CLASSIFYING PRONOUNS: THE VIEW FROM ROMANIAN

Alexandra Cornilescu[*] and Alexandru Nicolae[**]

Abstract: This paper[1] is devoted to the analysis of (DP, AP, and PP) postnominal modifiers of personal pronouns, focusing especially on Romanian. Regarding the internal structure of personal pronouns, we adopt the traditional view that they actually do not have a nominal restriction; instead, they themselves are definite NPs that raise to the D-domain, thus coming to be DPs. By means of the suffixal definite article, Romanian provides a contrast between definite modifiers, which prove to be DP-internal, and non-definite modifiers, which prove to be DP-external. Non-definite modifiers are non-problematic: they are predicates in a small clause configuration. By contrast, the definite postpronominal modifiers are analysed as occupying the specifier position of a Classifier Phrase, present in the extended projection of DPs headed by pronouns and proper names (Cornilescu 2007); the modifier "classifies" the personal pronouns with respect to the kind of the pronoun's referent (e.g. *we linguists* / Rom. *noi lingviş**tii***). Corroborative data from English and other Romance languages support the proposed analysis.

Keywords: personal pronouns, postpronominal modifiers, Classifier Phrase, kind-level modifiers

1. Introduction

Ever since Postal (1969), pronouns have been analysed as determiners on the strength of English examples like (1) and (2), analogous to (3) and (4):

(1) **we** linguists
(2) **we** rich
(3) **the** / **those** linguists
(4) **the** / **those** rich

This point of view was further reinforced by Abney (1987), who advances the view that determiners head the functional domain of the noun, considered thereafter as a DP. It is generally accepted that pronominal DPs should not be different from other DPs, except for the fact that they are headed by pronouns or, perhaps, an empty nominal restriction.

An important pronominal typology has been put forth by Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002), and recently confirmed by Gruber (2013). These authors distinguish between D-pronouns, ϕ-pronouns, and clitics. The personal pronouns we analyse are strong D-pronouns in this typology which we adopt.

While for languages like English, it is plausible that pronouns are determiners, whence the term "determiner pronouns", given the complementary distribution of

[*] University of Bucharest, Department of English, alexandracornilescu@yahoo.com.
[**] "Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics, Romanian Academy; University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters, Department of Linguistics, nicolae_bibi@yahoo.com.
[1] This work was supported by IDEI – PCE project 311/2011, "The Structure and Interpretation of the Romanian Nominal Phrase in Discourse Representation Theory: The Determiners". We would like to express our gratitude to Adina Dragomirescu (Bucharest) who read the final manuscript and made valuable suggestions.

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

pronouns and articles in (1)-(4), some Romance languages like Romanian ((5)-(6)) and French ((7)-(8)) are problematic for this view, given that pronouns seem to select definite DPs and definite adjectives (the a-examples in (5)-(8)), their distribution being different from that of typical determiners (e.g. demonstratives) (the b-examples in (5)-(8)).

(5) a. noi lingviste**le** (Rom.)
we linguists-FEM-DEF
'we linguist (women)'
b. **aceste** lingviste
these linguists-FEM
'these linguists'

(6) a. noi proşti**i** (Rom.)
we stupid-PL-DEF
'we stupid ones'
b. **aceşti** proşti
these stupid-PL
'these stupid people'

(7) a. nous les linguistes (Fr.)
we the linguists
'we linguistics'
b. **ces** linguistes
these linguists
'these linguists'

(8) a. nous **les** riches (Fr.)
we the rich-PL
'we rich ones'
b. **ces** riches
these rich-PL
'these rich ones'

In fact, the distribution is more complex than would appear so far. On the one hand, there are languages like French or Spanish where pronouns may be followed by both definite and indefinite noun phrases (9) (examples from Giurgea 2008: 266). Romanian also seems to exhibit definiteness variation in other quarters of the grammar (10).

(9) a. Nous (**les**) Français sommes une race supérieure. (Fr.)
we the French are a race superior
b. Nosotros (**los**) españoles somos una raza superior. (Sp.)
we the Spaniards are a race superior

(10) a. noi trei (Rom.)
we three
b. noi **cei** trei
we the three

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

On the other hand, even in English, the singular pronouns *I/you/he* cannot be followed by NPs, but can, or rather must, be followed by definite DPs:

(11) a. we linguists/the linguists
b. I *linguist/the linguist

It is generally claimed that the definite DPs in (11) require coma intonation, while the non-definite NP may be pronounced in the same intonational unit with the pronoun. However, in Romanian or French, the definite phrase need not be interpreted as a loose apposition, separated by comma intonation from the antecedent, and even in English, definite phrases following proper names (a category of DPs semantically close to pronouns), may or may not take comma intonation:

(12) a. Stephen the Great
b. Stephen Dedalus, the main character of the Portrait

From what has been said so far, at least two empirical problems have emerged: (i) where does the contrast in definiteness arise from, and (ii) why is there a difference between plural and singular personal pronouns?

Another result that has emerged from the study of DPs headed by pronouns is that, at least in languages like Romanian, they do not allow the full range of modifiers, and more generally the full range of DP constituents (Vasilescu in *GALR* 2008, I: 208-209, Vasilescu 2009, Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013). Thus, regarding lexical modifiers pronounced in the same intonational unit with the pronoun, non-definite adjectives would be ruled out, while PPs and relative clauses would be ruled in.

(13) a. *noi tineri
we young
b. noi din Moldova
we from Moldova
c. noi care am învins
we who have won

As a matter of fact, it is not that adjectives cannot be DP-internal in DPs headed by pronouns, but rather, like NPs (15), adjectives must be definite (14). When they are non-definite, both APs and NPs are interpreted as small clause predicates external to the pronominal DP (16).

(14) a. noi tineri**i**
we young-PL-DEF
b. el generos**ul**
he generous-DEF
(15) a. noi profesori**i**
we teachers-DEF
b. el doctor**ul**
he doctor-DEF

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(16) a. El generos, n- aş crede.
he generous, not would believe
'He be generous – I wouldn't believe that.'
b. Ei profesori? E de necrezut!
they teachers is of unbelieved
'They (be) teachers? It's unbelievable.'

The purpose of this paper is to give an account of the lexical modifiers, internal or external to pronominal DPs. Essentially, we claim that, in UG, pronouns merge as NPs, and subsequently raise to the D-position. Pronouns differ from ordinary NPs by the presence of a [Person] feature, overtly valued in D. Languages differ in the presence or absence of an uninterpretable definiteness feature on the pronominal NP; the presence of definiteness may be motivated semantically, for instance, singular pronouns are "more definite" than the plural ones (whose denotation may vary); or definiteness may represent a syntactic requirement in languages where the nominal stem must be syntactically marked as [definite] / [non-definite] (see Danon 2010). Romanian pronominal stems are uniformly definite in the sense of Nicolae (2013a); this property goes a long way towards explaining the difference between Romanian-type languages and English-type languages.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2, we spell out our assumptions on the feature structure and semantic interpretation of personal pronouns; in the next sections, we analyse postpronominal definite and non-definite adjective modifiers (section 3) and, subsequently, postpronominal definite and non-definite NPs (section 4). The original intuition on which we build is that, in the postpronominal construction, definite adjectives and definite nouns have kind-level interpretation, while non-definites have predicate denotations of the ordinary <e, t>-type. We then extend the analysis to PP-modifiers (section 5), proposing that the well-known *de*-PP [locative] modifiers also have kind-level interpretation with the preposition *de* functioning as a type-shifter, an interpretation which solves a number of (so far, unresolved) problems. Section 6 draws the conclusions.

