SPECIFICITY EFFECTS WITH CLITIC DOUBLING AND PE MARKING

Alina-Mihaela Tigău[*]

Abstract: This paper focuses on the relationship between *pe* marking and clitic doubling in Romanian arguing in favour of Bleam's (1999) hypothesis: the two mechanisms are semantically related through the specificity effects they both engender, but are otherwise independent one from the other. Diachronic data support this hypothesis. Another point which supports this hypothesis is that *pe* marking may be used in some contexts in which clitic doubling is not allowed (bare quantifiers). Furthermore, *pe* marking is not as consistent as clitic doubling when putting forth specificity effects. As to the way in which specificity effects arise we have identified different mechanisms: in the case of clitic doubling, the clitic pronoun acts as a restrictor on the domain variable of the DP it doubles, while in the case of *pe* marking, the specific interpretation is taken to be the effect of a certain interpretation procedure triggered by the insertion of *pe* (a semantic type shifter).

Keywords: specificity, clitic doubling, differential object marking

1. Introduction

This paper[1] addresses the relationship between *pe* marking and clitic doubling (CD) in Romanian arguing that this amounts to a semantic one. The two mechanisms are shown to be related in view of their semantic contribution (specificity effects). In this respect, we discard Kayne's generalization which militates for a syntactic relationship between *pe* marking and CD: an object DP may be clitic doubled only if it is case marked. By resorting to diachronic data, the two mechanisms are shown to have developed independently one from the other and at different stages. Furthermore, we notice that CD is more restricted in its domain, affecting only a subset of those DPs marked by means of *pe*. Secondly, while CD seems to be consistent in what specificity effects are concerned, *pe* marking is not necessarily so (see the cases where *pe* marked DPs were ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific interpretation or simply non-specific). Finally, we consider the way in which specificity effects obtain with each of the two mechanisms. In the case of CD, the clitic pronoun acts as a restrictor on the domain variable of the DP it doubles, while in the case of *pe* marking, the specific interpretation is taken to be the effect of a certain interpretation procedure triggered by the insertion of *pe* (a semantic type shifter).

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 is devoted to the study of the development of *pe* marking and CD in Romanian; section 3, by far the most comprehensive section in the paper looks at the semantic relatedness between *pe* marking and CD in Romanian. This section is organised into two subsections, each devoted to one of the two mechanisms under scrutiny. Finally, section 4 consists of the conclusions to this paper.

[*] University of Bucharest, Department of English, alina_mihaela_tigau@yahoo.com.
[1] Work on this study was financed by research project PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0959.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

2. Clitic Doubling arises independently from pe marking

2.1 *Pe* marking

As shown in Tigău (2010), *pe* marking dates back as far as the 16th century being limited at the time to definite pronouns and proper names. Definite descriptions are occasionally case marked while indefinite descriptions lack *pe*. Furthermore, we also noticed that PE marking has a strong preference for those DPs whose referents are [+human].

The passage from the 16th century Romanian to the 17th century marked an increase in overtly case marked definite descriptions. Thus, definite descriptions are optionally case marked by *pe*, just like in the 16th century Romanian, a fact which parallels present day Romanian. The only difference between the 16th century and present day Romanian on the one hand and the 17th century on the other in this respect is that in the latter the use of *pe* had extended to inanimate DPs as opposed to the former periods of time where only animate (and only [+human] for 16th century texts) DPs could be marked by *pe*.

The explanation we found for this phenomenon was that *pe* marking was in the process of grammaticalization in the 17th century. Consequently, the authors tended to mark all direct object DPs by means of *pe* in their desire to formally distinguish between the subject and the direct object DPs.

Heusinger and Onea (2008) argue that this increasing tendency of marking all types of definite descriptions, slows down significantly from the 17th century onwards. The 19th century witnesses a loosening of the definiteness constraint in that *pe* is able to mark indefinite descriptions.

From the 19th century to the 20th century *pe* marking regresses. There is also a decrease in the use of personal pronouns which are replaced by their clitic counterparts. Heusinger and Onea (2008) correlate the former phenomenon with the independent development of CD. More precisley, the development of *pe* marking occurs through transition points which involve a fine-structured semantic differenciation; the same effect, however, may be obtained due to the interaction with another, independent phenomenon (i.e. CD), which could lead to a regress of the former phenomenon. This is in fact what Heusinger and Onea (2008) argue to be happenning with Romanian between the 19th and the 20th centuries when the effect of CD overlapped with that of *pe* marking of indefinites leads to a semantic re-interpretation, resulting in a fine-structured scale linked to the combination possibilities of CD and *pe* marking.

2.2 Clitic Doubling

CD is a phenomenon by means of which clitic pronouns appear in verb phrases together with the full noun phrases that they refer to. Clitic doubling is found in many languages, including Spanish, Romanian, Bulgarian, Greek; in each case, this phenomenon seems to go by different rules.

Romanian seems to correlate the use of the case marker *pe* with the possibility of CD the overtly marked constituents in the accusative so much so that various linguists have argued that the accusative feature on the verb is checked by means of the clitic

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

pronoun (Kayne's generalisation). Thus, in those cases where the clitic co-occurs with a lexical DP, the preposition *pe* would be required in order to check the accusative feature on the direct object DP.

