumed (20)-(22) proper names with DO-function bear the *a*-marking. Firstly, note that the presence/absence of the *a*-marking in the minimal pair in (24) determines the two different interpretations of *chiamà* 'to call', respectively: 'call Angelino' (+DOM) vs 'call him (by the name) Angelino' (–DOM). More importantly, (25) shows that the proper name of a local TV-channel, *Telenorba*, is *a*-marked even if inanimate; a similar context is discussed in Andriani (2011; 2015) for other (determiner-less) proper names attached to inanimate referents, e.g. the bicycle brand *Graziella*, but this behaviour may not always be consistent, as we will observe below. In this respect, it is also crucial to bear in mind that *salutà* 'to greet' pertains to those predicates with prototypically human DOs, which somehow favours (or forces) the *a*-marking even with inanimate DOs.

In contrast with the *a*-marked inanimate *Telenorba* in (25), (26) shows a context in which a traditional mobile ice-shaving station, called *Grattamarianna*, is not *a*-marked:

- (26) ak'kwannə    sɔ    vvən'nutə    **grattama'rjannə**  
 when            am    sold            Grattamarianna  
 ‘when I sold *Grattamarianna* (i.e. mobile ice-shaving station)’

The lack of DOM may be due to the opposite situation described above for *salutà*, as *vènnə* ‘to sell’ would rarely have a [+human] DO as its complement. Moreover, unlike *(\*la) Telenorba*, *(la) Grattamarianna* may also behave as a common noun, thus, with an overt determiner (but also less prone to personification and, hence, not used as the proper name of the object, even though it contains one, *Marianna*).

Far from the norm discussed above for (20)-(23), the situation in (27)-(28) appears even more controversial, since the proper name *Annamaria* and the nickname *Minuicchio* appear bare:

- (27) sɔ    jjavə'tatə    'kwasə    'trɛ    'jjannə    a    'vvia nikɔ'laj | e    ffa'ʃibbə    **jannama'riə**  
 am    lived            almost    three years    at street Nicolai and    made.1SG    Annamaria  
 ‘I’ve lived almost three years in via Nicolai and (there) I had Annamaria’
- (28) 'mannə            dretta'mendə    **mənu'wiccə**    k    u    moto'rinə  
 send.2SG.IMP    directly            Minuicchio    with the    scooter  
 ‘send directly Minuicchio by scooter’

The absence of DOM with a proper noun in (27) may be ascribed to a restriction imposed by lexical verb *fà* ‘to make/do’ selecting as its complement the only logically possible human referent, i.e. one’s own son/daughter. As we shall also observe in a similar context, this specific verb-complement pair ‘to have a child/children’ usually rejects DOM, perhaps for its possessive interpretation, but we observed in §3.1.1 that the *a*-marking is indeed present when the DO is a personal pronoun, e.g. *(mə) faci a mmè* [...] ‘(mum) had **me**’ (see examples (40), §3.3.1, and (78), §3.5). In contrast, the DOM-less proper noun in (28) may be due to the ditransitive construction

‘send someone (to someone else)’, as discussed in §4.1. However, the lack of DOM with proper nouns in these two contexts come as an exception motivated by argument structure, but the rule would have them obligatorily *a*-marked in *more prototypical* monotransitive contexts, e.g. (20)-(25).

On a par with other Romance varieties (e.g. Catalan; Bernstein, Ordóñez & Roca, 2019; *et seq.*), proper names in Barese may be preceded by the so-called ‘personal article’ to express familiarity. In Barese, the personal article *mbà<sub>M</sub>/chəmmà<sub>F</sub>*, whose meaning may be paraphrasable as ‘my/our mate [proper name]’, derives from the truncated vocative of *chəmbàrə<sub>M</sub>/chəmmàrə<sub>F</sub>*, originally ‘(wedding) godfather/godmother’. Note that, in written sources from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (29), proper nouns with the personal article appeared unmarked with prototypical DOM-triggering predicates, such as ‘to call’ and ‘to find/bump into’:

- (29) a. 'mɔ 'maŋk a cca'ma / ... va 'ccamə **mba ko'linə** (*IvdC*, 1912, 1, 1)  
 now send.1SG to call.INF go-call.2SG.IMP *mate* Nicola.DIM  
 ‘now I’ll send someone to call / ... go call *my mate* Nick’
- b. 'bbwenə k aɟɟ ac'catə **mba pas'kwələ** u vət'tarə (*IvdC*, 1912, 3, 1)  
 good that have.1SG found *mate* Pasquale the barrel-maker  
 ‘it’s good I bumped into *my mate* Pasquale the cooper’

Crucially, these examples from 1912 contrast with the modern Barese situation, in which proper names with personal articles are obligatorily *a*-marked, as in *\*(a) mbà<sub>M</sub>/chəmmà<sub>F</sub>* [proper name], e.g. *so acchiat'a mbà Pasquàlə* ‘I bumped into *my mate* Pasquale’. Even though we are not in a position to generalise for the paucity of tokens available, it could be argued that the presence of this additional element, reinforcing the specificity of the proper noun, used to allow for the optionality of DOM, possibly because the personal article could satisfy the semantic requirements which would otherwise trigger DOM. However, this optionality is now resolved in modern Barese by means of the obligatory *a*-marking.

Before moving onto syntactically definite common nouns, i.e. with an overt determiner, we consider a subset of proper nouns with overt definite articles. These identify a unique, thus highly specific, referent, such as religion-related names, e.g. *la Madònnə* ‘the Virgin Mary’ (30), *u Səgnóre* ‘the Lord’ (31), and nicknames, e.g. *u cəcàtə* ‘the Blind(ed one)’ (32):

(30) 'təŋgə      la      ma'dənnə [...] e      dɔʒə'su a      'kkɛdda 'vannə  
have.1SG    the    Virgin-Mary      and    Jesus      at that      side  
‘I have the (icons/statues of) Virgin Mary and Jesus in the other room’

(31) j-a      rəŋgrad'dzja u      səp'porə      ka      m      a      'ffattə      kam'ba 'fin      a 'kkɛss e'ta  
have-to thank.INF      the    lord      that    me    has made    live.INF    till    to this    age  
‘I have to thank the Lord who made me live this long’

(32) al'lor      u      ka'nɔffə      u      tʃə'katə  
then      him    know.2SG    the    blind  
‘so you do know the Blind(ed) one’

Despite having overt definite markers, in theory these unique referents share semantic properties with proper names; yet, unlike the proper names introduced by DOM in (20)-(25), none of them is *a*-marked. Interestingly, also *Gəsù* ‘Jesus (Christ)’ in (30) is not *a*-marked because it is second conjunct in the coordinated structure, i.e. one of the contexts in which the optionality of DOM arises (cf. examples (4) and (18)). Indeed, in Barese we would expect *təŋg'a Gəsù a chɛdda vānne*, on a par with Neapolitan *təŋg'a Gəsù Criste come targa* ‘I have Jesus Christ as (i.e. on) my registration plate’. Indeed, DOM would be expected in contexts of secondary predication, e.g. in Spanish (López, 2016). Hence, syntactic definiteness seems to be the very first environment of the Definiteness Scale in which the absence/optionality of the Barese DOM becomes visible, even though the semantic features of these unique and specific referents should actually favour DOM.