2. Ingredients of the analysis

The minimalist framework adopted here is that of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), extended to the nominal domain in earlier work (e.g. Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011a); we therefore distinguish between the valuation and the interpretability of features.

Ever since personal pronouns were first analysed as determiners, they have been characterised with respect to definiteness, with the claim that personal pronouns are definite DPs, as confirmed by their occurrence in typical definiteness environments such as the partitive construction:


(17) a. doi dintre ei (Rom.)
two of them
b. two of them (E.)

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

More recently, however, Longobardi (2008) suggests that the minimal content of the D category is person rather than definiteness, so that pronouns may be assumed to check [Person] in D. We will adopt the hypothesis that in UG the characteristic feature checked in DPs headed by pronouns is [uperson] (Longobardi 2008). Moreover, the definiteness feature is not required semantically since personal pronouns are identified as participants in the discourse, with their specific roles, and are not identified as "definite", therefore, as "objects familiar to the speaker and hearer", in the sense of Heim (1982). The definiteness feature may be missing and is expletive when demonstrably present.

Since Romanian nominal stems are sensitive to definiteness and are analysed as [±u+def] (Cornilescu and Nicolae 2012, Nicolae 2013a), and since the discussion above has already suggested that definiteness plays an important part in pronominal syntax, the main claim of this paper is that pronouns should be viewed as NPs at merge (see for a similar proposal Cardinaletti 1994, Rouveret 1994). We come round to Emonds' (1985) intuition that functional categories are/were in the same lexical category as the category which they extend; accordingly, pronouns are in the same category with nouns, the NP-category. Thus pronouns merge as NPs, so that they will be specified for definiteness. We claim that Romanian personal pronouns are inherently definite, incorporating an [*u*+def] feature. Adopting the configuration in (18) (from Déchaine and Wiltschko 2002, Gruber 2013), pronouns merge low and raise to value first their ϕ-features, and then [Person] and [definiteness]. The configuration in (18) is the minimal internal structure of a pronominal DP.

(18)



This hypothesis on pronouns being derived determiners and basic NPs has several consequences. First pronouns do not have nominal restrictions, as (correctly) claimed in pre-Postal (1969) work (see, for instance, Manoliu Manea 1968). They are bundles of grammatical features and completely lack descriptive content, being *deictic or anaphoric* constituents, not referential phrases (Chomsky 1981). Secondly, in as much as they are nominal heads and are endowed with ϕ-features and definiteness, they are subject to general nominal agreement processes, such as the agreement between the noun and the adjective.

From a semantic point of view, pronouns are no choice DPs (Farkas 2000). Like proper names and as explicitly shown in (18), they lack descriptive content, being just bundles of grammatical features. In semantic representations they appear as variables and can never be predicates; an assignment function attributes them an individual (whether an atomic individual for singular pronouns or a group individual for plurals) (say, as in

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

Kamp and Reyle 1993). They do not denote classes or properties and, consequently, do not combine through predicate modification, but only through functional application (Heim and Kratzer 1998). Notice the sharp difference between the following phrases:

(19) a. **Noi trei** am plecat (??dar unul dintre noi a rămas).
we three have left but one from among us has remained
'We three left (?? but one of us remained).'
b. **Trei dintre noi** am plecat (dar unul a rămas).
three from among us have left but one has remained
'Three of us left (but one remained).'

(20) a. **Voi avocaţii** vă apăraţi clienţii.
you lawyers-DEF CL.2PL defend customers-DEF
'You lawyers defend your clients.'
b. **Avocaţii dintre voi** ştiu asta..
lawyers-DEF from among you know this
'The lawyers of you know this.'

There is a sharp contrast between (19a) and partitive (19b). While phrases of type (19a) indicate that the whole group denoted by noi 'we' has three members, all of whom have left, the pronoun embedding phrase in (19b) is a genuine partitive construction. Similarly, (20a) says something about all the lawyers available in some speech situation, while (20b) selects the lawyers out of a larger group including the hearer. The hypothesis that we entertain is that modifiers of pronouns are not restrictive, so that you lawyers cannot be the intersection of the sets of 'you' with the set of 'lawyers', on the model of red balls, denoting the intersection of the set of 'red' objects with the set of 'balls', since it is quite unclear what the set of 'you' objects would mean. Rather, at LF, the pronoun is always interpreted as the subject of a small clause whose predicate is the modifier (see, for a different opinion Giurgea 2008, Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013). There are several pronoun-modifier combinations depending on how the pronoun is interpreted (individual variable, property set) and depending on the formal structure of the predicative constituent, as will be seen in what follows.

It is also important that, with the exception of the third person, deictic pronouns are unspecified for gender, and get gender from the ϕP (see (18) above). One might assume that, for deictic pronouns, the ϕ-head has a valued interpretable gender feature, matching the unvalued interpretable feature of the pronoun, as shown by gender agreement of the predicative participle in (21):

(21) a. **Noi** am fost primi**ţi** / primite.
we have been received-PL.M / received-PL.F
'We were met (M/F).'
b. **Eu** am fost primit / primit**ă**.
I have been received-SG.M / received-SG.F
'I was met (M/F).'

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

Third person pronouns, which are gender-specified, agree with the gender head endowed with an interpretable unvalued feature. The ϕ-head also bears an interpretable unvalued Number feature.

(22) a. **El** a fost primit.
he has been receive-SG.M
b. **Ea** a fost primit**ă**.
she has been received-SG.F
'He / She was met.'

Taking into account what has been said so far, the lexicon entry of a deictic personal pronoun looks as in (23a), in contrast to the non-deictic pronoun in (23b).

(23) a. noi
[+D:__]
[*u*+Person: 1st person]
[+N[*u*+def: val]]
[*u*Gen:__]
[*u*Num:plural]
b. el
[+D:__]
[*u*+Person: 3rd person]
[+N[*u*+def:val]]
[*u*Gen: masculine]
[*u*Num: singular]

Let us now turn to the syntactic analysis of the pronominal structures featuring postpronominal modifiers, which is the main topic of this paper.

3. Pronouns and adjectives

Of the patterns based on the suffixal definite article, the most illuminating is that of the pronoun followed by a definite adjective.

(24) eu prostul / veşnic furiosul/ frumosul / deşteptul / generosul
I stupid-DEF / always furious-DEF beautiful-DEF / smart-DEF / generous-DEF
'I the stupid/the always furious/the beautiful/the smart/the generous'

3.1 Syntax and derivation

As generally agreed (see the discussion in Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011a, Nicolae 2013b), the definiteness feature on adjectives is an agreement feature, since definiteness is interpretable on nouns, but not on adjectives. Moreover, in (modern) Romanian only prenominal adjectives agree in definiteness, and may overtly display the suffixal definite article. The bearer of the definite suffix must be at least in the specifier position immediately below D, if not higher.