However, such an account would imply that *pe* marking and CD are part of a more complex phenomenon, a fact which is not accurate: historical data show that the two are independent phenomena which have developed at different stages in the language. Thus, we would rather view the two phenomena as independent one from the other but as having similar interpretational effects.

In a diachronic study we unfolded on a number of old Romanian texts (see Tigău 2010) we discovered that the use of *pe* seems to be a far more remote phenomenon, dating as far as the 16th century, than CD which develops at a later stage, after the advent of Clitic Left Dislocation (CLD).

Stan (2009) points to the existence of very few doubling structures where the direct object is doubled by personal and reflexive pronouns, whereas Gheţie (1974) proves that such a phenomenon is totally absent from most of the texts dating back from the 16th century. Furthermore, Asan (1961) maintains that the doubling of DPs was a rare phenomenon in the 16th century texts. The authors mentioned above agree with studies unfolded by Coteanu (1963), Niculescu (1965) and Rosetti (1978) who point that the syntactic constraints concerning the doubling of the direct object were much more stable when it came to the CLD-ed structure because in this latter case the clitic would have the role to resume a lexical object which had been dislocated from its base-generated position.

In the 16th century texts we studied we found no instance of CD. However, the phenomenon had already appeared by that time as Stan (2009) points out some CD constructions where personal pronouns and reflexives seemed to be the only elements prone to CD. Proper names and definite descriptions, which could undergo *pe* marking, were not clitic doubled. Consider:

(1) Ne-au rămas pre noi de bani (1595)
us have left PRE us of money.
'They defeated us of money.'

(2) SĂ ne piiarză şi pre noi (1599)
să us kill and PRE us
'to kill us too'

(3) şi- L prinsără pre El
and him.CL caught PRE him
'and they caught Him'

(4) să nu să aibâ pre sine
SĂ not SĂ have PRE self.
'so as not to have oneself' (Stan 2009)

As pointed out by Heusinger and Onea (2008) the phenomenon reaches a climax in its development by the 19th century where most of the strong forms of personal pronouns are accompanied by their clitic counterparts. Consider the examples under (5):

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

(5) a. şi lăsă pre ea frigul 17th century
and left PE she fever-the
'and the fever left her'
b. şi lăsă pre ea frigurile 17th century
and left PE she fever-PL-the
'and the fever left her'
c. şi o au lăsat pe ea frigurile. 19th century
and she.CL have left PE she fever-PL-the
'snd the fever left her'

Thus, pronouns are obligatorily case marked by *pe* in 19th century Romanian. Furthermore, these DPs are systematically accompanied by their clitic counterparts. This may be seen in example (5) above where the strong form of the personal pronoun *ea* is accompanied by the 3rd person, singular, feminine clitic *o*.

This increase in CD instances is steadily decreasing towards the 20th century when the co-occurrence of both a strong form of a pronoun and of its clitic counterparts is dispreferred; the clitic pronoun seems to suffice. Consider example (6) below which is a 20th century rendition of examples (5) above:

(6) Şi au lăsat-*o* frigurile.
and have left her.CL fever-PL-the
'And the fever left her' (Heusinger and Onea 2008)

Thus, CD develops at a different point in time and independently from *pe* marking. Nevertheless, as we will show in the sections to come, the two mechanisms seem to amount to similar interpretive effects revolving around the notion of specificity. Nevertheless, the data we will be looking at will prompt us to wonder whether these effects brought forth by means of *pe* marking or CD arise in the same way or in different ways.

3. Considering the semantic relatedness between CD and *pe* marking

In this section we would like to argue in line with Bleam (1999) in favour of a semantic relatedness between CD and *pe* marking in terms of specificity. Furthermore, we will consider the factors that influence the two mechanisms in an attempt to find out whether they are the same. We will see that CD does not obtain in the same contexts in which *pe* marking does, being more restrictive. On the other hand, CD seems to be more consistent in that clitic doubled and *pe* marked direct objects are always specific as opposed to those DP that are only *pe* marked and that may be ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific reading. Let us first analyze the case of CD.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

3.1 Clitic Doubling

3.1.1 Specificity with Clitic Doubling

As already pointed out, CD always insures a specific reading on the DP it marks in that it induces (at least) a d-linked reading of the indefinite (along the lines of Pesetsky 1987, Enç 1991, Kennelly 1999, 2004a, 2004b and Farkas's 1995 epistemic specificity).

Let us consider the following context:

(7) When the school year ends every summer our school principal gives prizes to the most diligent pupils who obtained the best marks. This year fifty pupils received such prizes.

(7) may continue either with (8a) or (8b) below:

(8) a. La serbarea din vara asta fiecare profesor i- a lăudat
at festivity from summer this every teacher them.CL has praised
pe mulţi elevi
PE many pupils.
'At this summer's festivity every teacher praised many pupils.'

b. La serbarea din vara asta fiecare profesor a lăudat mulţi elevi.
at festivity from summer this every teacher has praised many pupils
'At this summer's festivity every teacher praised many pupils.'

Example (8a) states that the pupils who were congratulated by their teachers necessarily belong to the range of fifty pupils mentioned in the context (7) as opposed to (8b). Since the two examples differ with respect to CD + *pe* marking we infer that it is this mechanism which restricts the resource domain of the object DP. Thus, through the mediation of CD + *pe* marking, the referent of the indefinite is constrained to a set of students out of which each teacher picked many representatives to praise. Example (8b), on the other hand enables no such restriction: we might conceive of a case where the teachers praised pupils from other generations or even other pupils from other schools e.g. those pupils who had taken part in the Olympics.