### 3.3. Overt Determiners: Demonstratives and definite articles

As mentioned in §3.1.2, common nouns accompanied by demonstrative elements, encoding deictic force, tend to be more frequently *a*-marked than those with a definite article, as we have already started observing in §3.2 for unique referents with definite articles.

#### 3.3.1. Demonstrative + NP

Recall the morphological forms of Barese demonstratives presented in Table 3; while the distal demonstrative forms for ‘that/those’ are identical to their pronominal counterparts, the proximal/medial forms for ‘this/these’ also include the clitic forms *stu<sub>M</sub>/sta<sub>F</sub>* ‘this \*(NP)’ and *sti* ‘these \*(NP)’, which are semantically, but not pragmatically, equivalent to the tonic forms, e.g. (36b). Irrespective of the form involved, demonstrative adjectives – similarly to their pronominal counterparts – appear to force the *a*-marking, as shown in (33) to (38) for a broad range of predicates and pragmatic contexts:

- (33) a    ttra'dit    a    'kkuddə    'fratə  
has   betrayed   DOM   that.M   brother(-my)  
‘she cheated on that (poor) brother (of mine)’

- (34) u    'vi    a    'kkuddə    wap'jonə    'lɛŋgə    'lɛŋgə ?    (Solfato, 2008, 29)  
him   see.2SG   DOM   that.M   boy   long.M   long.M  
‘do you see that very tall guy?’

- (35) si    allas'sat a    'kkuddə    'bbravə    wap'jonə    pə    'kkuddə    to'pinə  
are.2SG   left   DOM   that   good   boy   for   that   delinquent  
‘you dumped that good guy for that delinquent’

- (36) a. la    və'less    akka'nɔʃʃ    a    'kkɛdda    'mbamə  
her   wanted.1SG.COND   know .INF   DOM   that.F   infamous



b. ka      u      a      ffəj'jat      a      stu      'sɔrtə      də      'miəndzə      pət'ʃonə  
that      him      has      procreated DOM this      sort      of      half      twat

‘I’d like to know that terrible woman who procreated such an idiot’

(37) 'vɪstə      ka      u      ka'nɔʃfə      'bbuənə |      'tu |      a      'kkɔddə      kər'nutə  
seen      that      him      know.2SG      well      you      DOM that      rascal

‘since you know that rascal well’

(38) 'ji      m      u      'aʃ a      man'dʒa      'vivə      a      'kkɔddə      ʃkə'fusə  
I      self      him      have.1SG-to      eat.INF      alive      DOM that      disgusting

‘I’ll eat that disgusting man alive!’

DOM is also found whenever the DO introduced by the demonstrative is modified by other adjectival quantifiers (39) or numerals (40) – similarly to the intensifier *sɔrtə də*+N, roughly ‘such a(n)+N’, in (36b) above:

(39) 'siənd      a      'kkɔss      'aldə      spə'talə      (Solfato, 2008, 17)  
listen.2SG.IMP      DOM this      other      hospital

‘listen to this other fool (right here)’

(40) (sc. 'mammə) sə      pəʃ'ʒə      a      pa'pæ 'miə      e      mmə      fa'ʃi      a      'mmə  
mum(-my)      self      took.3SG      DOM dad      my      and      me      made.3SG      DOM me

e      a      'kkɪss      e      'ddu 'fratə

and      DOM these      and      two      brothers

‘(my mum) got together with my dad and had me and these two (other) brothers’

In (40), despite the presence of the predicate *fà* (*lə figghia*) ‘to have (children)’ (cf. (27) and relevant discussion in §3.2), the second conjunct of the coordinated DOs ‘me and these two brothers’ appears *α*-marked, contrary to what we observed in (4), (18), and (29); this again testifies to the

optionality of DOM in such contexts, which would not apply to regular DAT/LOC prepositions. Nonetheless, a fairly plausible reason for the presence of DOM is, in turn, the presence of the demonstrative introducing the quantified DPs.

Our small database contains rare instances of unmarked DOs introduced by a demonstrative, such as (41) and (42). In (41), the lexical verb *təné* ‘to keep (someone next to someone else)’ selects a clitic-resumed DP introduced by a demonstrative – thus highly specific – which appears unmarked. As we shall also discuss in §3.3.2, irrespective of the interpretation of *təné*, DOM will not surface whenever the DO is a (definite or indefinite) common noun, i.e. not a pronoun, a proper noun, or a determinerless kinship term. Indeed, [*təné* Dem+DP] may be another grey area down the Definiteness Scale in which DOM is highly favoured, but not strictly obligatory:<sup>4</sup>

- (41) 'ji u      və'levə      tə'ne | 'kuddə povə'riəddə də      ma'riddə-mə  
       I    him    wanted.3SG    keep    that    poor.DIM    of    husband-my  
       ‘I wanted to keep him (next to me, i.e. alive), that poor husband of mine’

Instead, the DO in (42) may lack DOM because ‘this person’, introduced in the previous sentence as the new referent *nu crəstianə* ‘a person’ and, thus, specific in (42), is not yet (or enough) identifiable in the discourse:

- (42) 'ʃerən      a    ac'ca      'kossə    krəs'tjanə  
       went.3PL    to find.INF    this    person  
       ‘they went to visit this person’

---

<sup>4</sup> In the particular case of (41), the absence of DOM might also be due – yet, not forced by – the particularly long intonational break after the verb, as if the DO were marginalised. Moreover, a reviewer rightfully points out that the object in question acts as an Aboutness Topic, which usually rejects DOM. However, examples such as (36)-(37)-(38) show that this factor does not necessarily block DOM in Barese.

However, note that the Barese verbal complex *scì a(d) acchià*, lit. ‘go to find’, may lead to ambiguity between the interpretations (i) ‘go see/visit (someone)’ and (ii) ‘go look for/find (someone)’. While (42), interpreted with the meaning of (i) in this instance, does not feature DOM, the interpretation in (ii) may do so, which would imply that the aspectual class of the verb (and/or the affectedness of the DO) may be responsible for this alternation; however, this needs further testing with native speakers.

Nonetheless, it may be generally concluded that the deictic component encoded in demonstratives usually forces the *a*-marking of the human DO, but exceptions to this generalisation can be found.

### 3.3.2. *Definite article + NP*

When we consider common nouns headed by overt definite articles, the *a*-marking appears to oscillate much more than with the referents scrutinised so far, even if these are kinship terms. It is useful to operate a divide between singular and plural referents, due to the higher levels of identification/specificity of the former.

*3.3.2.1. Singular DPs.* In (43) to (47), we note that DOM is present with singular referents – mostly kinship terms – such as ‘grandmother’ (43), ‘son’ (44), ‘husband’ (45), and ‘fiancé’ (46) (as well as ‘dead person’ (52a) below):

(43) 'mammə sə l a səppər'tat a la 'nənnə  
 mother(-my) self her has borne DOM the grandma  
 ‘my mum has had to provide for (lit. bear) grandma’

(44) [a+u >] o 'fɿɰə də səɲnə'ri | u av a affə'kwa 'jɪnd o 'liəttə  
 DOM-the son of you.POL him has-to choke.INF in to-the bed  
 ‘she’ll end up choking your son in bed!’

