Differential argument marking of free (pro)nouns (DAM) and differential argument indexing via bound pronouns (DAI) (1) are generally explained based on referential and syntactic properties of arguments (e.g. humanness, specificity, definiteness). Such differential coding is often motivated as means of (i) disambiguation of semantic roles or (ii) coding salient or unexpected properties of arguments (Iemmolo 2010; Kittilä 2011; Leonetti 2004). Romance studies commonly limit differential coding to object marking (DOM) and to object indexing (DOI) via clitic doubling (Iemmolo 2014)(1). They further assume the complementary distribution of DOM and partitive determination (2), which targets different types of objects in terms of individuation scales (e.g., human or inanimate, count and mass or referential and non-referential) (Körner 1987; Stark 2005; Hopper and Thompson 1980). The inverse tendencies to high- or low-individuation coding are observed in Spanish (1) and French (2), respectively. Typologically, Stark (2005) indicates that such coding tendencies have correlates in nominal determination, such that DOM correlates with frequent bare indefinite nouns (2a), whereas partitive articles correlate with “(obligatory) indefinite determination” in partitive (2b) and plural indefinites. I show that correlates of individuation coding go beyond previously recognized patterns. Based on a sample of 22 Romance varieties, I show that the indexing correlates of DAM (i) cover various patterns within and without ditransitive “clitic clusters” (3)(i.e., sequential Theme and Recipient indexes)(Haspelmath 2012)). Based on historical corpora (French, Spanish) and a web-as-corpus study, I also (ii) show a previously undescribed pattern of differential recipient marking in French (DRM)(4). I advance (iii) a frequency-based account for the inverse correlation between DOM and DRM and their respective correlates in third person indexing. I demonstrate that the evolution of DAI was one of several changes in Old Romance to affect token frequencies of third person indexes. These, in turn, biased the distribution of formal alternations in clitic cluster since, where such alternations occurred, higher frequency items were more likely to become substitute forms (3a,3c). I show that DOM and DRM evolved as inverse correlates following the conventionalization of opposite tendencies in argument indexing, i.e., DOI→DOM and DRI→DRM). Finally, I suggest that (i) principles of linguistic borrowing (Matras and Sakel 2007) account for the occurrence of DOM patterns only in some low-individuation DAI varieties and (ii) that domain-general processing constraints may explain the non-universal formal alternation in clitic clusters (compare (3a,3c) with (3b)).

(1) **La van a elegir a ella** (Spanish)

   Her go.3PL. ALL vote.for.INF DOM her

   ‘They are going to vote for her.’ (Española 2009, 1243)

(2a) **Compro (*del) pan** (Spanish)  (2b) **J’achète *(du) pain** (French)
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buy.PRS.1SG PRT bread buy.PRS.1SG PRT bread
‘I buy (some) bread.’ ‘I buy (some) bread.’

(3a) Se=lo=enseño a decir (Spanish)
RFL.3=AC 3SGM=teach.PRS.1SG ALL say.INF.

I teach him/her to say this.’ (Española 2009, 1240)

(3b) Ja li=la=donaré (Valencian) (3c) Ja la hi donaré (Central Catalan)
ADV DAT.3SG=AC.3SGF=give.FUT.1SG LOC

‘I will give it to her’ (Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua 2006, 177)

(4a) J’ai mailé directement à Bri une réponse (French)
1SG=have.PRS.1SG mail.PTCP directly ALL Bri an answer

‘I mailed an answer directly to Bri’ (http://www.awale.qc.ca/, 09-08-2015)

(4b) J’ai envoyé un mail chez le carrossier (French)
1SG=have.PRS.1SG send.PTCP a mail APUD the cars-dealer

‘I sent a mail to the cars dealer’ (http://www.vwquebec.ca/, 09-08-2015)
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