CLD amounts to the same interpretive effects as CD. Consider, in the context of the question 'How did you meet your friends?'

(9) a. Pe trei (prieteni) i- am cunoscut la facultate.
PE three (friends) them.CL have met at faculty
'I have met three of my friends at the faculty.'

b. Pe mulţi (prieteni), însă, i- am cunoscut în liceu.
PE many (friends) however them.CL have met in high school
'I have met many of my friends in highschool.'

Thus, example (9a) could be felicitously continued by (9b) which implies that the three friends in question belong to a group of other people with whom I got acquainted at some point in my life. Furthermore, the CLD-ed DP *pe mulţi* is also anaphoric in the same sense.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

3.1.2 Accounting for the specificity effects in CD

In the examples presented in the previous section clitic doubled and *pe* marked object indefinites are always specific in the sense of Enç (1991). In other words, CD + *pe* marking triggers an interpretation according to which the referent pointed at by the indefinite DP in question is part of a bigger, presupposed set.

This amounts to saying, the indefinite doubled by the clitic is constrained in its domain and will have to pick its referent from a range which has been previously introduced into the discourse domain. In this respect, the clitic behaves similarly to the case marker *-(y)i* in Turkish (as shown in Enç 1991 and in Kennelly 1999, 2004a, 2004b) and its associate DP is interpreted as a "covert partitive".

The clitic itself is a main contributor when it comes to actualizing the specific reading on clitic doubled and PE marked indefinite objects in that it acts as an operator restrictor, modifying the resource domain variable of the QP they mark. Thus, the clitic ensures the coindexation of the referent of the DP with a referent that has been previously introduced in the discourse domain and not only that, the clitic also restricts the referent of the indefinite to a subset of the referent previously introduced within the discourse domain.

The fact that the clitic pronoun acts as a restrictor on the range of its associate DP, meets the expectations of all those syntactic analyses of Clitic Doubling structures which envisage the clitic as a determiner modifying their DP-double. In our endeavor to formalize our findings with respect the semantic import of the clitic, we adopt the "Big DP Hypothesis" as put forth by Uriagereka (1995). According to this analysis, the clitic starts out as a determiner within a big DP accommodating both the clitic and its DP-double. This local relation in which the two constituents find themselves at some point in their derivation accounts for the agreement between them with respect to phi-features but, more importantly for our account, it also provides an explanation as to why the clitic acts as a restrictor on the associate DP.

According to Farkas and de Swart (2003), a determiner places various interpretive constraints on the discourse referent which it introduces. Following these lines we argue that the big DP contains two determiners: there is an indefinite determiner on the one hand and another determiner (the clitic) on the other. Both determiners may place interpretive constraints on the NP. Indeed, the indefinite determiner places a certain restriction on the NP that may have to do with scope (cf. Farkas and de Swart 2003, pg. 42). The clitic, on the other hand, introduces a discourse referent as well, but this referent is a presupposed one (let us call this $\Sigma(u)$). Furthermore the condition that the clitic places on the double is that the discourse referent that instantiates the thematic argument of the nominal be subsumed to the presupposed discourse referent introduced by the clitic ($v \leq \Sigma(u)$). The condition imposed by the clitic accounts for the "covert partitive" reading of the indefinite object.

3.2 *Pe* -marking

Pe has been looked upon as a marker of personal gender and of identification due to the fact that it is mandatory with proper names and personal pronouns (*Gramatica*

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

Academiei, II, 154). Moreover, Niculescu (1965) notices that person-denoting common nouns may be marked by *pe* if known beforehand, a fact which points that *pe* is a marker indicating individualization or particularization. Moreover, the referents of these person denoting nouns are individualized for the speaker at the time of the communicative act.

However, the behaviour of bare quantifiers might pose problems to these accounts: *pe* may take bare quantifiers such as *nimeni* 'nobody', *cineva* 'somebody', *oricine* 'anybody' which do not refer to a particular person known beforehand. In this case *pe* is employed with the aim of distinguishing between person-denoting quantifiers which are always *pe* marked and their counterparts which do not refer to persons. As pointed out by Cornilescu (2000), bare quantifiers are organized according to semantic gender:

(10) a. Am auzit *pe* cineva cântând.
have heard PE somebody singing
'I have heard someone singing.'
b. Am auzit ceva.
have heard something
'I have heard something'.

(11) a. N- am auzit *pe* nimeni plângând.
not have heard PE nobody crying
'I haven't heard anyone crying.'
b. N- am auzit nimic.
not- have heard nothing
'I haven't heard anything.'

(12) a. Copilul ascultă *pe* oricine.
child-the obeys PE anyone
'The child obeys everybody'.
b. Copilul mănâncă orice.
child-the eats anything
'The child eats anything.'

Thus, as can be seen in examples (10-12) above, the person denoting quantifiers are always *pe*-marked, unlike their counterparts which do not denote person and which are never *pe*-marked.

Bare quantifiers also constitute a point of difference in what the mechanisms of Clitic Doubling and *pe* marking are concerned in that the former is never available with bare quantifiers, while the latter is obligatory with person denoting quantifiers:

(13) * L- am auzit *pe* cineva cântând.
him.CL have heard PE somebody singing.
'I have heard someone singing.'

