

Definite “bare” nouns and *pe*-marking in Romanian.

Klaus von Heusinger & Sofiana Chiriacescu

Klaus.vonHeusinger<at>ling.uni-stuttgart.de
sofiana.chiriacescu<at>ling.uni-stuttgart.de

1. Introduction*

Romanian is a language which exhibits differential object marking (DOM) using the particle *pe* (Niculescu 1965, Pană-Dindelegan 1997, von Heusinger & Onea 2008, Stark & Sora 2008). Direct object case marking is obligatory for some referential types of direct objects, optional for others and ungrammatical for a third type. The semantic-pragmatic parameters for DOM in Romanian (animacy, definiteness and specificity) are responsible for the distribution of *pe* in most cases but they cannot account for the presence or absence of the DOM-marker in a particular set of constructions. The interesting cases are post-verbal indefinite direct objects and unmodified definite NPs or “bare nouns”, which differ considerably from modified definite NPs. It is these non-elucidated cases that represent the focus of our interest in the present paper.

In the case of post-verbal, indefinite human specific direct objects, *pe*-marking is optional. Based on a diachronic and synchronic study we previously showed (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009) that besides specificity, discourse prominence also influences the case-marking of indefinite direct objects. Case marked indefinite direct objects show the property of “referential persistence”, i.e. the number of occurrences of co-referential expressions in the subsequent utterances is higher than in the case of unmarked indefinite direct objects. Referential persistence is a weaker constraint than topicality, which obligatorily triggers *pe*-marking.

Post-verbal definite NPs generally get DOM, if they are further modified. However, definite NPs which are not modified are subject to an independent constraint of the Romanian grammar: Most prepositions block the definite article of an unmodified NP. Thus, *pe*-marking - formally similar to a preposition - blocks the attachment of the definite article to an unmodified definite direct object. Speakers have two alternatives: they either use a construction in which the direct object is suffixed with the enclitic definite article (-a/-u)l and where *pe* is omitted, or mark the direct object with *pe*, omitting instead the definite article. In this paper we show that this variation is not aleatory, but that the discourse prominence influences the *pe*-marking of the definite unmodified object along the same constraint that holds for indefinite NPs, rather than for definite modified NPs.

The examples in (1), (2) and (3) below intend to exemplify the possible alternations with definite NPs, starting from the common context sentence (A), which licenses the definiteness of the direct object in the subsequent sentences. The modified direct object *un*

* We would like to thank Maria Teresa Espinal, Manuel Leonetti and Louise McNally for organizing the international workshop *Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Language* and for editing the present volume. We are grateful to the audience of the *Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages* workshop held in October in Barcelona for constructive comments and considerable assistance, especially M. Teresa Espinal, Daniel Jacob, Udo Klein, Manuel Leonetti, Edgar Onea and Elisabeth Stark. Another version of this paper was presented at the *Second International Linguistics Symposium* organised in November 2008 in Bucharest. Our research was supported by the German Science Foundation by a grant to the project C2: *Case and referential context*, as part of the Collaborative Research Center 732 *Incremental Specification in Context* at the University of Stuttgart. Furthermore, the first author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Fritz Thyssen Foundation and the VolkswagenStiftung (*opus magnum*).

băiat bolnav (‘a sick boy’) is taken up in the continuation sentences (1a) and (1b) by means of the same definite NP. If no other semantic and/or syntactic restrictions are present in the sentence, modified definite NPs are generally preceded by *pe*, as in (1a). Constructions of the other type, in which the modified direct object remains unmarked, like in (1b), are rather marginal:

- (1) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
 (a) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiatul bolnav
 Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy.DEF sick
 ‘The doctor examines the sick boy.’
 (b) Doctorul examinează băiatul bolnav
 Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF sick
 ‘The doctor examines the sick boy.’