(45) ʔə 'kristə və'levə [...] fa'ʔevə kam'ba [a+u >] o **ma'ritə** 'miə  
 if Christ wanted.3SG made.3SG live.INF DOM-the husband my  
 'If Christ had wanted it, my husband would still be alive (lit. he made my husband live)'

(46) 'di | akka'noʃʃ [a+u >] o **'tsitə** də 'rina ?  
 say.2SG.IMP know.2SG DOM-the fiancé of Rina  
 'ask (him): do you know Rina's boyfriend?'

Clitic-resumed DOs in low (43) and high (44) positions, as well as informationally focussed DOs (45)-(46), all bear the *a*-marking, even when occurring in causative constructions, e.g. (45).

In contrast, most referents presented below appear unmarked, such as 'shoemaker' (47) and 'waiter' (48), as well as kinship terms, such as 'mother' (49), 'daughter' (50), and 'family' (51):

(47) na 'bbella 'di [...] ko'linə [...] 'jaccə **u** **skar'pare**  
 a nice day Nicola.DIM finds the shoemaker  
 'one fine day, Nick bumps into the shoemaker'

(48) 'kiddə s as'settən e 'ccamən **u** **kama'riərə**  
 those self sit.3PL and call.3PL the waiter  
 'they take a sit and call the waiter'

(49) komə 'vədi **la 'mammə** e nnu 'fiʃʃə | 'jind a 'nnoddə l atʔə'di  
 how saw.3SG the mum and a son in to nothing them killed.3SG  
 'as soon as she saw the mum and one (of the) son(s), she killed them'

(50) cca'mə **la 'fiʃʃa** 'grannə  
 call.3PL the daughter big  
 '(she) called (her) older daughter'

(51) 'tu si at'ʔisə **la fa'miʃʃa 'mɛ** | e 'mmə 'ji 'aʃʃ a at'ʔit a 'tte  
 you are.2SG killed the family my and now I have.1SG-to kill.INF DOM you

‘you’ve killed my family, and now I’ll have to kill you’

Another interesting, yet unexpected, alternation is shown in the sentences in (52). The same informationally focused DO ‘dead person’ appears *a*-marked in its first instance (52a) and unmarked in the very next sentence (52b):

- (52) a. 'tiəmbə 'fa [...] | 'fɛvənə 'tuttə lə komvra'tell a akkəmbaŋ'ŋa o 'mwærtə  
time ago went.3PL all the brethren to accompany.INF DOM-the dead  
‘some time ago, all the (religious) brethren used to accompany the dead person...’
- b. na'bbella'di | 'komə 'stev a spət'ta u 'mwærtə | ko'linə [...] 'jaccə u skar'pare  
a nice day as was to wait.INF the dead Nicola.DIM finds the shoemaker  
...one fine day, while waiting for the dead person, Nick bumps into the shoemaker’

We may either hypothesise that the predicates involved, i.e. ‘to accompany’ (52a) and ‘to wait for’ (52b), are responsible for this alternation, perhaps due to a lexical restriction of ‘to accompany’ which requires a prototypically human DO; or the aspectual nature of the events described by the predicates plays a role, i.e. habitual: ‘used to accompany the dead person’ vs durative: ‘was waiting for the dead person’ (see Andriani, in press, for similar considerations in other Apulian varieties).

On a par with Neapolitan (Ledgeway, 2009, p. 841) and the Barese facts discussed in the previous sections, in (53)-(58) we note the absence of the *a*-marking with definite common nouns whenever the lexical verb is *təné*, irrespective of its interpretations ‘have/hold/keep’:

- (53) tə'nevə u skar'parə assə'lutə pə 'jjiddə  
had.1SG the shoemaker only for him  
‘he had his own shoemaker exclusively for himself’

- (54) 'təŋgə 'purə la wəŋ'pəddə daf'forə

have.1SG also the girl outside

‘there’s even my girlfriend (waiting) outside’

(55) tə'nevə u ma'ritə 'miə dəsokku'patə

had.1SG the husband my unemployed

‘I had my husband unemployed (at that time)’

(56) kəm'ba | tənə-m'mi-wə 'tu | u pəttfə'ninnə (Solfato, 2008, 18)

man.VOC hold.2SG.IMP-me.DAT-him.ACC you the baby boy

‘man, you hold the baby for me’

(57) u 'təŋgə u 'tsitə

him have.1SG the fiancé

‘I’ve (already) got a boyfriend’

(58) 'ji | u 'tsitə 'bbəddə | u 'təŋgə 'ddʒa (IvDC, 1912, 4, 1)

I the fiancé nice him have.1SG already

‘I already have a nice boyfriend’

DOM is absent on definite DOs selected by *tənέ* even if these are specific, appear as clitic-resumed topics or informational foci, or involve secondary predications, as in (55).

Finally, morphologically singular definite nouns with collective interpretation, which refer to human entities such as ‘people’ (59a), would not be marked in the modern dialect. However, in written sources from the past century, the *a*-marking on ‘people’ may be allegedly found because of the identification/specificity of the referent, which in (59a) is the speaker himself, while the generic expression ‘the crowd (of people)’ in (59b) is – expectedly – unmarked:

(59) a. 'pag a la 'ddʒəndə (IvDC, 1912, 5, 1)

pay.2SG.IMP DOM the people

‘pay the people (like myself)!’

b. so      ac'catə   **la**      'fəddə   a   la   kan'dinə      (IvDC, 1912, 5, 4)

am   found   the   crowd   at the   wine shop

‘I found the wine shop crowded with people’

3.3.2.2. *Plural DPs*. Once we move onto plural referents, inherently less specific than singular ones (cf. Manzini & Savoia, 2005, II, p. 515), the incidence of DOM dramatically drops, irrespective of the specificity of the definite plural DO. This contrast can be seen in (60), where the referent ‘my sons’ is clearly specific and identified, and (61)-(63), where the referents are generic:

(60) e 'mmo jε | 'kambəkə lə 'fijjə 'miə  
and now is live.1SG the sons my  
'see, I (even) provide for my sons'

(61) e        'vval        la        'pen        a man'na        **lə 'fijʝə**        a la 'skolə?        (Solfato, 2008, 29)  
          and    worth        the        sorrow to send.INF        the sons        to the school  
          ‘and is it worth at all sending one’s sons to school?’