Thus, CD may not obtain in exactly the same contexts as *pe* marking, which might amount to saying that the two mechanisms do not depend on the same semantic factors.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

3.2.1 *Pe* as a trigger for specificity

Pe seems to trigger specificity effects with indefinites. Thus, Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) argues that in examples such as those in (14) below the accusative marker disambiguates the indefinite DP towards a referential reading:

(14) a. In fiecare zi, Ion întâlneşte *o fată* la cinema. (ambiguous).
in every day John meets a girl at cinema
'Every day, John meets a girl at the cinema.'
b. În fiecare zi, Ion o întâlnește *pe o fată* la cinema. (non-ambiguous)
in every day John her.CL meets PE a girl at cinema.
'Every day John meets a girl at the cinema.'

Example (14a) above is ambiguous in that the indefinite may refer to a specific girl or not, while (14b) is not ambiguous, referring to a specific girl that John meets every day.

In line with Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Cornilescu (2000), points to the fact that *pe* marked indefinites are upgraded and that their individualized reading amounts to *specificity* (in the sense of epistemic specificity as in Farkas 1995). Thus, in example (15a) below the speaker has a referent in mind when he refers to 'some good old friends'. The same goes for example (15b) where the *pe* marked direct object is bound by the speaker.

(15) a. unde să vizitez *pe nişte vechi şi buni prieteni*, familia Ronetti Roman.
where SĂ visit PE some old and good friends family-the Ronetti Roman
'where I should visit *pe* some good old friends, the Ronetti Roman family.'
b. Întreb cu respect *pe un domn* impiegat pe ce linie este tras
ask with respect PE a railway clerk on what platform is pulled in
trenul de Iaşi
train-the of Iasi.
'I respectfully ask a railway clerk on what platform the train to Iaşi had pulled.' (Cornilescu 2000)

Epistemically specific indefinites may also be bound by another DP from within their local context, in which case their referent is rigid with respect to that local DP. This is what happens in example (16) below where the indefinite is bound by the DP *a woman.*

(16) a. O femeie numai în cămaşă ţine strâns de piept *pe un om* îmbrăcat în
a woman only in nightie holds tightly by chest PE a man dressed in
în uniformă
in uniform.
'A woman who is wearing only a nightie is holding tightly by the chest a man dressed in uniform.' (Cornilescu 2000)

To the examples presented above, we would like to add a set of tests pointing to the fact that *pe* may force a specific reading on the indefinite it marks. However, this reading

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

is not always available as *pe* marked indefinite direct objects may still be ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific interpretation. We will argue that this is due to the corroboration of *pe* with CD, a phenomenon which develops later in the history of Romanian language and which we will show to amount to the same specific interpretation. As pointed out by Heusinger and Onea (2008: 70) and by Tigău (2010), *pe*- marking undergoes a regress at the end of the XIX-th century, which is paralleled by an expanse of CD, a phenomenon with similar interpretive effects. The upsurge of the latter phenomenon inhibited the former.

3.2.2 The mood of the verb

The mood of the verb in a relative clause constitutes a diagnostic for specificity. Thus, if the mood of the verb in the relative clause is the indicative, the nominal that is modfied by the relative clause will be interpreted as specific. If, on the other hand, the mood in the relative clause is the subjunctive, the nominal modified by that relative clause will be interpreted as non-specific (Rivero 1979).

In example (17a) below, the indefinite *un profesor* 'a professor' is modified by a relative clause in which the mood of the verb is the indicative and which will thus trigger a referential reading for the indefinite DP. Indeed, the speaker has a referent in mind when (s)he talks about a professor who explained a certain phenomenon. In this case the use of *pe* is strongly favoured. Example (17b) shows a situation in which the indefinite is not marked by *pe.* To our mind, this example is not felicitous although some speakers on whom we tested the example found it acceptable.

(17) a. Caut *pe* un profesor care mi- a explicat acest fenomen.
search PE a professor who me.DAT has explained this phenomenon
'I am looking for a professor who explained this phenomenon to me.'
b. ?Caut un profesor care mi- a explicat acest fenomen.
search a professor which me.DAT has explained this phenomenon
'I am looking for a professor who explained this phenomenon to me.'

Let us now consider an example where the relative clause modifying an indefinite direct object contains a verb in the subjunctive:

(18) a. Caut un profesor care să -mi explice acest fenomen.
search a professor who SĂ me.DAT explain-SUBJ this phenomenon
'I am looking for a professor who might explain this phenomenon to me.'
b. Caut pe un profesor care să-mi explice acest fenomen
search PE a professor which SĂ me.DAT explain-SUBJ this phenomenon
'I am looking for a professor who might explain this phenomenon to me.'

Indeed, in example (18a) above, the use of the subjunctive engenders a non-specific reading on the unmarked indefinite *un profesor.* Notice that the direct object has not been marked by means of *pe*. However, if we do mark the indefinite by means of *pe*, we notice a change of meaning in that the *pe*-marked indefinite is interpreted as specific in the sense

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

of covert specificity: the teacher is interpreted as pertaining to a previously mentioned set e.g. he might be one of the teachers from the Physics department (the marked indefinite quantifies over a set of known professors).

Thus, *pe* is expected with the indicative mood, its interpretation being specific. Moreover, the use of *pe* with indefinite direct objects modified by relative clauses containing the subjunctive engenders a specific reading on the indefinite it marks. When *pe* is not apparent in such contexts the interpretation is non-specific, as expected.