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(25) a. Carte**a** (e) minunată / *minunat**a**.
book-DEF is wonderful / wonderful-DEF
b. *carte minunat**a**
book wonderful-DEF
c. minunat**a** carte / *minunat**a** carte**a**
wonderful-DEF book / wonderful-DEF book-DEF

If the source of the article on an adjective is a definite noun, one must raise the question of the source of the definiteness feature on the adjective in the pronominal construction. Our hypothesis is that, since the only overt nominal occurring in (24) is the pronoun, it is the pronoun which is inherently definite and imposes definiteness agreement on an initially prenominal adjective. The fact that the adjective starts out in prenominal position is proved by the occurrence in this pattern of adjectives which are strictly prenominal otherwise (i.e. in DPs with lexical heads), such as certain intensional adjectives or intensional readings of adjectives. In DPs headed by nouns, adjectives like *fost* are ungrammatical in postnominal position (26c) in contrast with the pronominal DPs (26a); in the same vein, subjective interpretations of adjectives, which are only prenominal (27b) normally, may nevertheless obtain in postpronominal position (27a), and be suffixed by the definite article (note that, postnominally, these adjectives have descriptive readings, cf. (27c)).

(26) a. noi foşti**i**
we former-DEF
'we the former ones'
b. foştii artişti
former-DEF artists
'the former artists'
c. *artiştii foşti
artists-DEF former
(27) a. tu unic**ul** / singur**ul**
you unique-DEF / sole-DEF
'you the only one'
b. unicul / singur**ul** artist
unique-DEF / sole-DEF artist
'the only artist'
c. artistul unic / singur
artist-DEF unique / sole
'the unique / sole artist'


This distribution of adjectival senses indicates that the pronoun either merges higher than prenominal adjectives (e.g. in the D-domain) or, more likely in the case of Romanian, it moves there. Once we take into consideration definiteness agreement, the balance definitely tilts to the second option.

We will consider as basic for DP-pronouns the structure: DP > ϕP > NP proposed in Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002) and also in Gruber (2013), already introduced above in (18). Consider first the derivation of a non-modified personal pronoun, as in (28):

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(28) a. Noi (suntem obosite).
we (are tired-PL.F)
'We (are tired).'

b.



noi

In our analysis, the NP position is precisely occupied by the pronoun, which, as traditionally assumed, does not have a nominal restriction, but merely consists of "a bundle of grammatical features" (as stressed in Manoliu Manea 1968). Any descriptive information is, in fact, supplied by some different nominal phrase in the extended domain of the pronoun. We propose that the projection which introduces descriptive information on the referent of the pronoun is the Classifier Phrase (ClassP), as with proper names (Kihm 2005, Cornilescu 2007). The ClassP is immediately above NP and is, in fact, identical to, or analogous with, Zamparelli's (2000) Kind Phrase (KindP). "Kind" or "sort" is among the semantic features which are likely to be grammaticalized in the functional domain of DPs. The extended structure of the pronoun thus becomes DP > ϕP > ClassP > NP. The proposal that pronouns start out as NPs has been advanced before, for instance in Pesetsky (1978) or Rouveret (1994). What is at stake, then, is the merge position of the pronoun, since there is general agreement that strong pronouns are (derived) determiners.


Under these assumptions, the starting point of a phrase like (29a) may be (29b) below. The important point is that the adjective is in a configuration (i.e. prenominal) where it can Agree with the pronominal NP, the latter, by assumption being specified as [*u*+def: val] and behaving like a definite noun. The essential property of this derivation is that it forces the adjective to be definite, since it finds itself in a configuration of Agree with a definite nominal.

The presence of the [*u*+def: val] feature on the low Class-constituent forces the merger of an Art head, with an interpretable unvalued [*i*def] feature, valued by the adjective immediately below Art^0 (29c). This derivational algorithm is in line with proposals by Julien (2005), Roehrs (2006) and Leu (2008) that the article merges on the lexical NP phase and subsequently raises to D. As a consequence of definiteness valuation, the uninterpretable valued features of both the adjective and the pronoun are erased. The pronominal DP raises through Spec, ArtP to Spec, ϕP, where it erases its uninterpretable ϕ-features (gender, number). These steps are depicted in the derivations below.


BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(29) a. el generos**ul**
he generous-DEF
'he the generous'


b.



c.




d.




BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

e.



f.



Thus, the essential difference between personal pronouns and common nouns is the obligatory pronoun + definite adjective order, as opposed to definite adjective + noun order. This contrast immediately follows from the fact that only pronouns must raise to D to check Person.

(30) a. el generos**ul**
he generous-DEF
b. generos**ul** conducător
generous-DEF leader
a'. *generos**ul** el
generous-DEF he
b'. *conducător generos**ul**
leader generous-DEF

On this analysis, the difference between the English *we rich* and the Romanian *noi bogaţii* 'we rich-DEF'/French *nous les riches* 'we the rich' springs from the analysis of *noi* 'we' as a definite NP. The English pronouns, in contrast, are not marked as syntactically definite.

3.2 On the semantics of the construction

Unlike DPs headed by nominals, DPs headed by pronouns may establish a contrast between definite and non-definite adjectives in the same post-nominal position. Notice

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

that *postnominal* adjectives represent intersective modifiers, an interpretation which is not open to *postpronominal* adjectives:

(31) a. Profesorii incompetenţi au nenorocit şcoala.
professors-DEF incompetent have ruined school-DEF
'(The) incompetent teachers ruined school.'
b. Voi incompetenţi**i** aţi nenorocit şcoala.
you.PL incompetent-DEF have ruined school-DEF
'You incompetents have ruined school.'

There is a sharp contrast between definite and non-definite adjectives in post-pronominal position (see example (16) above), as further confirmed by other examples:

(32) a. Noi generoş**ii** iubim pe toată lumea.
we generous-DEF love PE all word-DEF
'We generous love everybody.'
b. Ei generoşi, n-aş crede.
they generous not would believe
'They (be) generous – I wouldn't believe that.'
(33) a. *Noi generoşi am acordat împrumutul.
we generous have granted loan.DEF
b. Noi, generoşi, am acordat împrumutul.
we generous have granted loan.DEF
'We, (being) generous, have granted the loan.'

An important recent grammar of Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013: 242) mentions that non-definite adjectives are predicates of small clauses, but does not enlarge on the possibility of definite adjectives modifying personal pronouns. Postpronominal non-definite adjectives which are not appositions with coma intonation ((32b), (33b)) are indeed small clause predicates and also have other semantic attributes.

In what follows we show that, while non-definite predicative adjectives are indeed external to the pronominal DP ((32b), (33b)), definite adjectives are *internal* to it ((31b), (32a)), and that Romanian pronouns accept adjectival modification just as the pronouns of other languages. As already seen, the definiteness of the adjective is a syntactic reflex of the inherent definiteness of the pronoun, and it is indubitable proof that the adjective is originally prenominal, and therefore part of the functional domain of the pronoun. Moreover, as long as the only feature all pronouns must check in D is [Person], it may well be the case that syntactic definiteness is not obligatory in the feature matrix of pronouns in other languages, whence the contrast between English and Italian (34)/(35) vs. Romanian and French (36)/(37).