(62) nɔm bə'tev a've lə 'fijə  
not could.3SG have.INF the sons  
'she couldn't have children'

(63) p u 'fattə ka 'koddə mət'ti lə ppət'tənə  
for the fact that that.M put.PST.3SG the prostitutes  
'(we left that building) because he put prostitutes in there'

Nonetheless, the lack of DOM in the examples above may be ascribed to the nature of the predicates: the unergative *cambà* ‘live/to get by’ in (60), here used in its transitive/causative variant ‘provide for (someone)’; or, again, to the ditransitive *mannà* ‘send (one’s children to school)’ in (61) (cf. §4.1); and the possessive *avè* ‘to have’ in the expression ‘have children’ in (62), where the

generic DO – with an expletive definite article in Barese – would typically be unmarked. Likewise, (63) shows the generic plural referent ‘prostitutes’ without DOM; however, it may also be the argument structure of ‘to put (someone somewhere)’ to be playing a role in blocking DOM, somewhat similarly to the case of ditransitive predicates with DATIVE or LOCATIVE arguments (§4.1).

In contrast to this, written sources from the 20<sup>th</sup> century attest the presence of DOM with specific definite plural referents. For instance, we find the *a*-marking on a plural kinship term, *lə fratə* ‘brothers’ in (64), interpreted with a silent 3SG possessive and clearly specific, as the DP refers to the preceding proper names *Peppinə* and *Giuanninə*, the brothers of the female referent (i.e. ‘her’). Likewise, ‘young ladies’ in (65) is also interpreted as specific because the locative ‘up there’ modifies the noun. However, we should also bear in mind that the verb *offennə* ‘to offend’ would prototypically require a human referent (cf. also the obligatoriness of DOM in Spanish with *ofender*; Torrego, 1998; *i.a.*):

- (64) va 'ccam a ppep'pinə | a ddzuwan'ninə | a lə 'fratə  
 go- call.2SG.IMP DOM Giuseppe.DIM DOM Giovanni.DIM DOM the brothers  
 ‘go call Peppino, Giovannino, (both) her brothers’ (IvDC, 1912, 5, 4)
- (65) 'sendz ɔf'fenn a lə səppə'rinə də dda-'ssusə (IvDC, 1912, 4, 4)  
 without offend.INF DOM the young ladies of there-up  
 ‘without offending the young ladies up there (on the balconies)’

3.3.2.3. *Non-human DPs.* Some interesting cases of DOM with definite animate referents can be found in Barese proverbs (64) or expressions (65), representative of older stages of the language. As initially pointed out in the very first example in (1), non-human or inanimate referents would usually not appear *a*-marked in Barese, except if these are proper names, or are personified, i.e. rational beings, e.g. *u vónə vedi o ciùccə* [+DOM] ‘the ox saw the donkey’ (cf. Andriani, 2015, §2.5). Consider now the examples in (66)-(67):



- (66) u 'liəttə at'ʃʔit o 'torə  
 the bed kills DOM-the bull  
 'resting weakens the tough ones (lit. the bed kills the bull)'
- (67) 'faʃə 'rit a lə gat'toddə  
 makes laugh.INF DOM the kittens  
 's/he is laughable (lit. makes the kittens laugh)'

In (66), it is evident that *tórə* 'bull' refers to 'a tough person', while in (67) *lə gattuddə* refers to 'silly people', being, in fact, the Barese counterpart of the Italian expression *far ridere i polli* 'to make chickens laugh'. As mentioned above in §3.3.1, we may again observe how the causative construction 'make someone laugh' in (67) does not block DOM, not even when the referent are the 'personified' kittens, i.e. the subject of the embedded predicate 'laugh'. Moreover, note that DOM in (66) is present even though the subject 'bed', i.e. 'resting', in (66) is non-agentive, a feature which normally blocks the presence of DOM with definite common nouns, e.g. *nu chiangónə accedi u frabbəcatórə* 'a rock killed the builder' (cf. also Andriani, 2015, §2.4). This latter case, together with the other instances of Barese DOM from past-century sources, lead us to assume the plausible scenario whereby DOM was more extended than what we observe in modern Barese.

### 3.4. Indefinite Pronouns

While we mentioned in §3.1 that most pronouns tend to appear *a*-marked in Barese, Andriani (2011; 2015) argues that indefinite pronouns – bar the animate universal quantifier 'everyone' – show sensitivity to the specificity/identification of the referent as a trigger for DOM, on a par with highly specific indefinites.

Indeed, the specificity-driven contrast is immediately evident with the existential quantifier pronoun *quacchedùnə* (archaic: *ngocchedùnə*) ‘someone’, which patterns with its semantically equivalent indefinite *nu crəstianə* ‘a person’ (cf. Andriani 2015, p. 66). These can receive a quantificational, i.e. [+SPECIFIC], interpretation, marked with DOM, and a cardinal one, where the [–SPECIFIC] element remains unmarked:

- (68) a. 'joʃə jɛ la ʃər'nata 'bbonə k j-a at'ʃīt a **kkwakke'dunə**  
 today is the day good that have-to kill.INF DOM someone  
 ‘today is the right day to kill someone (among you)’ [+SPECIFIC]
- b. ʃə 'sɛndəkə **kkwakke'dunə** a 'ddifə 'kɪssə 'kosə  
 if hear.1SG someone to say these things  
 ‘if I (ever) hear anyone saying such things’ [–SPECIFIC]

These will be *a*-marked whenever they refer to a specific and identifiable entity, e.g. ‘someone (among you)’ in (68a); in contrast, the generic referent ‘anyone’ remains unmarked (68b). However, we cannot exclude what appears to be one of the structural constraints on the presence of the *a*-marking in Barese, namely a perception verb blocking DOM in the matrix clause in (68b), as shown in §4.2. Likewise, the same could be argued for the facts in (69), where the pronoun *junə* ‘one (person)’, interpreted as the indefinite pronoun ‘(some)one’, is *a*-marked because of its specific interpretation in (69a)-(69b). Instead, the lack of DOM in (69c) may both be due to its interpretation as a partitive numeral ‘one (of the sons)’, as well as to the ditransitive verb ‘to bring, carry’, blocking DOM, as discussed in §4.1:

- (69) a. 'pɪɟ e 'ttu | 'mɔ | nɔnn u at'ʃīt a 'jjunə 'kom a 'kkoddə ?  
 take and you now not him kill.2SG DOM one like to that.M  
 ‘wouldn’t you go ahead and kill someone like him?’ (Solfato, 2008, 27)

- b. 'mɔ 'stɔgg a spət'ta      **a**      'jjunə (sc. krəs'tjanə)  
 now stand to wait.INF      DOM one      person  
 'I'm waiting for someone (i.e. specific person)'
- c. 'pərtɔ      'junə (sc. 'fijjə) də la      'prima məj'jerə  
 brought.3SG one      son of the first wife  
 'he (i.e. dad) brought one (son) from the first wife'

Both hypotheses seem plausible; however, the ditransitive nature of the predicate may be the decisive factor, as also the non-specific variant of 'one' in object position would still require the *a*-marking in modern Barese, e.g. *accit 'a jjunə də mazzatə* 'to beat (some)one up (lit. to kill one with blows)' (Sada, Scordia & Valente, 1971, p. 48).

One important rectification to Andriani's (2011; 2015) findings is that *nəssciùnə* 'no-one' seems to bear the *a*-marking in all cases (cf. Andriani, forthcoming, for the same conclusion in northern Apulian varieties): when it implies partitive or comparative readings 'anyone (among/like)' (70a), or the negative proper 'no-one' (70b).