It might be interesting at this point to have a look at the interaction between *pe*-marking and CD in such environments: as we have seen, *pe* marking is still possible with indefinites modified by relative clauses in the subjunctive. In this case, the *pe* marked DP is interpreted as (covertly) specific.

(19) Caut *pe* un student care să ştie bine englezeşte.
search PE a student which SĂ know-SUBJ well English
'I am looking for a student who might speak English well.'

As opposed to *pe* marking, CD is never possible in such a context. The only environment available is one where the relative clause modifying the indefinite contains a verb in the indicative:

(20) a. *Îl caut pe un student care să ştie bine englezeşte.
him.CL search PE a student which SĂ know-SUBJ well English
'I am looking for a student who might speak English well.'
b. Îl caut pe un student care ştie bine englezeşte.
him.CL search PE a student which knows well English
'I am looking for a student who speaks English well.'

Thus, CD is only possible in (20b) above, where the mood of the relative is the indicative. As it seems, the factors which regulate *pe* marking are not as restrictive as those regulating CD[2]. Data such as these (coming from Spanish) prompted Bleam (1999: 212) to put forth the Subset Hypothesis: "both the clitic and the prepositional accusative arise independently based on the semantic interpretation of the NP. But, the semantic properties which give rise to CD form a subset of the semantic properties which give rise to diferential object marking".

3.2.3 *Pe* with partitive constructions

In line with its specific interpretation, *pe* marking is obligatory with partitive constructions in Romanian:

(21) a. Am auzit pe mulţi dintre aceşti studenţi plângându- se cât de grea
have heard PE many of these students complaining SE how of difficult
este materia.
is subject matter-the

[2] See Leonetti (2004: 6-7) for similar results in Spanish.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

'I have heard many of these students complain about how difficult the subject matter is.'

b. ?Am auzit mulţi dintre aceşti studenţi plângându- se cât de grea
have heard many of these students complaining SE how of difficult
este materia.
is subject matter-the
'I have heard many of these students complain about how difficult the subject matter is.'

In example (21a) above the use of *pe* is expected if one takes into account the fact that partitives have specific interpretation (as they point to a familiar domain of quantification for the *pe* marked indefinite).

3.2.4 *Oarecare*

As pointed by Săvescu (2007), *oarecare* entails a free choice reading in sequences *un NP oarecare* 'any NP' which appear in a modal, intensional environment. Thus in the conditional sentence below any individual that satisfies the condition of being one's colleague may satisfy the claim that he should be scolded should he criticize his teachers. Thus *oarecare* triggers a non-specific interpretation on the indefinite it marks. If *pe* is to trigger specificity on the indefinite it marks, then one would not expect it in the context of *oarecare*. However, example (22b) seems to vex this expectation.

(22) a. Dacă auzi un student oarecare criticându-şi profesorii, ceartă-l.
if hear a student any criticizing-REFL teachers scold him.CL
'Should you hear any student criticizing his teachers, scold him.'

b. Dacă auzi pe un student oarecare criticându-şi profesorii, ceartă-l.
if hear PE a student any criticizing-REFL teachers scold him.CL
'Should you hear any student criticizing his teachers, scold him.'

Indeed, *pe* seems to be able to mark *un coleg oarecare*. However, the use of *pe* might engender a restriction on the domain of quantification i.e. one might understand the sentence as: 'If you happen to hear *one of these* colleagues [….]'. Thus, the *pe* marked indefinite direct object acquires a (covertly partitive) specific reading in this case. Nevertheless, the *pe* marked indefinite may also be read non-specifically. Thus, the *pe* marked indefinite is ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific reading.

Thus, *pe* seems to give way when used with *oarecare*. An interesting situation, however, arises when *oarecare* is corroborated with a relative clause. As expected, *oarecare* fits well with a relative clause containing a subjunctive as the interpretation of the indefinite is non-specific. However, if we mark the indefinite in example (23b) below by means of *pe*, the only reading available for it is the specific one. Thus, in (23b) below teacher in question belongs to a previously mentioned set e.g. 'from among those in the English department'.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

(23) a. Caut un profesor oarecare care să mă ajute la teme.
look a teacher any which SĂ me help at homework
'I am looking for a (any) teacher who might help me with my homework.'
(23) b. Caut pe un profesor oarecare care să mă ajute la teme.
look PE a teacher any which SĂ me help at homework
'I am looking for a (any) teacher who might help me with my homework.'

Even more interestingly, the use of CD is disallowed:

(24) Îl caut pe un profesor oarecare care să mă ajute la teme.
him.CL look PE a teacher any which SĂ me help at homework
'I am looking for a (any) teacher who might help me with my homework.'

Example (24) above in ungrammatical due to the fact that the *pe* marked and clitic doubled indefinite is understood as epistemically specific i.e. as anchored by the speaker: since the speaker has a certain teacher in mind, that teacher may no longer be just *any* (= *oarecare*) teacher.

Finally, if the relative modifying the indefinite contains a verb in the indicative, *oarecare* is banned:

(25) a Caut pe un profesor care m- a ajutat la teme.
look PE a teacher which me.CL has helped at homework
'I am looking for a teacher who helped me with my homework.'
b. *Caut pe un profesor oarecare care m- a ajutat la teme.
look PE a teacher any which me.CL has helped at homework
'I am looking for a (any) teacher who helped me with my homework.'