(34) we generous (E.)
(35) noi richi (It.)
we rich
(36) noi generoş**ii** (Rom.)
we generous-DEF

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(37) nous **les** généreux (Fr.)
we the generous

Let us come back to the contrast between postpronominal definite and non-definite adjectives. What has appeared so far is that DPs followed by non-definite adjectives cannot be arguments, but always represent clausal constructions, c-selected by propositional verbs or adjectives. The same predicates reject pronouns followed by definite adjectives which are DPs, instead of small clauses

(38) a. El generos este aproape o imposibilitate.
he generous is almost an impossibility
'It's almost an impossibility that he be generous.'
b. *El generos**ul** este aproape o imposibilitate.
he generous-DEF is almost an impossibility

But there is a further interpretative contrast between the two types of adjectives. Predicative adjectives are either stage-level predicates (SLPs) or individual-level predicates (ILPs). In contrast, postpronominal definite adjectives must be interpreted as ILPs, and are excluded in contexts which require SLPs, as testified by the contrast below:

(39) a. M- am întâlnit cu el *generos / *inteligent / mânios / furios.
CL.1SG.ACC have met with him generous / intelligent / angry / furious
'I met him angry/furious.'
b. M- am întâlnit cu el generos**ul** / mânios**ul**.
CL.1SG.ACC have met with him generous-DEF / angry-DEF
'I met him the generous one/the angry one.'
c. M- am întâlnit cu el generos**ul** furios.
CL.1SG.ACC have met with him generous-DEF furious
'I met him the generous one (when he was) furious.'

Thus the small clause after *întâlni* 'meet' requires SLPs, so that adjectives which denote ILPs are ruled out (39a). In contrast definite adjectives are unrestricted, but all of them are interpreted as denoting permanent properties of the pronoun's referent (cf. (39b)). Furthermore, definite adjectives must precede non-definite ones (39c). This is expected if the former are DP-internal and the latter are DP-external. Definite adjectives also precede other types of small clause predicates, such as PPs in (40a), participles in (40b) and cannot appear at a distance from the noun (40c). Notice the same contrast in (41), with depictive secondary predicates: only non-definite adjectives may have this role, as seen in (41a). Definite adjectives are again interpreted as permanent characteristic properties (41b) and must precede the depictive secondary predicate (see the contrast between (42a) and (42b)).

(40) a. M- am întâlnit cu el atotputernic**ul** fără bani azi!
CL.1SG.ACC have met with him almighty-DEF without money today
'I met him the almighty moneyless yesterday!'

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

b. El atotputernic**ul** ajuns la sapă de lemn, asta era un spectacol!
he almighty-DEF arrived at shovel of wood this was a show
'He the almighty, reduced to a morsel of bred – this was a show!'

c. *El ajuns la sapă de lemn atotputernic**ul**.
he arrived at shovel of wood almighty-DEF

(41) a. În cameră a intrat el furios.
in room has entered he furious
'He rushed into the room furious.'

b. În cameră a intrat el furios**ul**.
in room has entered he furious-DEF
'He the furious entered the room.'

(42) a. În cameră a intrat el furios**ul** roşu la faţă / furios ca de obicei.
in room has entered he furious-DEF red at face / furious as of custom
'He the furious entered the room red in the face / furious as usual'

b. *În cameră a intrat el roşu la faţă furios**ul**.
in room has entered he red at face furious-DEF

The interpretation of these examples has shown several facts. First of all, definite adjectives are internal to pronominal DPs and they cannot be small clause predicates. This naturally follows from the analysis above, where definiteness is the result of an agreement process, which, moreover, cannot happen for predicates in Romanian.

Secondly, a semantic conclusion also follows. Definite adjectives must be interpreted as permanent properties of the referent. Alternatively, they may be viewed as properties of the kind which is realized by the pronoun's referent.

Two different modes of semantic combination are required to deal with the two distinct types of adjectives. Specifically, to accommodate the data, we will assume that pronouns can have two types of individual denotations and that they are never predicates, naturally.

On the one hand, the pronoun may be viewed as denoting some variable, assigned a particular individual by some assignment function. As known from Kaplan (1989), pronouns can have direct reference and directly refer to some context-given individual which satisfies some predicate. This individual variable denotation is sufficient to account for the pronoun's combination with a (non-definite) predicative adjective. As shown above, this configuration is propositional, a small clause selected by predicates that are not compatible with object-level subjects. The predicate *be an impossibility* selects for a clausal (propositional) constituent and it is not compatible with DPs denoting individuals. The meaning of (43a) is plausibly rendered by (43b):

(43) a. El generos, asta este chiar o imposibilitate.
he generous this is really an impossibility
'He generous – it's really an impossibility.'

b. este-o-imposibilitate(generos (x))
is-a-impossibility(generous(x))

c. *El (generos**ul**) este o imposibilitate.
he generous-DEF is an impossibility

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

Let us turn to the semantics of the combination pronoun + definite (nominalised) adjective. As shown above, the definite adjective is inside the DP and expresses permanent, individual-level properties. This raises the problem of the type of semantic combination active with definite adjectives. We could suggest that to accommodate the definite, property-denoting adjective, we should raise the type of the pronoun and allow it to denote the characteristic property set of some context-given individual. The pronoun will have a higher, individual concept reading, representing the set of properties defining a particular individual, i.e. λP.P(x). The definite adjective denotes one of these characteristic properties.

(44) a. El generosul făcea mult bine.
he generous-DEF made much good
'He the generous one did a lot of good things.'
b. făcea-mult-bine (λP.P(x)(generos)) ➔ făcea-mult-bine (generos(x)) ➔ făcea-mult-bine(x) ∧ generos(x).

As already hinted above, a better solution is to assume that the article shifts the denotation of the adjective to the kind-level '(the) generous'; the adjective is nominalized and denotes a kind, the kind 'generous (individual)'. The referent of the pronominal variable instantiates a realization of the kind, as in (45c). The kind-level interpretation immediately accounts for the impossibility of occurrence in the SLP contexts of the definite adjective.

(45) a. El generosul făcea mult bine.
he generous-DEF make much good
b. λP.τx ∃k [generos (k) ∧ R (x, k) ∧ P(x)] (făcea-mult-bine)
c. τx ∃k [generos (k) ∧ R (x, k) ∧ (făcea-mult-bine) (x)]

In Romance and other languages, as known, the definite article can shift the denotation of a predicate (class) to the corresponding intensional entity, the given kind. Therefore the type shifting operations needed to account for the denotation of definite adjectives is independently needed for Romance generic sentences with definite subjects (Chierchia 1998).

The same semantics holds valid for the nominal constituents and PPs which appear to modify the pronoun, which will be discussed in the following sections.

4. Pronouns and nominal modifiers

In this section we turn to non-appositional constructions where Romanian pronouns are followed by definite NPs. Romanian again contrasts with English, just as before. In English pronouns appear to have determiner distribution directly selecting NPs/NumPs, while in Romanian they select definite DPs (see (46)). In genuine appositional constructions, both languages allow both definite and indefinite nominals ((47)-(48)).

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(46) a. We linguists learn a lot. (E.)
b. Noi lingvişti**i** învăţăm multe. (Rom.)
we linguists-DEF learn many
'We linguists learn a lot.'

(47) a. You, acknowledged famous linguists, have accomplished a lot. (E.)
b. Voi, lingvişti celebri, aţi realizat multe. (Rom.)
you linguists famous have realized many
'You, famous linguists, have accomplished a lot.'

(48) a. You, **the** most reputed linguists in the world, must do something about it (E.)
b. Voi, lingvişti**i** cei mai cunoscuţi acum, trebuie să interveniţi (Rom.)
you linguists-DEF the most known now must SĂ intervene
'You, the most known linguists now, must intervene.'