- (70) a. pə lla 'frevə | nəŋ ganəf'frevə      'ccu **a**      **nəf'junə**      [+SPECIFIC]  
 for the fever not knew.IMPF.1SG more DOM no-one  
 'for the fever, I could no longer recognise anybody (around me)'
- b. 'nonə | 'fijjə | nəŋ 'vɔjɟ      **a**      **nəf'junə**      [–SPECIFIC]  
 no son not want.1SG DOM no-one  
 'no, son, I want no-one (i.e. I'm better off alone)!'

Example (71) shows the only instance of an unmarked 'no-one' in our database:

- (71) s affat'ʃɔrənə 'du [...] | nɔ llə və'lɪbbə |      **nəf'junə**      də 'tott e 'ddu

self expose two.M not them wanted.1SG no-one of all and two.M  
 ‘two (pretenders) came forward, I didn’t want them, neither of the two’

This may be due to the *marginalisation* of this constituent, which is evident in both intonational break and the fact that the resumptive clitic ‘them’ clearly refers to the preceding ‘two (boys)’. Otherwise, the variant with DOM *non vəlibbə \*(a) nnəssciùnə də tutt’e ddu* would be the only viable option.

In contrast, Andriani’s results are confirmed for *tuttə(quàndə)* ‘everyone’ (72)-(73), or ‘all/each/both of’ (74), which always gets *a*-marked irrespective of its specific vs generic semantic interpretation, syntactic position, or pragmatic function:<sup>5</sup>

- (72) v aɣ a at'ʃit̪ a ttottə'kwandə [+SPECIFIC]  
 you.PL have.1SG-to kill.INF DOM everyone  
 ‘I’m going to kill all of you!’
- (73) la ma'dənnə bbənə'diʃ a 'ttottə [-SPECIFIC]  
 the Madonna blesses DOM everyone  
 ‘the Virgin Mary blesses everyone’
- (74) 'koddə və karə'kɛʃʃə də mat'tsat a 'ttott e 'ddu  
 that you.PL loads of hits DOM all and two  
 ‘he’ll beat up both of you’!

<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, the semantic equivalent of ‘everybody’, *u munnə* ‘the world’, is attested with DOM in a 1913 text, but can no longer be *a*-marked in modern Barese, as confirmed by native speakers:

- (i) ppə nnəŋ 'va par'la a u 'munnə (IvDC, 1913, 8, 2)  
 for not makes talk.INF DOM the world  
 ‘so that everyone won’t talk (about it)’

We conclude this section by considering the animate relative/*wh*-pronoun for ‘who(m)’, namely *cə/ci* [tʃə/tʃi] (< Latin QUI),<sup>6</sup> which has always been *a*-marked at least since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (75):

(75) **a** 'tʃi as'piətt a appət'tʃa la kal'darə ? (IvDC, 1912, 5, 4)

DOM who wait.2SG to turn on.INF the pot

‘who (i.e. what) are you waiting for to turn on the stove?’

(76) **a** 'tʃə sta cca'miəndə | nən 'diənə 'spɛcc a 'kkassə-tə ?

DOM who are.2SG look.2SG not have.2SG mirror at house-your

‘who are you looking at? You don’t have mirrors at home?’

(77) dʒə'su | aj'judə-lə | **a** 'tʃə mə'volə 'malə e **a** 'tʃə mə'volə 'bbenə

Jesus help.2SG.IMP-them DOM who me wants evil and DOM who me wants good

‘Jesus, help those who hate me and those who love me’

The animate *wh*-elements in (75)-(76) both require the *a*-marking in modern Barese, otherwise ambiguity could arise with the inanimate ‘what’, as well as with the animate *cə* ‘who’ in subject function. In (77), instead, *cə* functions as an indefinite demonstrative pronoun ‘those who’, which is also always obligatorily *a*-marked in modern Barese.<sup>7</sup>

### 3.5. Indefinites, Numerals, and Quantifiers + NP

On the lower levels of the Definiteness Scale, the *a*-marking in Barese becomes optional, or disappears altogether. This occurs whenever the relevant NP is modified by what Milsark (1974)

<sup>6</sup> In Barese, *cə* is syncretic with the inanimate *wh*-pronoun ‘what’ (<QUID), as well as the irrealis conjunction ‘if’ (<SE).

<sup>7</sup> Some Apulian varieties grammaticalised *a ccə*, lit. ‘to whom’, as the indefinite demonstrative pronoun ‘those who’ used in both subject and object functions; cf. Andriani, forthcoming.

labels ‘weak determiners’, namely indefinite articles, numerals (other than pronominal ‘one’, cf. §3.4), and indefinite quantifiers, which tend to be non-specific (cf. also López, 2016, p. 246).

The lack of DOM in different (in)definite or quantificational contexts can be observed in (78), where all referents are kinship terms or pronominal forms with high levels of specificity:

- (78) a. u      'primə    ma'ritə      las'sə    'trɛ 'ffɪjə      a    'mmammə [...] |  
           the    first      husband    left.3SG   three sons      to mum(-my)  
           ‘her first husband left three sons to my mum [...],
- b. 'po    (sc. 'mammə ) sə    pəɹ'jo      a      ppa'pæ 'miə    e      ffa'ʃi      a      'mme |  
           then      mum(-my)self   took.3SG   DOM dad      my    and    made.3SG   DOM me  
           ‘[...] then she (mum) picked my dad and she had me,’
- nu 'fratə    ka    u      sə 'ppersə |    e      u 'loldəmə    də    lə      'fratə  
           a    brother that   him   am   lost      and   the last      of    the    brothers  
           ‘one brother whom I’ve lost, and the last of the brothers’

In (78a), the DO ‘three sons’ of the ditransitive predicate ‘to leave’ appears unmarked because of the numeral, but also for the co-presence of an overt animate indirect object, which normally blocks DOM (cf. §4.1). Likewise, (78b) shows two specific referents, ‘a brother’ and ‘the last of the(/my) brothers’, which remain unmarked possibly due to the selecting predicate ‘to have (children)’, besides the two constituents being the second and third conjunct of a coordinated structure with an  $\alpha$ -marked pronoun.

In the same way, specific indefinite referents, such as ‘a son (i.e. one of the sons)’ (79), ‘a brother’ in (80) and ‘a fiancé’ in (81), appear unmarked, and so does the list of non-specific kinship terms in (82) ‘a sister, a mum, a brother, a niece’:

- (79) ac'cə      nu 'fɪjə 'jɪnd o      kə'mə [...] u    'waldə      'jɪnd o      war'nalə

found.3SG a son in to-the *comò* the other in to-the urinal

‘she found one (of the) son(s) in the chest of drawers [...], the other (son) in the urinal’

(80) 'mɔ | **nu** 'fratə | u sɔ 'ppərsə

now a brother him am lost

‘now, one brother, he died (lit. I have lost him)’

(81) ka 'ji | a kkwat'tordəʃ 'annə | tə'nevə **nu** 'tsitə ka 'jevə səl'datə

that I at fourteen years had.1SG a fiancé that was soldier

‘(someone was saying) that, when I was 14, I had a fiancé who was a soldier’

(82) nɔn 'dɛŋgə **na** 'sorə | [...] **na** 'mammə | [...] **nu** 'fratə | [...] **na** 'nəpotə

not have.1SG a sister a mum a brother a niece

‘I don’t have any sister, mum, brother, niece...’