A relatively productive phenomenon, which correlates with the *pe*-marking of the direct object is the doubling of the direct object with a clitic, like in (1a). According to Gierling (1997) and Gramatica Academiei Române (2005), the presence of the clitic pronoun is not only restricted to the class of human referents. The obligatory occurrence of an accusative clitic, limited in Spanish to contexts in which the direct object is realized as a strong pronoun, extends in Romanian to strong NPs like proper names, pronouns, definite descriptions and NPs with strong quantifiers, all of which must be clitic doubled. As pointed out by Gierling (1997), the addition of modifiers favors the strong (specific) reading of the object, diminishing the acceptability of non-doubled constructions in contexts in which these would be otherwise optional. Moreover, clitic doubling is claimed to be compatible with weakly quantified NPs only if there is no material which would force a non-specific interpretation. A construction in which the direct object is doubled by a clitic is interpreted as being specific, whereas the reverse does not necessarily hold. The driving factor behind clitic doubling is therefore not specificity but its dependency on the doubled object.

Romanian shows a general blocking effect of prepositions upon unmodified noun phrases. Even though we do not analyze the differential object marker *pe* in terms of a preposition, the above blocking phenomenon nevertheless holds, as illustrated in (2a) below. *Pe* is responsible for the ungrammaticality of the enclitic definite article (*-ul*) on the unmodified noun in (2a), in the way in which the (‘true’) preposition *la* (‘at’) does in (2b). The presence or the absence of a clitic pronoun does not improve the acceptability of the sentence (2a) below (see Popescu 1997 for a proposed explanation of this phenomenon). So, a noun modified by most (accusative) prepositions is necessarily used without the definite article in Romanian (Gramatica Academiei Române 2005). Note, however, that this blocking effect disappears with modified nouns as in (1a) and (2c).

- (2) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
 (a) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat(*-ul)
 Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
 ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
 (b) Doctorul se uită la băiat(*-ul)
 Doctor.DEF REFL look at boy
 ‘The doctor looks at the boy.’
 (c) Doctorul se uită la băiatul bolnav
 Doctor.DEF REFL looks at boy.DEF sick
 ‘The doctor looks at the sick boy.’

While in the case of other prepositions this rule strictly blocks the sole apparition of the

definite article, like in (2b), in the case of DOM-marked nouns it allows two alternatives. The ungrammatical sequence (2a) can be reformulated in two different ways: as in (3a) where *pe* is omitted and the definite article is kept, or as in (3b) where *pe* is retained but the definite article is omitted:

- (3) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
 (a) Doctorul examinează băiatul
 Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF
 ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
 (b) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat
 Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
 ‘The doctor examines the boy.’

Up to this point, the literature (Cornilescu 2001, von Heusinger & Onea 2008) mainly concentrates on the conditions and development of *pe*-marking in Romanian. After accounting for the more problematic cases involving unmodified indefinite NPs (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009), we will bring into focus the factors licensing the *pe*-marking of unmodified definite NPs. Our main claim is that the crucial condition is the same as for indefinite NPs, namely “referential persistence”. Referential persistence (Givon 1981, Ariel 1988) designates a discourse pragmatic property that is weaker than topicality and reconstructs the informal description of “importance for the subsequent discourse”. This property indicates that the NP will be more frequently taken up in the following discourse and we can offer a quantitative measure of this property. If our hypothesis is correct, we would add to the local parameters determining DOM in Romanian and other languages a discourse-based parameter, integrating discourse information into the Grammar of DOM.

In Section 2 we will briefly look at the local factors animacy, definiteness and specificity, which are responsible for the distribution of *pe*-marking in Romanian in most cases. The contexts in which personal pronouns, proper names, indefinite and definite NPs may appear are enumerated. For indefinite unmodified DOs which cannot be accounted for by means of the general acknowledged criteria, we propose the adoption of a discourse-based feature, namely “referential persistence”. In Section 3 we concentrate on definite unmodified NPs or “definite bare NPs”. Using several tests, we also try to differentiate between differentially marked definite NPs and bare NPs. Furthermore, we will discuss some syntactic restrictions that are responsible for the blocking of the appearance of *pe*. In a next subsection, we try to find out by analyzing newspaper excerpts, whether *pe* behaves as a topic maker or if it displays the same contrast as in its relation to indefinite NPs. Section 4 comprises the summary, the concluding remarks and some open remained questions of the present paper.

2. PE Marking in Romanian

Animacy, definiteness and specificity are the three main local factors that determine whether a direct object will be *pe*-marked or not. In the following, we will briefly sketch the distribution of *pe* as a case marker along these scales, paying special attention to entities realized as definite unmodified direct objects in post-verbal position. Space limits do not permit us to go into a detailed discussion of this distribution (however, see Farkas (1978), Gramatica Academiei Române (2005), Chiriacescu (2007), von Heusinger & Onea (2008), Stark & Sora (2008), for a detailed picture of this distribution).