As already mentioned we are uniquely interested in the construction in (46), whose existence has often been noticed, but whose properties have sometimes been misdescribed. Thus it has been implicitly or explicitly claimed that this construction is available only in the first and second person[2] (particularly in the plural). In fact, this construction is available in all persons singular and plural (see (49) and (50) below). In the singular (cf. (49)), what is required to get a non-appositive interpretation is a contrastive focus intonation on the definite NP. Notice that example (49c), rewritten with comma intonation (49c'), sounds distinctly odd.

(49) a. Eu mam**a** susţin proiectul, eu profesoar**a** mă opun.
I mother-DEF support project-DEF I teacher-DEF CL.1SG.ACC oppose
'I the mother support the project, I the teacher am against it.'
b. Tu savant**ul** te- ai îngrozit, tu omul de afaceri ai
you scientist-DEF CL.2SG.ACC have horrified you man-DEF of business have
fost de acord.
been of agreement
'You the scientist were horrified, you the businessman have agreed.'
c. El savant**ul** se va opune, el părintele va fi de acord
c'. *El, savantul, se va opune, el, părintele, va fi de acord.
he scientist-DEF SE will oppose he parent-DEF will be of agreement
'He the scientist will oppose it, he the parent will agree with it.'

(50) a. Numai ei oameni**i** de afaceri şi nu ceilalţi ştiau adevărul.
only they men-DEF of business and not others knew truth-DEF
'Only they the businessmen and not the other ones knew the truth'
b. Noi lingvişti**i** şi voi filozofi**i** avem interese comune.
we linguists-DEF and you philosophers-DEF have interests common
'We linguists and you philosophers have common interests.'

[2] "Plural 1st and 2nd also allow definite DPs not separated by comma which specify the group including the speaker/addressee" (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013: 242).

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)


It has also been claimed, for examples of type (50b), that the definite DP "restricts" the pronoun. The term restrictive modification could be misleading. Notice first that, as one runs through the six persons, the interpretation of the pronominal construction does not seem to change: in all of the examples, the definite DP is focused and functions as a classifier which specifies the kind (in Carlson's 1977 sense) realized by the pronoun's referent. Semantically, the construction is not different from the adjectival one. Secondly, if the definite DP is viewed as a kind-level modifier, this interpretation can be extended to all pronouns, singular or plural; it is well known that the modifiers of the singular pronouns cannot be viewed as restrictive. In fact, the restrictive modifier interpretation is inappropriate even for the plural pronouns for which it was proposed, since *noi oamenii de afaceri* 'we men-DEF of business', does not mean 'those of us who are businessmen', but rather, 'we, who are all businessmen'.

While semantically the definite noun construction is very similar to the definite adjectival one, its syntactic structure clearly shows that the nominal is not the restriction of the determiner-pronoun, rather the structure contains two full DPs: the pronoun and an inherently definite NP in the classifier phrase. This is shown by examples of type (51), where the pronoun and the definite nominal disagree in ϕ-features (number/gender):

(51) a. noi plebe**a** / mulţime**a** / prostime**a**
we plebs-DEF / crowd-DEF / mob-DEF
'we the plebs/the crowd/mob'
b. voi popor**ul** / vulg**ul** / guvern**ul** / parlament**ul**
you people-DEF / rabble-DEF / government-DEF / parliament-DEF
c. ei departament**ul**
they department-DEF

In this interpretation the initial configuration of the definite noun construction looks like (52) below, a configuration where the classifier may still agree with the classified in definiteness.


(52)



BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)


Since the two nominals have different and valued ϕ-features, definiteness is the only agreement feature[3]. The examples above show that, while definiteness is inherently marked on the pronoun, it is overtly realized on the definite noun, therefore it is the classifier phrase which ends up valuing the definiteness feature of the pronominal phrase. Following definiteness agreement, the derivation of the definite noun construction goes through the same steps as for the definite adjective construction (see section 3.1 above). The uninterpretable definite feature on the classifier phrase forces the merger of an Art [*i*def:__] head. The Art head has its feature valued by the definite classifier, and the [u+def] feature is again erased on both the classifier and the pronominal head, linked by the same Agree chain.

(53)



The pronoun raises through Spec, ArtP to Spec, ϕP, as shown in ((54a), (54b)), to erase its uninterpretable ϕ-features (gender, number). At the next step, the D[*i*def:__] merges, as in (54c). If the ϕ-head adjoins to D, the definite ArtP may raise to Spec, D (observing equidistance, in the sense of Lasnik 2009), valuing D's definiteness feature (54d). The pronoun, however, has not erased its [*u*Pers] feature. A PersP is projected as a Last Resort (54e). The D head (i.e. the ϕ+D head) adjoins to Pers, allowing the ϕP containing the pronoun to move to PersP.


(54) a.




[3] Agreement features, including definiteness, should not be viewed as a cluster, valued at once. As already suggested, ϕ-features may project independently and be valued by separate Agree operations. Such a situation is described, for instance, in Boeckx (2002).

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)


b.




c.



d.



BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)



It would also be desirable to consider a terminological point: what is the syntactic category of the Person phrase in a Split-D approach (see Giusti 1996, 2005 on Romanian, 2012, Ihsane and Puskas 2001, Aboh 2004, Laenzlinger 2005a, 2005b, 2010, Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011b)? In any nominal phrase, the pronoun is the absolute leftmost constituent, being even followed by classical predeterminers like *toţi* 'all'*/amândoi* 'both'. On the other hand, since Longobardi (2008) insists that the [Person] feature is the minimal content of the category D, a natural suggestion is that PersP is the higher, D_{outer}, of the configuration.

Consider some cross-linguistic facts. The derivation is perfectly similar for French examples like *nous le peuple français* 'we the French people', except that Art is realized as *les*. In languages like Italian or English, where there is no definite article in the plural pronoun construction, the derivation is the same, but there is no inherent definiteness specification on the pronoun and therefore no ArtP is projected. Possible ϕ-feature mismatches, as in *How are you people?*, show that in these languages too the pronoun is an NP initially, rather than a D with a nominal restriction.

Let us now examine a more extended version of the contrast between English and Romanian, including singular, as well as plural personal pronouns. While the Romanian pronominal construction is homogeneous exhibiting the same form for all persons, the English one is heterogeneous, exhibiting a marked contrast between the singular and the plural pronouns. The discussion is confined to the first and second person constructions, to steer clear of the competition between personal pronouns and demonstrative in the third person.

(55) a. eu lingvist**ul**, tu profesor**ul** (Rom.)
I linguist-DEF you professor-DEF
b. noi lingviști**i**, voi profesori**i**
we linguists-DEF you.PL. professors-DEF

(56) a. I **the** linguist, you **the** professor (E.)
a'. *I linguist, *you professor
b. we linguists, you professors
b'. we the linguists, you the professors