In (80), not only is the DP fronted, thus potentially a preposition-less Hanging Topic, and the referent no longer alive, thus inanimate, but also the predicate ‘lose’ may be among the causes for the lack of DOM. In this respect, Spanish shows a subtle alternation with ‘lose’, as in *Juan perdió (a) su hijo* ‘John lost his son’ (Bolinger, 1991, p. 200), where the absence of DOM is interpreted as in (80), i.e. the referent passed away, while its *a*-marked counterpart conveys the interpretation of a less definitive kind of ‘losing’, i.e. both physical or emotional ‘distancing’ between subject and object. Instead, (81)-(82) involve the predicate *tənέ* ‘to have’, which normally blocks DOM, thus these contexts can be considered as ‘borderline’ for the *a*-marking.

In any case, Andriani (2011; 2015) attests the presence of DOM only with specific indefinite (singular) referents, which is also confirmed by modern (83) and 20<sup>th</sup>-century sources (84)-(85):

(83) wɑʃ'ʌɔ | 'we sən'di a **nu** 'fratə ?

boy.VOC want.2SG hear.INF DOM a brother

‘man, will you listen to a brother (i.e. myself)?’

- (84) a'vim      ac'cat    **a**      **na**    **wap'jæddə**    **pə'litə**      (IvdC, 1912, 4, 1)  
have.1PL    found    DOM a      girl                  clean  
‘we’ve found (such) a proper girl (like your daughter)’
- (85) 'ŋgəndr    **a**      **nu**    **maskal'dzonə** | ʃə    'ppwetə 'kəmmə'na? (IvdC, 1913, 8, 1)  
meet.2SG    DOM a      scoundrel                  what can.2SG combine.INF  
‘you meet a scoundrel (like the one you met), what can you end up doing?’

The reading of ‘a brother’, ‘a girl’, and ‘a scoundrel’ here is specific, even though the referents have just been introduced (but were implicit in the discourse). However, the predicate in (85) may pertain to those prototypically requiring a human referent, such as ‘to greet’ (cf. example (25) with a proper name referring to an inanimate referent), thus forcing DOM. Despite the details, the contrast between the examples in (78)-(81) and (83)-(85) suggests, once again, that Barese DOM has actually reduced the domains in which it is now operative – possibly due to Italian influence here – creating (temporary) optionality of the *a*-marking in the modern variety.

The Barese indefinite article  $n(-u_M/-a_F)$  ‘a’ in combination with adjective *aldə* ‘other’ form the indefinite adjective *naldə\_M/nalda\_F+N* ‘another N’ (86) – also pronominalisable, e.g. (87) – and indefinite pronoun *naldùnə* ‘another one’ (88). These are typically used to identify alternative referents, whose levels of specificity are expectedly low:

- (86) [*Context*: A brother tells her sister: Thank God we have each other...]
- a. ka    ʃə    'mwerə 'tu    |    'ji    nɔnn 'accəkə    'nalda    si'sinə  
that if die.2SG you I not find.1SG another Teresa.DIM  
'because if you die, I will not find another Sisina,...
- b. 'komə    ʃə 'morə    məŋ'guttʃə |    'tu    nɔnn 'accə    'naldə    məŋ'guttʃə  
like if dies Domenico.DIM you not find.2SG another Domenico.DIM  
...like if Minguccio dies, you won't find another Minguccio'



(87) e tʃə nɔm 'botə və'ni 'jeddə | 'av a man'na 'naldə (sc. krəstjanə)  
 and if not can.3SG come.INF she has-to send.INF another person  
 'and if she can't come, she has to send someone else'

(88) 'va 'ssfriʃ a nnal'd-unə (Papiol, 1947, 49, 4)  
 go.2SG.IMP fry.2SG DOM another-one  
 'go take advantage of someone else(, not me)!'

As already observed with the definite counterpart 'the other (son)' in (79), DOM is absent in both cases of adjectival *naldə*+N (86) and pronominal *naldə*(+N) (87). Both cases do not identify specific referents, but alternative ones to these, e.g. 'another Teresa/Domenico' and 'another (person)'. Crucially, DOM is absent in spite of the fact that the nominal expressions in (86) also involve proper names, and the 'another (person)' in (87) is pronominal (yet, selected by ditransitive *mannà* 'to send'; cf. §4.1). In contrast, (88) shows that pronoun *naldùnə* 'another one' already appears *a*-marked since the past century, and that continues being the case in the modern dialect. Note that the pronominal form *naldùnə* only differs from the variant *naldə* in (87) for the absence of *-ùnə* '-one', an ending typical of other indefinite pronouns (§3.4); such a similarity with other pronouns may explain the tendency of human-referring *naldùnə* to appear *a*-marked.

Similarly to other indefinites, in (89) we note that pre- and post-nominal *assà* 'many' does not allow the bare plural 'friends' to be *a*-marked – and this is not necessarily due to the verb *təné* 'to have':

(89) 'ji 'tɛŋg (\*a) (as'sa) a'miʃ as'sa  
 I have.1SG DOM many friends many  
 'I have/find many friends'

In our database, numerals also seem to be excluded from the *a*-marking, as we already observed above with ‘three sons’ in (78), repeated in (90) below, and shown here for ‘twelve sons’ in (91) and ‘hundred sons’ (90), all of which identify referents with a low degree of specificity:

(90) u 'primə ma'ritə las'sə 'trɛ 'ffijjə a 'mmammə  
the first husband left.3SG three sons to mum(-my)  
‘her first husband left three sons to my mum’

(91) nə sɔ 'ffattə 'dudəʃfə 'fijjə | nə sɔ 'ffattə  
of-them am made twelve sons of-them am made  
‘I’ve made twelve of *them* sons, I made!’

(92) n at'tanə 'kambə 'ʃiəndə 'fijjə | 'ʃiəndə 'fijjə nəŋ 'gambənə n at'tanə  
a dad feeds hundred sons hundred sons not feed.3PL a dad  
‘a dad provides for hundred sons, hundred sons cannot provide for a dad’

The absence of DOM in (90) and (91) may be, once again, due to the predicates ‘to send’ (90) and ‘to have (children)’ (91), which have been said to block DOM. Likewise, the transitive/causative *cambà* ‘to provide for’ in (92) may be argued to block DOM with referents on the lower levels of the Definiteness Scale. However, the pan-Southern Italian proverb in (92) is known in several variants, e.g. the one replacing ‘a dad’ with ‘a mum’. In this respect, it is crucial to report this alternative version uttered by an elderly female informant from Bari Vecchio, who *a*-marked both relevant DOs with DOM: *na mammə camb'a cciəndə figghia, cciəndə figghia non gambən'a na mammə* ‘a mum provides for a hundred sons, hundred sons can’t provide for a mum’. Indeed, the same Barese proverb in (92) is also reported with both *a*-marked DOs in the version from Cerignola (FG), a town hundred kilometres north-west of Bari, e.g. [...] *a cento figli*, [...] *a un padre* (Antonellis, 1994, p. 43).