Furthermore, because *pe*-marking targets mainly those direct objects which are specified for the semantic feature [+human], we will not analyze direct objects that constitute exceptions with respect to this animacy feature.

2.1 Definite expressions

Full personal pronouns (4) referring to animate entities are always marked with *pe* and doubled by a clitic in the Romanian language of the 21st century:

- (4) Maria îl ascultă pe el
 Mary CL listens PE he
 ‘Mary listens to him.’

It is worth mentioning at this point that full personal pronouns are most commonly used in order to refer to human entities that are very often emphasized in this position. Direct objects realized as reflexive pronouns, the interrogative and relative pronouns *care* and *cine* (‘that / who’) referring to animates as well as inanimates also receive *pe*-marking. The negative pronoun *nimeni* (‘nobody’) and the indefinite pronouns are also differentially marked with *pe* when they replace a noun referring to an individual (see Pană-Dindelegan 1997, Gramatica Academiei Române 2005, Chiriacescu 2007, von Heusinger & Onea 2008, Stark & Sora 2008 for further discussions concerning different types of pronouns).

Proper names referring to humans, or to strongly individuated, personified animals, as in (5), are always case marked with *pe* when they appear in direct object position. Exceptions from this rule are toponyms. Not even in cases in which these proper names referring to names of countries or cities are used metonymically, denoting the inhabitants of a city is the occurrence of *pe* preferred.

- (5) L -am văzut pe Ion / Donald Duck
 CL Aux. seen PE John / Donald Duck
 ‘I have seen John / Donald Duck.’

There are further additional conditions triggering the *pe*-marking of proper names, including metonymical shifts, metaphorical transfers, etc. (cf. Gramatica Academiei Române 2005, Chiriacescu 2007) but we do not discuss them in our present analysis.

As already noted in the introductory part, definite NPs are usually (but not always) differentially marked with *pe* whenever the noun is further modified. We tested this generalization on 650 examples found on *Google* and in a corpus containing Romanian newspaper articles. Even though *Google* is not necessarily a representative corpus, it has several advantages as the storage of an enormous amount of data which can be processed electronically, facilitating their rapid analysis.

We opted for three transitive verbs: *a omori* (‘to kill’), *a critica* (‘to criticize’), *a impresiona* (‘to impress’) and tested the frequency of *pe*-marked and unmarked definite modified NPs in relation to each verb. To avoid any false results, we did not take into consideration phraseologies and repetitions. The type of construction we tested is given in (6) below:

- (6) (a) Am impresionat -o pe femeia...
 Aux. impressed CL PE woman.DEF...
 ‘I have impressed the... woman.’
 (b) Am impresionat femeia...
 Aux. impressed woman.DEF...
 ‘I have impressed the ... woman.’

The examples in (6) are similar, except that in (6a) the definite modified direct object is preceded by *pe* and doubled by a clitic, while in (6b) the direct object is neither marked with

pe nor doubled by a clitic. As it would have been complicated and difficult to test, we did not specify the modifier of the definite NP. Our findings are summarized in table (7) below:

(7) Definite modified NPs

	Total	Pe-marked (with def.art)	Unmarked (with def.art)		
			Syntactic restriction	Semantic restriction	
To kill	63	49	10	1	3
To criticize	138	113	7	15	3
To impress	108	92	4	10	2
Total	309	254	21	26	8

When in combination with the three verbs listed above, animate definite modified direct objects are generally preceded by *pe* as predicted by the high position on the Referentiality Scale. There are, however, a considerable number of unmarked occurrences of animate definite direct objects. The majority of these cases can be accounted for either in terms of a syntactic or in terms of a semantic restriction. Firstly, the occurrence of the possessive dative in preverbal or postverbal position rules out the *pe*-marking. This syntactic restriction will be discussed more amply in example (22) in the next section. The semantic restriction which renders the *pe*-marked construction infelicitous is found in relation to definite noun phrases which bear a collective reading or to definite nominal phrases which represent a metonymical shift (e.g. *El a impresionat presa straină*, ‘He impressed the foreign press’), which marks the noun phrase as inanimate and therefore blocks *pe*-marking. However, the last column of the table in (7) underlines the existence of marginal cases of variation (8 out of 254) in which the particle *pe* optionally precedes a direct object.