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

These data raise the question of why there is a disparity between singular and plural pronouns in English. First, it must be said the phrases in (56a) do not require comma intonation (Martin Maiden p.c.) and therefore they are not loose appositions, but the definite nominal phrase is internal to the pronominal DP in (56a), just as it is in (56b). There are syntactic and semantic differences between (56a) and (56b). In the first place, from a semantic angle, the speaker, i.e. 1st person singular, and the hearer, i.e. 2nd person singular are truly unique, context-given participants, differing from the plural first person and second person, whose membership varies from speech act to speech act; for instance, from one sentence to the next, the first person plural may be inclusive or exclusive (Vasilescu in *GALR* 2008, I: 197-200). This remark, which has been made before, was interpreted as showing that singular pronouns denote unique sets and cannot be further restricted (see Pesetsky 1978, Giurgea 2008). However, in each speech act, the plural pronoun readings are associated with a specific group, a non-atomic variable and the modifier does not select a subgroup, but indicates the kind which is realized by the whole group. Given this, we prefer to interpret the existence and uniqueness of the referent of the singular pronoun as a definiteness feature which is incorporated in the singular pronouns as a semantic property, as has at times been proposed for proper names (Borer 2005). Under the analysis that we have proposed if singular pronouns always incorporate definiteness there may be agreement with the classifier phrase, just as there is in Romanian for all the personal pronouns. Plural pronouns do not possess that feature, so the classifier remains non-definite in (56b). A further remark is that languages differ in the range of expressions capable to express the kind-reading of a nominal phrase. In English bare plurals may express kinds, as first pointed in Carlson's (1977) classic work; this accounts for the felicity of (56b), as opposed to (55a') in English. Even in English, bare singulars (non-mass) lack the kind reading, and the definite article may act as a type shifter, turning properties into kinds (see Chierchia 1998); this accounts for the felicity of interpreting the definite NP as a kind in (55a). The prediction is that languages where bare plurals may express kinds may have expressions of type (55b) (*we linguists*), modulo the definiteness specification of the pronominal NP. German is such a language:

(57) Was denken wir (*die) Deutschen über die Hochschulreform
what think we the Germans about the university reform
'What we Germans think about the university reform.'

There appear, however, to be two dimensions of variation: one is that of the means of encoding the predicate vs. kind/property interpretation in the language. But this is not sufficient. Italian, a language where the kind reading of bare plurals is constrained (though not inexistent, see Longobardi 1994), may use the same structure as German and English, contrasting with Romanian and French:

(58) Noi (*gli) italiani siamo i migliori.
we the Italians are the best
'We Italians are the best.'

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

The second, in our opinion, crucial dimension of variation is *definiteness*, which may be a syntactic and semantic feature, as it is in Romanian, or only a semantic feature as it appears to be in English (Danon 2010; see Nicolae 2013a, for Romanian). The role of definiteness especially comes out in languages like French (or Spanish) which exhibit variation between the patterns in (59a) and that in (59b) for the same plural pronouns. It is also in terms of definiteness that we can understand the contrast between Romanian, where the pronouns are definite, and French and Italian, where the pronouns may be indefinite (60). To express alternation, Italian and French use an indefinite pronominal form ((60a), (60b)), while Romanian uses a definite demonstrative form, excluding the indefinite counterpart (60c). Assuming that there is agreement between the personal pronoun and the pronouns expressing alternation, the contrast is easily explained.

(59) a. nous musiciens (Fr.)
we musicians
b. nous les musiciens
we the musicians

(60) a. nous autres (Fr.)
we others
b. noi altri (It.)
we others
c. noi ceilalţi / *alţi (Rom.)
we the others / others

Summing up on this brief comparative discussion, it appears that in English too, it is more profitable to analyze personal pronouns as basically NPs that raise to the D-position. This analysis allows for the accommodation of nominal (and adjectival) classifiers, as well as for definiteness agreement, when it is required (for instance, for singular pronouns). The view that English pronouns are NPs that switch category and turn into determiners has been argued for, with different evidence, by Pesetsky (1978). On the other hand, certain pronominal forms, like *us* and *them* below have genuine article behaviour and might represent basic determiners, as originally proposed in Postal's (1969) seminal work. Determiner *us* and *them* (61) are nominative-accusative forms, distinct from the standard accusative pronouns:

(61) a. **us** linguists
b. **them** guys

(62) a. **We**, linguists from conviction, abhor computers.
b. ***Us**, linguists from conviction, abhor computers.
c. **We/us** linguists from conviction abhor computers.

(63) a. All **us** linguists understand the riddle of existence.
b. All those linguists understand the riddle of existence.
c. *All **we/us** read Panini.
d. *All **we**, the linguists of America, understand the riddle of existence.

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

The examples above show a clear contrast between *we* and *us*, visible in (62a)/ (62b); *us* requires the presence of an overt restriction, being otherwise incompatible with loose appositions. Examples like (63) show that *us*/*them* have determiner distribution, possibly being preceded by the predeterminer *all* (63a), just like demonstratives (63b). This is not possible for the pronoun *we* (63c) or for a pronominal variant of *us/them* (63d).

5. Pronouns and prepositional modifiers

Pronouns are also compatible with PP modifiers. In the pronominal construction, PP-modifiers are very much like the nominal and adjectival ones. The same contrast may be set up between PPs which may have only a small clause predicate interpretation and are DP-external, PPs which admit only a DP-internal interpretation, and PPs with which both readings are available. Here are examples illustrating the three situations:

(i) The class of PPs which function as small clause predicates is the same as the class of PPs which appear across the copula: spatial prepositions, prepositions like *pentru* 'for', *contra*, *împotriva* 'against':

(64) a. Tu la Sinaia / în parc la ora asta? N- aş fi crezut!
you at Sinaia / in park at hour-DEF this not would be believed
'You at Sinaia/in the park at this hour? I wouldn't have believed it.'

a'. N- aş fi crezut ca tu să fii la Sinaia / în parc la ora asta.
not would be believed that you SĂ be at Sinaia / in park at hour-DEF this
'I wouldn't have believed that you would be at Sinaia/in the park at this hour.'

b. El de la Paris? Mai degrabă de la ţară.
he from Paris more rather from countryside
'He from Paris? Rather, from the countryside.'

b'. El nu e de la Paris, e de la ţară.
he not is from Paris is from countryside
'He is not from Paris, he is from the countryside'

c. Tu pentru acest proiect ... nu cred.
youfor this project not believe
'You for this project ... I don't believe it.'

c'. Tu eşti pentru acest proiect.
you are for this project
'You are for this project.'

d. Tu contra lui e greu de crezut.
you against his is hard of believed
'You against him is hard to believe.'

d'. E greu de crezut că tu eşti contra lui
is hard of believed that you are against his
'It's hard to believe that you are against him.'

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

These small clauses are selected by propositional predicates, functioning as their arguments, as shown by the finite clause paraphrases. The pronominal DP is interpreted as the subject of the prepositional small clause.

(ii) The class of PPs which always function as internal to the DPs headed by the pronouns include the *de*-counterparts of the locative Ps mentioned above. The whole DP, including the PP, is an argument of some predicate. The PP is the equivalent of a restrictive relative clause:

(65) a. Tu *din*[4] *asociaţia* *Pro Democraţia* înţelegi aceste principii.
you DE-in association-DEF Pro Democracy understand these principles
'You from the Pro Democracy association understand these principles.'

a'. Tu care eşti *în / *din asociaţia* Pro Democraţia înţelegi aceste principii.
you who are in DE-in association-DEF Pro Democracy understand these principles
'You who are in the Pro Democracy association understand these principles.'

b. Tu *din banca întâi* nu ai făcut tema.
you DE-in desk-DEF first not have done homework-DEF
'You from the first desk haven't done your homework.'

b' .Tu care eşti *în / *din banca întâi* nu ai făcut tema.
you who are in / DE-in desk-DEF first not have done homework-DEF
'You who sit in the first desk haven't done your homework.'

c. Tu ***de** la geam* stai în lumină.
you DE at window stand in light
'You at the window are standing in the light.'

c'. Tu care eşti *la geam / *de la geam* stai în lumină.
you who are at window / DE at window stand in light
'You who are at the window are standing in the light.'

d. Tu ***de** pe hol* vorbeşti prea tare.
you DE on hallway speak too loud
'You on the hallway are speaking too loud.'

d'. Tu care *eşti pe / *de pe hol* vorbeşti prea tare.
you which are on / DE on hallway speak too loud
'You who are on the hallway are speaking too loud.'