#### 4. Structural contexts blocking DOM in Barese

After having (re)considered the behaviour of a variety of DO-referents, we conclude our overview of the Barese DOM by discussing two structural contexts which seem to have blocking effects on *a*-marking in this variety, namely the co-occurrence of animate DOs with an indirect object (§4.1) and the occurrence of the DO as the subject/object of a clause embedded under perception verbs (§4.2).

##### 4.1. Ditransitive structures with human indirect objects

In the case of ditransitive predicates including an overt (human) RECIPIENT/GOAL indirect object, e.g. ‘someone to someone(/somewhere)’, DOM is blocked – a restriction which is also attested in Altamurano (Loporcaro, 1988, pp. 273–274):

- (93) sɔ mman'natə / allas'satə / ppas'satə (\*a) 'jɛddə/ la pətʃə'nɛnnə a 'ssrəggə-mə  
am sent left passed DOM she the babygirl to mother-in-law  
‘I sent/left/passed her/the babygirl to my mother-in-law’
- (94) ma'rjuttə a pprəsən'datə (\*a) u / nu kəd'dʒinə a lə kəm'baɲɲə  
Mario.DIM has presented DOM the a cousin(-his) to the friends  
‘Mario’s presented his cousin/a cousin of his to his friends’

In (93)-(94), the DOs which are normally *a*-marked, i.e. personal pronouns and specific (in)definite common nouns, cannot appear with DOM whenever the human indirect object is present. We observed similar cases in which a proper name in (28), §3.2, a plural common noun in (61), §3.3.2, and an indefinite pronoun (87), §3.5, all surface without DOM.



In sum, the thematic, i.e. ditransitive, structure of the verb or certain clausal boundaries appear to block the *a*-marking; however, similar syntactic restrictions require further research and testing, a task which is left for future research.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper, we have seen that the Barese DOM is certainly sensitive to the specificity and definiteness of the [+human] – and, at times, [+animate] – referents (cf. Andriani, 2011; 2015). However, Barese DOM appears more constrained than initially discussed once larger sets of referents and pragmatic/syntactic contexts are taken into consideration. The general results for the different types of (in)definite elements considered are summarised in Table 4:

**Table 4: Summary of the presence (+), absence (–), or optionality (±) of DOM in Barese**

	HUMAN	ANIMATE	INANIMATE
Definiteness / Animacy >			
1/2 personal pro.	+	+	Ø
3 personal pro.	+	+	–
Demonstrative pro.	+	+	–
Proper N	+	+(/±)	± (HUM)
Kinship+Encl.Poss.	+	Ø	Ø
‘Personal’ D+proper N	+	Ø	Ø
Dem+NP	+	± (HUM)	–
D+NP (sing.)	± (SPEC)	± (HUM)	–
D+NP (plur.)	± (SPEC)	± (HUM)	–
<i>Wh</i> -pro	+	–	–
Q(+NP) (universal)	+	–	–
Q(+NP) (negative)	+	–	–

Q/Wh(+NP) (existential)	± (SPEC)	–	–
Indef.+NP	± (SPEC)	–	–
Q/Wh+NP	± (SPEC)	–	–
Num+NP	±	–	–

In particular, Barese DOM seems to be sensitive on the internal structure of the nominal expression. On the one hand, determiner-less elements such as pronouns, kinship terms with enclitic possessives (cf. Manzini & Savoia, 2005, II, p. 515), and proper names tend to always be *a*-marked. In this respect, Barese DOM behaves very similarly to that of modern Neapolitan (Ledgeway, 2000; 2009) and, less so, to Corsican, inasmuch as “DOM is present as long as there is no determiner” (Neuburger & Starke, 2014, p. 382; however, ‘specificity’ is not a DOM-trigger in Corsican). On the other hand, elements with overt (prenominal) determiners/modifiers are more likely to show optionality. With common nouns lower on the Definiteness Scale, instead, DOM appears sensitive to the semantic composition of the determiner field (i.e. Dem+NP vs D+NP), in particular, to the interpretable level of specificity/identification. In both cases, the Barese *a*-marking appears to act as a device to spell out further referential properties of the D(P)/NP, i.e. [+specific/identified], which D alone may not fully encode. At times, the lexicalisation of D alone by means of a definite article may be enough to express the semantic properties encoded in the *a*-marking (cf. the variety of San Luca, Calabria; De Angelis, 2019; Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri, 2019; but this is not the case in Salento, see Andriani, forthcoming), but this seems rather unsystematic in Barese.

Although this is beyond the scope of this descriptive paper, we could treat DOM as the overt manifestation of (sets of) additional D-features, which canonical D-elements are not always able to encode. Hence, assuming Longobardi’s (1994; *et seq.*) N-to-D raising for determiner-less elements within the DP, we may argue that the N-movement to D (or D-related positions) triggers the *a*-marking in Barese. Hence, only those D-less referents reaching the highest positions in the extended projection of N (cf. Grimshaw 2005) are (nearly) always obligatorily marked, whilst the presence of

functional D-/Num-elements, such as (in)definite articles, numerals, and some quantifiers, may disfavour DOM, or block it altogether. Nonetheless, these basic ingredients licensing DOM in Barese are subject to other *superordinate* constraining factors, such as the predicate type and certain syntactic configurations.

Moreover, no particular sensitivity to information structure was encountered in our data sample, as DOM equally appears on both – fronted or *in-situ* – topicalised and focused DOs. Nonetheless, a clitic-resumed DO with topic function will always tend to be more specific and identifiable than a newly given, focused DO, so that the former will favour the *a*-marking of referents lower on the Definiteness Scale.

Nonetheless, we have observed several contexts in which the Barese DOM does not seem as ‘stable’ as other prepositions, since the semantic and syntactic considerations summarised so far can be overridden in the following contexts, i.e. when the DO:

- i) is the second conjunct of a coordinated structure [<sub>&P</sub> *a* DO [<sub>&</sub> & (*a*) DO]];
- ii) is modified by numerals, weak quantifiers, and indefinites [(*a*) Num/QP [NP]];
- iii) co-occurs with animate indirect objects required by ditransitive verbs;
- iv) acts as an argument of a verb embedded under a perception verb (cf. also Corsican DOM-less DOs when modified by a relative clause; Neuburger & Stark, 2014, p. 378);
- v) is at the lower levels on the Definiteness Scale and the type of verb displays low degrees of agentivity of its subject and/or affectedness of its object, e.g. *tané/fà/avé (la figghia)* ‘have (children)’; instead, other predicates selecting prototypically human DOs (e.g. ‘greet/help/order/kill/etc.’) largely favour DOM.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Crucially, many of these can be found in Sornicola’s (1997) list of Old Sicilian and Old Neapolitan predicates *a*-marking their human internal arguments, albeit in a limited number of cases compared to modern varieties; for details, see Sornicola (1997), Ledgeway (2009), among others. Future research on Barese DOM will need to test a wider range of predicates (cf. Pineda, 2016, 2020; Pineda & Royo, 2017), including those in Sornicola’s study, as this tension between DATIVE and ACCUSATIVE is certainly true from a diachronic perspective, so that the *a*-marking may have survived synchronically as a lexically determined relic, rather than an active process.