As already shown above, a *pe* marked indefinite such as *pe un profesor* '*pe* a teacher' may be modified by a relative whose verb is in the indicative. Example (25a) is grammatical. The use of *oarecare* engenders ungrammaticality in (25b) as it forces a free choice reading on a referentially anchored indefinite.

3.2.5 The *câte* test

Câte is a distributive which actualizes a narrow scope reading on the indefinite it marks. Thus, in example (26) below there is a one to one correspondence between *every student* and *a teacher:*

(26) Fiecare student cunoaşte câte un profesor de engleză.
every student knows some a teacher of English
'Every student knows some English teacher.'

When *pe* is used to mark the indefinite, it engenders a specific reading, i.e. the teachers who are paired to the students belong to a previously mentioned set of teachers:

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

(27) Fiecare student cunoaşte pe câte un profesor de engleză.
every student knows PE some a teacher of English
'Every student knows some English teacher.'

However, *pe* does not always engender a specific reading in the context of *câte*. In example (28) below the indefinite *pe un politician* is non-specific:

(28) Când aud pe câte un politician că se laudă cu ce va face dacă va fi
when hear PE some politician that SE brags with what will do if will be
ales închid televizorul.
elected shut TV-the
'Whenever I hear some politician bragging about his future deeds in case he gets elected I turn off the TV.'

3.2.6 *Pe* in existential constructions with *a avea*

A avea only takes weak DPs as it only allows for a property reading in what its direct object is concerned. This is why *pe* marked indefinites which are specific are excluded:

(29) a. Am o soră mai mică.
have a sister more small
'I have a younger sister.'
b. *Am pe o soră mai mică.
have PE a sister more small
'I have a younger sister.'

3.2.7 Some contexts in which *pe* does not triggers specificity

(i) *vreun*/*vreo*

As pointed out by Farkas (2005), Săvescu (2007), indefinites headed by *vreun*/*vreo* are never associated with a specific interpretation. Indeed, in most of the examples containing *vreun direct objects* we found that the indefinite was not marked by *pe.* Example (30) below is but one case in point:

(30) Cum s- ar potrivi singurătatea lui Rilke cu telefonul [la] care te
how SE would fit loneliness of Rilke with phone-the at which you.ACC
cheamă în fiecare minut some admirator? (Anton Holban, *Jocurile Dianei*)
call in every minute an admirer
'How would Rilke's loneliness match the phone to which an admirer calls you every minute?'

However, we found a number of examples where *vreun* indefinites are marked by means of *pe.* These DPs are never specific in their interpretation, however:

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

(31) De câte ori am auzit *pe vreun iubitor* al stilului vechi spunând că
of how many times have heard PE some lover AL style old saying that
nu înţelege stilul nou, am putut observa că neînţelegerea, şi
not understands style-the new have could notice that misunderstanding-the and
prin urmare antipatia, venea tocmai de la această profundă schimbare in
by consequence antipathy-the came precisely from this deep change în
orientarea expresiei. (Paul Zarifopol, *Pentru arta literară*)
orientation-the expression-gen
'Whenever I heard some old style lover complaining that he did not understand the new style I could notice that the misunderstanding, hence the antipathy, sprang from this profound change in the orientation of the expression.'

(32) Întreb *pe vreun coleg* ceva, dar mă depărtez înainte de a primi
ask PE some colleague something but myself draw away before of to receive
răspunsul. (Anton Holban, *Jocurile Dianei*)
answer-the
'I ask some colleague something, but I draw away before getting the answer.'

(33) Banul Ghica, când vrea să ajute *pe vreun sărac*, chema
boyard Ghica, when wanted SĂ help PE some poor called
pe Manea. (Ion Ghica, *Scrisori către Vasile Alecsandri)*
PE Manea
'Whenever Ghica, the boyrad, wanted to help a poor man, he would call Manea.'

Thus, the three examples above point to the fact that with *vreun* indefinites *pe* marking may not engender a specific interpretation.

(ii) bare quantifiers

As already discussed, *pe* may take bare quantifiers such as *nimeni* 'nobody', *cineva* 'somebody', *oricine* 'anybody', which do not refer to a particular person known beforehand:

(34) Este un băiat liniştit. Nu supără *pe* nimeni.
is a boy quiet not upsets PE nobody
'He is a quiet boy. He never upsets anybody.'

(35) Dacă supără *pe* cineva, să-mi zici.
if upsets PE somebody, SĂ me.DAT tell
'Should he upset anyone, tell me.'

Thus, when employed with bare quantifiers, *pe* does not ensure a specific interpretation.

3.2.8 Concluding remarks

As we have seen, CD and *pe* marking seem to be semantically related in that both mechanisms trigger a specific interpretation on the indefinite DP they mark. However, this is but a rough conclusion which needs to be further polished by considering the

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

differences holding between the two mechanisms. Thus, we have noticed that CD is more restricted in its domain, affecting only a subset of those DPs marked by means of *pe*. Secondly, while CD seems to be consistent in what specificity effects are concerned, *pe* marking is not necessarily so (see the cases where *pe* marked DPs were ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific interpretation or simply non-specific). In fact this inconsistent behaviour of *pe* with respect to specificity might lead one to wonder whether it is really tenable to assert the *pe* marking should be equated with specificity. One might assume in line with Leonetti (2004, 2008) that *pe* marking is intrinsically related to some notion such as "prominence or individuation" which encompasses the notion of specificity. Thus, the specificity effects in *pe* marking and CD might arise in different ways. In the next subsection we will take a look at the semantic contribution of *pe* in terms of semantic type shifter.