Notice that these PPs cannot function as small clause predicates and cannot occur across the copula if *de* is lexicalised (see also (65a'), (65b'), (65c'), and (65d') above):

(66) a. Pe mine m- au găsit la facultate / ***de** la facultate.
PE me CL.1SG.ACC have found at faculty / DE at faculty
'They found me at the faculty.'

b. Ion este la geam / ***de** la geam.
Ion is at window / DE at window
'Ion is at the window.'

[4] The preposition *din* is historically made up of *de* 'of' + *în* 'in'.

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

(iii) A third category is that of PPs which may have both types of readings, that we might call predicative, as in (68), and attributive, as in (67); such is the case of *cu* 'with' and *fără* 'without':

(67) a. Dă -i o plăcintă şi lui cu bască.
give CL.3SG.DAT a pie and him with beret
'Give a pie also to the one with a beret.'

b. Tu cu pălărie / cu barbă / cu plete / cu basma ai ieşit
you with hat / with beard / with plaited hair / with kerchief have come out
foarte bine în poză.
very well in photo
'You wearing a hat/having a beard/having plaited hair/wearing a headkerchief came out very well in the photo.'

(68) a. Tu cu pălărie / cu barbă / cu plete / cu basma, n- aş fi
you with hat / with beard / with plaited hair / with kerchief not would be
crezut!
believed
'You wearing a hat/having a beard/having plaited hair/wearing a kerchief, I wouldn't have believed it!'

b. El fără papion, nu se poate!
he without butterfly-bow not SE can
'He without a butterfly bow – impossible!'

As far as DP-internal PP modifiers are concerned, their syntax raises no problems which would not already have been discussed. The PP is part of the ClassP, introducing information which might be construed as naming the kind realized by the pronoun's referent, or alternatively some property that this referent satisfies. Romanian PP-modifiers interestingly confirm the hypothesis that (at least in Romanian) DP-internal pronominal modifiers denote kinds. Remember that, while properties/predicates are denoted by nouns, verbs and adjectives, only NPs/DPs denote kinds. Baker (2003) contends that kinds represent the basic denotation of the category Noun, since it can account for the combination of nouns with determiners and quantifiers, a feature which is shared by no other lexical category.

Let us turn to the de preposition which introduces modifiers internal to the pronominal DP, i.e. modifiers which cannot be interpreted as predicates. Thus, oversimplifying the data, de always introduces a PP [Locative] whenever the PP [Locative] modifies an NP, but it is impossible across the copula, as an adverbial or as the predicate of any small clause, as shown by the following contrasts:

(69) a. Tabloul atârnă **pe** perete.
painting-DEF hangs on wall
'The painting hangs on the wall.'

b. *Tabloul **pe** perete atârnă strâmb.
painting-DEF on wall hangs crooked

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

c. Tabloul **de pe** perete atârnă strâmb.
painting-DEF DE on wall hangs crooked
'The painting on the wall hangs crooked.'
d. *Tabloul este **de pe** perete
painting-DEF is DE on wall

(70) a. *Băiatul **la** geam a strănutat.
boy-DEF at window has sneezed
b. Băiatul **de la** geam a strănutat.
boy-DEF DE at window has sneezed
'The boy from the window sneezed.'

(71) a. Florile au înflorit **în** grădină.
flowers-DEF have bloomed in garden
'The flowers have bloomed in the garden.'
b. Florile **din** grădină au înflorit.
flowers-DEF DE-in garden have bloomed
'The flowers in the garden have bloomed.'
c. *Florile au înflorit **din** grădină.
flowers-DEF have bloomed DE-in garden

The preposition is not required by some other DP-functional category. The presence of *de*+PP[Locative] does not hinge on the presence of any type of determiner, for instance, in particular, these modifiers are even possible with bare plurals. The bare plural combinations are not entirely felicitous since the modifier tends to provide identifying information on the referent, triggering the insertion of a determiner:

(72) a. A îndreptat [un tablou / tabloul / mai multe tablouri de pe
has straightened a painting / painting-DEF / more paintings DE on wall
perete].
wall
'He straightened a painting/the painting/more paintings on the wall.'
b. Admiră tablouri [**de pe** / ??**pe** pereţii muzeului].
admires paintings DE on / on walls museum-DEF.GEN
c. A vorbit cu [prieteni **de la** / ***la** Paris].
has spoken with friends DE at / at Paris
'He spoke to friends from Paris.'

As also noticed in the literature (Cornilescu 2001), *de*-modifiers are incongruent with event interpretations of deverbal nouns. Thus (73b) is odd since it makes reference to the kind '(d)in 1985', suggesting that more than one demolishing has taken place.

(73) a. dărâmarea clădirii în 1985
demolishing-DEF building-DEF.GEN in 1985
'the demolishing of the building in 1985'
b. ??dărâmarea din 1985 a clădirii
demolishing-DEF DE-in 1985 AL building-DEF.GEN

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

To understand the role of *de*, we should remember that spatial (and temporal) prepositions/particles have three functions in English and, possibly, in UG, as shown by Klipple (1997) (see also Drăgan 2013 for Romanian): (i) they denote places (*Under the bed is where the kittens like to play*); (ii) they denote relations between a figure and a background (*The ball is under the bed*); and (iii) they denote aspectual properties (*The y have used the supplies up*). We propose that the role of *de* is to eliminate the relational reading (reading (ii) – note that Romanian does not possess relation (iii)) in favour of the entity reading (reading (i)), and litft the latter to the kind reading. Thus, the preposition *de* is a type-shifter forming a kind out of a place entity. While *la Paris* is a Location, *de la Paris*, is the set of properties of the kind 'entity in Paris'. If these PPs can only denote kinds, one can immediately understand that they combine only with nouns (see (69d) and (71c)), since nouns are the only kind-denoting lexical category. Nouns have kind readings by default (Baker 2003).

As for the combinations of DE PPs with pronouns, it is quite similar to the combinations discussed below. The PP *din România* (DE-in Romania) denotes the set of properties of the kind 'entity in Romania'.

(74) a. Noi din România înţelegem mult.
we DE-in Romania understand a-lot
'We from Romania understand a lot of things.'

b. din România = λP.[din-Romania (k) $\wedge$ P(k)]

c. noi din România = λP.τX [(din-Romania (k) $\wedge$ R(X, k)) $\wedge$ P(k)]

d. Noi din România înţelegem mult. =
= λP.τX [(din-România (k) $\wedge$ R(X, k)) $\wedge$ P(k)] (înțelegem-mult)
= τX $\exists$k [(din-România (k) $\wedge$ R(X, k)) $\wedge$ înțelegem-mult (k)]

6. Conclusions

The paper confirms the hypothesis that pronominal DPs have internal structure. The minimal strong personal pronoun evinces the functional structure DP > ϕP > NP, as demonstrated by Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002). In this structure, Romanian personal pronouns merge as NPs, which raise to D to check [Person] and [Definiteness]. In this analysis, pronouns do not have a nominal restriction, but function as anaphoric or deictic constituents.