In Section 3 we will look at contexts which block the appearance of the differential object marker with definite unmodified direct objects. The first type of these contexts deals with the inhibiting effect of the possessive dative on the apparition of the *pe*-marker which gives rise to an alternative construction. The second context which blocks the DOM-marking is the incompatibility of the direct object with *pe* in the absence of other modifiers than the enclitic definite article. The focus of our interest will represent those constructions in which the *pe*-marked construction can co-occur with the unmarked construction.

2.2 Indefinite NPs and the local parameters

For indefinite human direct objects, *pe*-marking is optional; however, the parameters that might influence the DOM-marking are not quite clear, this being a typical instance of “fluid” constraints (see Malchukov & de Hoop 2007, de Swart 2007). In what follows, we test the following (additional) parameters: scopal specificity with extensional and intensional operators, epistemic specificity in “transparent” contexts and topicality.

Scopal specificity with extensional and intensional operators triggers *pe*-marking. While the sentence (8a) is ambiguous between a specific (or wide scope) reading and a non-specific (or narrow scope) reading, the non-specific reading in (8b) is ruled out due to the presence of *pe* (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). The same variation between wide and narrow scope is maintained for constructions with intensional operators, like in (9):

- (8) *Extensional operators (universal quantifiers)*
- (a) Toți bărbații iubesc o femeie
All men love a woman
‘All men love a woman.’ (specific/ non-specific)
- (b) Toți bărbații o iubesc pe o femeie
All men CL love PE a woman
‘All men love a/ this woman.’ (only specific)
- (9) *Intensional operators*
- (a) Ion caută o secretară
John looks for a secretary
‘John looks for a secretary.’ (specific/ non-specific)
- (b) Ion o caută pe o secretară
John CL looks for PE a secretary
‘John looks for a secretary.’ (only specific)

The indefinite NP *o secretară* (‘a secretary’) in (9a) could refer to a specific as well as a non-specific woman, while the sentence (9b) only allows a specific interpretation of the woman introduced in the sentence.

The contrast between (10a) and (10b) could be explained by epistemic specificity. In the first sentence, the referent of the indefinite *un prieten* (‘a friend’) is not particularly important in the present context. In contrast to that, the speaker of a sentence like (10b) gives the impression that the referent of the direct object is important for the present discourse, maybe intending to communicate more information about him. If we take into consideration example (10c), we soon realize that the picture becomes more complex, since the direct object is preceded by *pe* but not doubled by a clitic. (See Gierling 1997 for an explanation of this problem in terms of focus-projection).

- (10) *Transparent context*
- (a) Petru a vizitat un prieten
Petru Aux. visited a friend
‘Petru visited a friend.’
- (b) Petru l -a vizitat pe un prieten
Petru CL Aux. visited PE a friend
‘Petru visited a friend.’
- (c) Petru a vizitat pe un prieten
Petru Aux. visited PE a friend
‘Petru visited a friend.’

In cases like (10), epistemic specificity alone cannot offer a satisfying justification of the variation found within the class of indefinites in transparent contexts.

Besides the local factors tested above, the global factor topicality also plays an important role for DOM. The distribution of *pe*-marking for indefinites is significantly different if the direct object is in a preverbal position, in the sense that a sentence like (11a), where the topicalized direct object is *pe*-marked is strongly preferred in comparison to (11b), where the direct objects is not preceded by *pe*.

(11) *Topicality*

- (a) Pe un băiat îl strigau părinții
PE a boy CL called parents
'A boy was called by the parents.'
- (b) Un băiat strigau părinții
A boy called parents
'A boy was called by the parents.'

Even if topicality explains the preference of (11a) over (10b), this factor is not general enough to account for the more subtle examples presented in (10).

2.3 Indefinite NPs and the discourse parameters

Because the variation with indefinite unmodified direct objects can be accounted for neither in terms of the local factors animacy, definiteness and specificity nor in terms of the global factor topicality, we proposed the addition of a discourse-based factor on the list of the *pe*-triggering features. This parameter called "discourse prominence" is the most general factor and exhibits the property of "referential persistence" of a referent introduced by a *pe*-marked indefinite unmodified object. In a previous study we showed (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009) that a referent introduced in the discourse by means of an indefinite *pe*-marked direct object tends to be more often taken up in the subsequent discourse than an unmarked one.