3.2.9 *Pe* as type shifter

Cornilescu (2000) shows that *pe* places constraints on the denotations of the DPs which it marks. Thus, *pe* marked DPs only have argumental denotations: <e> (i.e. object) or <<et>t> (i.e. generalized quantifier). On the other hand, these DPs never have a property reading i.e. <et> , nor do they ever get a 'kind' interpretation which is related to the property reading.

This claim is supported by extensive evidence:

Firstly, the case marker *pe* is obligatory with proper names which are of e-type since they are excluded from those contexts where a property reading is required. Notice that proper names cannot be combined with the reflexive passive; bare singulars are suitable in such a context as they can only express a property reading:

(36) a S- a băgat *carne*.
REFL has brought meat
'They have brought meat.'

b. S- a adus *Ion* la judecată
REFL has brought Ion to trial.
'They have brought Ion to trial.' (Cornilescu (2000))

Secondly, *pe* is never used in a context in which the predicate only allows for a property denotation for the constituent occupying the object position. In this case the verb and the direct object make up a derived complex predicate. It seems that only bare singulars and singular indefinites may be used with these verbs.

(37) a. Ion are nevastă tânără.
Ion has wife young
'Ion has a young wife.'

b. Ion are o nevastă tânără.
Ion has a wife young.
'Ion has a young wife.'

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

c. *Ion (o) are pe o nevastă tânără.
Ion (her.CL) has PE a wife young
'Ion has a young wife.'

(38) a. Ion pretinde / cere / vrea / dorește nevastă tânără.
Ion claims / requests / wants / wishes wife young
'Ion claims/requests/wishes a young wife.'

b. Ion pretinde/ cere/ vrea dorește o nevastă tânără.
Ion claims / requests/ wishes a wife young.
'Ion claims/requests/wishes a young wife.'

c. *Ion (o) pretinde / cere / vrea / dorește pe o nevastă tânără..
Ion (her.CL) claims / requests / wants / wishes PE a wife young.
'Ion claims/requests/wants/wishes a young wife.' (Cornilescu 2000)

(39) Căutăm profesor / secretară / informatician / zidar.
look teacher / secretary / IT specialist / mason
'Teacher/secretary/IT specialist/mason wanted.'

Thus, DPs entailing a property reading cannot be accompanied by *pe*, nor can those DPs entailing a kind reading, which is related to the property reading. DPs which receive *pe* have individual object readings (i.e. the <e> and <et> interpretations)

Thirdly, DPs headed by *pe* may not be used with verbs allowing the 'kind' reading: verbs like *a iubi* 'to love', *a urî* 'to hate', *a respecta* 'to respect', *a admira* 'to admire' (Cornilescu 2000). As can be seen in example (40) below, definite DPs in the plural that are not accompanied by *pe* may occur in the object position of these verbs and can receive a "kind" reading:

(40) Ion iubeşte fetele. (generic)
Ion loves girls-the
'Ion loves girls.'

Pe-DPs are not generally allowed with these verbs:

(41) ?Ion le iubeşte pe fete.
Ion them.CL loves PE girls
'Ion loves girls.'

Finally, kind denoting definite descriptions such as *fel* 'kind' and *tip* 'type' disallow *pe*:

(42) a. Mihai nu agreează tipul ăsta de fete.
Mihai not like type-the this of girls
'Mihai does not like this type of girls.'

b. *Mihai nu agreează pe tipul ăsta de fete.
Mihai not like PE type-the this of girls
'Mihai does not like this type of girls.'

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

Thus, as a consequence of the tests discussed above, we may draw the conclusion that *pe* is a type shifter in that it shifts the denotation of a DP from a property reading, <et>, to that of a generalised quantifer (<<et>t>) or entity (<e>). Thus, *pe* represents an indicator of a type shifting operation on the indefinite. The insertion of *pe* triggers an interpretation procedure which will give rise to strong (specific) readings for the indefinite it marks.

3.2.10 Concluding remarks

By considering a number of tests put forth in Cornilescu (2000) we adopted the claim that the case marker *pe* type-shifts the denotation of the DP it marks into that of <e> entity or <<et>t> generalized quantifier.

We also tried to account for the specific interpretation which *pe* marked indefinite direct objects may acquire by considering this reading as the effect of a certain interpretation triggered by the insertion of *pe* (a semantic type shifter) and different from the (default) interpretation procedure of unmarked DPs (see Tigău forthcoming[2]).

4. Conclusions

This paper focused on two mechanisms which are traditionally grouped together under what is known as Kayne's Generalisation. According to this principle, CD is syntactically dependent on case marking. The reason for such a dependence would be that the clitic in the CD structure absorbs the case of its DP double which will no loger be legible if it is not case marked by a preposition. The preposition is thus a means of saving the derivation.

When analyzing the Romanian data, we adopted the Independence Hypothesis put forth by Bleam (1999) and supported by Leonetti (2004, 2008) a.o. The afore mentioned hypothesis states that the two mechanisms are not syntactically but semantically related in view of the specificity effects they both seem to contribute.