We have proposed that the characteristic syntactic property of Romanian pronouns is that they are inherently marked for definiteness, and therefore they are liable to agree with any modifiers, when present. Since pronouns are NPs, they behave like regular nouns, their nominal stem being marked for syntactic definiteness (i.e. [*u*+def: val]). This is a manifestation of parametric option of Romanian as a syntactically definite language (Nicolae 2013a). Syntactic definiteness accounts for all of the properties that differentiate Romanian strong pronouns from their counterparts in other languages.

Since pronouns do not have a nominal restriction, any descriptive (lexical) information must be supplied by a distinct nominal, a classifier phrase (ClassP) in our

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

interpretation. This is the source of the many types of modifiers internal to the pronominal phrase (e.g. an NP, an AP, or a PP). Syntactically, when possible, these modifiers agree with the definite pronoun, getting to be marked for definiteness themselves. This is the case of adjectival and nominal modifiers.

An interesting contrast has emerged between pronominal DP-internal and -external APs / NPs / PPs: external constituents are predicates of small clauses, while DP-internal APs / NPs / PPs supply kind-level information on the pronoun's referent, thus classifying the pronoun. One might say that DP-internal postpronominal modifiers qualify as nominal categorization devices in the sense of Aikhenvald (2000).

References

Abney, S. P. 1987. The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Aboh, E. O. 2004. Topic and focus within DP. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 21: 1-12.

Aikhenvald, A. 2000. *Classifiers. A Typology of Noun Categorization Devices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, M. 2003. *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boeckx, C. 2002. Quirky agreement. *Studia linguistica* 54 (3): 354-380.

Borer, H. 2005. *In Name Only*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti, A. 1994. On the internal structure of pronominal DPs. *The Linguistic Review* 11 (3-4): 191-219.

Carlson, G. 1977. Reference to Kinds in English. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Chierchia, G. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 339-405

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Cornilescu, A. 2001. Romanian nominalizations: Case and aspectual structure. *Journal of Linguistics* 37 (3): 467-501.

Cornilescu, A. 2007. On classifiers and proper names. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 9 (1): 61-75.

Cornilescu, A., Nicolae, A. 2011a. On the syntax of Romanian definite phrases: Changes in the patterns of definiteness checking. In P. Sleeman and H. Perridon (eds.), *The Noun Phrase in Romance and Germanic. Structure, Variation, and Change*, 193-221. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cornilescu, A., Nicolae, A. 2011b. Nominal peripheries and phase structure in the Romanian DP. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 56 (1): 35-68.

Cornilescu, A., Nicolae, A. 2012. Nominal ellipsis as definiteness and anaphoricity: The case of Romanian. *Lingua* 122 (10): 1070-1111.

Danon, G. 2010. The definiteness feature at the syntax-semantics interface. In A. Kibort, G. G. Corbett (eds.), *Features. Perspectives on a Key Notion in Linguistics*, 144-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Déchaine, R. M., Wiltschko, M. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33 (3): 409-442.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C., Giurgea, I. (eds.). 2013. *A Reference Grammar of Romanian***,** vol. 1, *The Noun Phrase*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Drăgan, R. 2012. *Aspects of Lexical Structure: Verbs in Locative Constructions in English and Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Emonds, J. 1985. *Towards a Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Farkas, D. 2000. Varieties of definites. Ms., University of California at Santa Cruz.

GALR. 2008. V. Guţu Romalo (ed.), *Gramatica limbii române*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Giurgea, I. T. 2008. *Recherches sur la structure interne des pronoms et des expressions nominales sans nom exprimé*. PhD dissertation, Université Paris 7 "Denis Diderot".

Giusti, G. 1996. Is there a TopP and a FocP in the noun phrase?. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6 (1): 105-128.

Giusti, G. 2005. At the left periphery of the Romanian noun phrase. In M. Coene, L. Tasmowski (eds.), *On Space and Time in Language*, 23-49. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.

Giusti, G. 2012. On Force and Case, Fin and Num. In V. Bianchi and C. Cresti (eds.), *Enjoy Linguistics! Papers Offered to Luigi Rizzi on the Occasion of his 60th Anniversary*, 205-217. Centro Interdipartamentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio, Siena: CISCL Press.

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

Gruber, B. 2013. The Spatiotemporal Dimensions of Person: A Morphosyntactic Account of Indexical Pronouns. PhD dissertation, Utrecht University.
Heim, I. 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Heim, I., Kratzer, A. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Ihsane, T., Puskás, G. 2001. Specific is not definite. *GG@G* (Generative Grammar in Geneva) 2: 39-54.
Julien, M. 2005. *Nominal Phrases from a Scandinavian Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Kamp, H., Reyle, U. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Kaplan, D. 1989. Demonstratives. In J. Almog, J. Perry, H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*, 481-563. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kihm, A. 2005. Noun class, gender, and the lexicon-syntax-morphology interfaces: A comparative study of Niger-Congo and Romance languages. In G. Cinque and R. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, 459-512. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Klipple, E. 1997. Prepositions and variation. In A.-M. di Sciullo (ed.), *Projections and Interface Conditions*, 74-108. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Laenzlinger, C. 2005a. French adjective ordering: Perspectives on DP-internal movement types. *Lingua* 115 (5): 645-689.
Laenzlinger, C. 2005b. Some notes on DP-internal movement. *GG@G* (Generative Grammar in Geneva) 4: 227-260.
Laenzlinger, C. 2010. The CP/DP parallelism revisited. *GG@G* (Generative Grammar in Geneva) 6: 49-107.
Lasnik, H. 2009. Shortest Move and Equidistance. Ms., University of Maryland, available at: http://ling.umd.edu/~lasnik/LING611%202009'/Equidistance.pdf.
Leu, Th. 2008. The Internal Structure of Determiners. PhD dissertation, New York University.
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. 2008. Reference to individuals, person, and the variety of mapping parameters. In H. H. Müller and A. Klinge (eds.), *Essays on Nominal Determination*, 189-211. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Manoliu Manea, M. 1968. *Sistematica substitutelor din româna contemporană standard.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei R.S.R.
Nicolae, A. 2013a. Notă de sintaxă comparată: parametrul [+definit] în sintaxa grupului nominal românesc. *Limba română* 62 (2): 186-209.
Nicolae 2013b. Types of Ellipsis in Romanian. The Interpretation of Structures Containing Ellipsis Sites and the Syntactic Licensing of Ellipsis. PhD dissertation, University of Bucharest.
Pesetsky, D. 1978. Category switching and so-called pronouns. In D. Farkas, W. M. Jacobsen, K. W. Todrys (eds.), *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society*, 350-361. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Postal, P. 1969. On the so-called *pronouns* in English. In D. Reibel, S. Shane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English*, 201-224. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Roehrs, D. 2006. The Morpho-Syntax of the Germanic Noun Phrase: Determiners Move into the Determiner Phrase. PhD dissertation, Indiana University.
Rouveret, A. 1994. *Syntaxe du gallois.* Paris: CNRS Éditions.
Vasilescu, A. 2009. Strategii pragmatice de reluare gramaticalizate ca relaţii apozitive de tip GN1–GN2. *Limba română* 58 (2): 275-284.
Zamparelli, R. 2000. Layers in the Determiner Phrase. PhD dissertation (revised version), University of Rochester.

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)

BDD-A19484 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:04:27 UTC)