In conclusion, although further in-depth research and systematic testing are needed to untangle all subtleties concerning Barese DOM, it would not seem straightforward to treat Barese *a*-marked DOs as PPs, but, rather, as *differentially marked* DPs (cf. Ledgeway, 2000; Guardiano, 2010, p. 94; *i.a.*).

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the organisers of the *Workshop on Differential Object Marking in Romance – Towards Microvariation* (9-10 November 2018, INaLCO, Paris) for this opportunity; the audience of the Paris workshop, the *Anglia Ruskin-Cambridge Romance Linguistics Seminars* (30 May 2019, University of Cambridge), *The dialects of Apulia and Salento* workshop (30 May 2022, Universität Zürich), and the *CILPR30* conference (4 July 2022, Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife) for the useful and constructive feedback, as well as an anonymous reviewer. My deepest gratitude also goes to Alice Corr, Alessandro De Angelis, Franck Floricic, Cristina Guardiano, Adam Ledgeway, Anna Pineda, Michelle Sheehan, and Giuseppina Silvestri for having discussed with me the intricacies of Barese DOM (and beyond). This research was made possible thanks to the funding from Prof. Michela Cennamo's PRIN-project (20159M7X5P: *Transitivity and argument structure in flux*) and Prof. Roberta D'Alessandro's ERC-project (CoG\_681959\_MicroContact) – to whom I am also extremely grateful. All errors are my own responsibility.

## References

- Aissen, J. (2003). Differential Object Marking: iconicity vs economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 21(3), 435–483.
- Andriani, L. (2011). *Differential Object Marking, Clitic Doubling, and Argument Structure in Barese*. MRes thesis, LUCL/Universiteit Leiden.



- 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*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Andriani, L. (forthcoming). Differential Object Marking in Apulia: A descriptive overview. *Caplletra: revista internacional de filología*.
- Bárány, A. (2018). DOM and dative case. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 3(1), 97.
- Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the Low IP Area. In L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP* (pp. 16–51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bernstein, J., Ordóñez, F., & Roca, F. (2019). On the emergence of personal articles in the history of Catalan. In M. Bouzouita, A. Breitbarth, L. Danckaert, & E. Witzhausen (Eds.), *Cycles in Language Change* (pp. 88–108). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bolinger, D. (1991). *Essays on Spanish: Words and Grammar*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta.
- Bossong, G. (1982). Der präpositionale Akkusativ im Sardischen. *Festschrift Iohannes Hubschmid zum 65 Geburtstag* (pp. 579–599). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Bossong, G. (1985). *Empirische Universalienforschung: Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Bossong, G. (1991). Differential Object Marking in Romance and Beyond. In D. Wanner, & D. Kibbee (Eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Urbana-Champaign, April 7–9, 1988* (pp. 143–170). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Typology and Linguistic Universals: Syntax and Morphology*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Cruschina, S. (2012). Discourse-related features and functional projections. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- D'Alessandro R. (2017). When you have too many features: auxiliaries, agreement, and clitics in Italian varieties. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 2, 50.
- De Angelis, A. (2019). Articolo espletivo e marcatura differenziale dell'oggetto nel dialetto reggino di San Luca. *L'Italia Dialettale*, 80, 59–76.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Egerland, V. (2013). On the grammar of kinship. Possessive enclisis in Italian dialects. In K. J. Kragh, & J. Lindschouw (Eds.), *Deixis and pronouns in Romance Languages* (pp. 69–83). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Enç, M. (1991). The Semantics of Specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 1–25.
- Grimshaw, J. (2005). Extended projection. In J. Grimshaw, *Words and structure* (pp. 1–74). Stanford, CA: CSLI Press.
- Guardiano, C. (2010). L'oggetto diretto preposizionale in siciliano. Una breve rassegna e qualche domanda". *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt ("Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia")*, 11, 83–101.
- von Heusinger, K., & Kaiser, G. A. (2005). The evolution of differential object marking in Spanish. In K. von Heusinger, G. A. Kaiser, & E. Stark (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop "Specificity and the Evolution/Emergence of Nominal Determination Systems in Romance"* (pp. 33–69). Universität Konstanz: Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft.
- 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. & Lombardi, A. (2005). Verb Movement, Adverbs and Clitic Positions in Romance. *Probus*, 17(1), 79–113.
- Ledgeway, A., Schifano, N., & Silvestri, G. (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.
- Longobardi, G. (1994). Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25(4), 609–665.

- Longobardi, G. (2005). Toward a unified grammar of reference. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 24, 5–44.
- López, L. (2016). (In)definiteness, Specificity, and Differential Object Marking. In S. Fisher, & C. Gabriel (Eds.), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance* (pp. 241–266). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Loporcaro, M. (1988). *Grammatica storica del dialetto di Altamura*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Lyons, C. (1999). *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manzini, M. R., & Savoia, L. M. (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa (3 vol.)*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Manzini, M. R. & Franco, L. (2016). Goal and DOM Datives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 34(1), 197–240.
- Milsark, G. (1974). *Existential Sentences in English*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Neuburger, K. A. & Starke, E. (2014). Differential Object Marking in Corsican: Regularities & triggering factors. *Linguistics*, 52(2), 365–389.
- 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*, 32(1), 129–173 [DOI: 10.1515/probus-2019-0001].
- Pineda, A., & Royo, C. (2017). Differential indirect object marking in Romance (and how to get rid of it). *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 62(4), 445–462.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of grammar* (pp. 281–337). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rohlf, G. (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, G. (1971). Autour de l’accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes: concordances et discordances. *Revue de linguistique romane*, 35, 312–334.

Sornicola, R. (1997). L'oggetto preposizionale in siciliano antico e in napoletano antico. Considerazioni su un problema di tipologia diacronica. *Italienische Studien*, 18, 66–80.

Torrego, E. (1998). *The Dependencies of Objects*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

### **Sources:**

Antonellis, L. (1994). *Dizionario dialettale cerignolano etimologico e fraseologico*. Cerignola (FG): Centro regionale di servizi educativi e culturali.

Sada, L., Scordia, C., & Valente, V. (1971). *Dizionario storico-etimologico del dialetto barese (saggio)*. Bari: Levante Editori.

Solfato, G. (2008). *Teatro. Un percorso nella lingua barese*. Bari: Casa Sornaiolo.

IvDC (1912-1914). *Il vero Don Ciccio: filastrocche settimanali*. Bari: Tipografia Popolare.

Papiol (1947). *Papiol: settimanale umoristico pupazzettato*. Bari: Soc. Ed. Tipografica.