With respect to Romanian, the Independence Hypothesis is firstly supported by diachronic facts in that CD and *pe* marking arise and develop at different stages in the evolution of Romanian. Thus, while *pe* marking had already appeared by the XVIth century, CD develops much later, after the advent of CLD.

Another point which supports the Independence Hypothesis is the fact that *pe* marking may be used in some contexts in which CD is not allowed. One such situation ist

---

[2] In this paper we argue in line with López (2012) that unmarked DPs are subject to semantic incorporation into the VP which further incorporates into v. *pe* marked indefinites on the other hand are shown to move out of the VP into a SpecApplP. The fact the marked DPs move out of the VP is supported by examples such as:

(i) Au extrădat pe un refugiat$_i$ poporului său$_i$.
(ii) Au extrădat un refugiat$_i$ poporului său$_j$.

Only (i) allows a reading according to which the refugee and the people are coindexed. This points to the fact that the *pe* marked DP was raised to some higher node wherefrom it can c-command the indirect object.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

hat of bare quantifiers which may be *pe* marked when denoting persons but which may never be clitic doubled.

Furthermore, *pe* marking does not seem to be as consistent as CD when it comes to the specificity effects it gives rise to: we found several contexts in which the *pe* marked direct object DPs were not specific. This made us wonder whether it is really tenable to assert the *pe* marking should be equated with specificity. One might assume in line with Leonetti (2004, 2008) that *pe* marking is intrinsically related to some notion such as 'prominence or individuation' which encompasses the notion of specificity. Thus, the specificity effects in *pe* marking and CD might arise in different ways.

Indeed, as to the way in which specificity effects arise we have identified different mechanisms: In the case of CD, the clitic pronoun acts as a restrictor on the domain variable of the DP it doubles, while in the case of *pe* marking, the specific interpretation is taken to be the effect of a certain interpretation procedure triggered by the insertion of *pe* (a semantic type shifter).

Corpus

Ion Ghica. *Scrisori către Vasile Alecsandri*. http://ro.wikisource.org/wiki/Scrisori_c%C4%83tre_Vasile _Alecsandri.
Anton Holban, Anton. 1971. *Jocurile Daniei.* Bucharest: Ed. Cartea Românească.
Paul Zarifopol. *Pentru arta literară.* http://ro.wikisource.org/wiki/Pentru_arta_literar%C4%83.

References

Asan, F. 1961. Propoziţia apozitivă şi apoziţia. *Limba română* X (4): 312-316.
Bleam, T. 1999. Leísta Spanish and the Syntax of Clitic Doubling. PhD dissertation, University of Delaware.
Cornilescu, A. 2000. Notes on the interpretation of the prepositional accusative in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 2 (1): 91-106.
Coteanu, I. 1963. *Elemente de lingvistică structurală*. Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Enç, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 1-25.
Farkas D. 1995. Specificity and scope. Ms., University of Santa Cruz.
Farkas, D. 2005. Free choice in Romanian. In B. J. Birner and G. Ward (eds.), *Drawing the Boundaries of Meaning, Neo-Gricean Studies in Pragmatics and Semantics in Honour of Laurence R. Horn*, 71-94. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Farkas, D. and H. de Swart. 2003. *The Semantics of Incorporation.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
Gheţie, I. 1974. *Începuturile scrisului în limba română. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei R. S. R..
Gramatica Academiei. 1963. Vol. II. Bucharest: Editura Academiei R.P.R.
von Heusinger, K. and Onea, E. 2008. Triggering and blocking effects in the diachronic development of DOM in Romanian. *Probus* 20: 67-110.
Kennelly, S. 1999. Multiplication. Ms., UiL-OTS.
Kennelly, S. D. and F. Reniers. 1999. Cumulative and distributive interaction of polyadic quantifiers. In P. Dekker (ed.), *12th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 181-185. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Institute for Logic, Language and Computation.
Leonetti, M. 2004. Specificity and differential object marking in Spanish. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 3: 75-114.
Leonetti, M. 2008. Specificity in clitic doubling and in differential object marking. *Probus* 20: 33-66.
López, L. 2012. *Indefinite Objects. Scrambling, Choice Functions, and Differential Marking.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

Niculescu, A. 1965. *Obiectul direct prepoziţional în limbile romanice. Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice.* Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică.
Pesetsky, D. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In E. J. Reuland and A. G. B. ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 98-129. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Rivero, Maria-Luisa.1979. Mood and presupposition in Spanish. *Foundations of Language* 7:305-36.
Rosetti A. 1978. *Istoria limbii române.* Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică.
Săvescu, O. 2007. *Oarecare* indefinites and free choice in Romanian . In G. Alboiu, A. Avram, L. Avram and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Moş: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu,* 205-225. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.
Stan, C. 2009. Complementul direct. Ms., University of Bucharest.
Tigău, A. 2010. *Syntax and Interpretation of the Direct Object in Romance and Germanic Languages with an Emphasis on Romanian, German, Dutch and English.* Bucharest: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.
Tigău, A. forthcoming. On scrambling and differential object marking in German and Romanian. In M. Burada, O. Tatu and R. Sinu (eds.), *11th Conference on British and American Studies – Embracing Multitudes of Meaning.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Uriagereka, J. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79-123.

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)

BDD-A19489 © 2014 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:46 UTC)