Two newspaper articles were chosen to illustrate the special status within the discourse occupied by the direct object preceded by *pe*. The first article in (12) contains a direct object introduced by means of *pe* in the discourse, whereas in the second article (13), the same indefinite direct object occurs without *pe*. It is worth noting at this point, that the two article extracts relate the same shooting event in the same way, the only difference being the realization phrase of the two objects.

(12) *pe*-marking¹

[1] Neculai Florea, de 40 de ani, viceprimarul satului Horodniceni, și-a pus poliția pe cap după ce l-a împușcat cu un pistol cu gloanțe de cauciuc **pe un tânăr** din localitate.

[2] Incidentul s-a petrecut în noaptea de 10 spre 11 februarie, la discoteca ce aparține soției viceprimarului Florea și a fost reclamat la poliție în cursul după amiezii, la ora 15:40.

[3] La ora respectivă, **Vasile M.**, de 24 de ani, din comuna Horodniceni, **pro** s-a adresat postului de poliție reclamând că **pro** a fost împușcat în picior de viceprimarul Neculai Florea.

[4] La Horodniceni s-a deplasat în aceeași zi o echipă operativă a Serviciului arme, explozivi, substante toxice din IPJ Suceava, pentru a elucida cazul.

[5] Din primele verificări efectuate s-a stabilit că în cursul nopții, la discoteca viceprimarului, pe fondul consumului de alcool, a avut loc o altercație, iar Neculai Florea a folosit pistolul cu gloanțe de cauciuc împotriva lui **Vasile M.**, pe care l-a împușcat în picior, rănindu-l.

[6] Viceprimarul Neculai Florea susține că a fost nevoit să facă uz de armă, întrucât a fost agresat **de tânărul în cauză**.

[1] The 40-year-old Nicolae Florea, the vice mayor of the Horodniceni village, angered the police after he shot **a young man** from the same village with a gun with plastic bullets.

[2] The incident took place on the night of February 10th in the discotheque, whose owner is Florea's wife, while the police were notified at 15:40 in the afternoon.

[3] At that time, the 24-year-old **Vasile M.**, from the Horodniceni village complained to the police that **he** was shot in the leg by the vice-mayor Neculai Florea.

[4] A team of the IPJ Suceava went to Horodniceni to investigate the case.

[5] In keeping with initial findings, it was established that during the night an altercation took place at the vice mayor's discotheque due to alcohol consumption. Neculai Florea used his gun with plastic bullets against **Vasile M.**, **whom** he shot in the leg, hurting **him**.

[6] The vice-mayor Neculai Florea maintains that he had to make use of his gun, as he was shoved by **the mentioned young man**.

¹ <http://www.obiectivdesuceava.ro/index.php?ids=26841&page=articol>

[7] A spus că în cursul nopții de 10 spre 11 februarie, în discoteca administrată de soția lui a izbucnit un scandal între două grupuri rivale de tineri.

[8] "Soția mea m-a chemat și am intervenit ca să liniștesc apele.

[9] Am încercat să stau de vorbă, să-i calmez, dar **băiatul acela** m-a lovit în piept și era cât pe ce să..

[7] He said that on the night of February 10th, a scuffle broke out between two rival groups of young men in the discotheque administered by his wife.

[8]. My wife called me and I came to calm down the situation.

[9] I tried to talk to them, to calm them down, however, **that boy** hit me in the chest and **he** almost...

(13) no *pe*-marking²

[1] Viceprimarul Neculai Florea, din comuna Horodniceni, este cercetat de poliție după ce în noaptea de sâmbătă spre duminică a împușcat în picior **un tânăr** de 24 de ani la discotecă.

[2] Viceprimarul, care este membru PNG, a scos pistolul pentru a interveni într-o încăierare între tineri, care avea loc în discoteca familiei sale.

[3] El este asociat unic, iar soția sa administrator.

[4] Poliția a stabilit că **tânărul împușcat, Vasile Mihai**, pe fondul consumului de alcool, **pro** a fost implicat într-un scandal, iar viceprimarul a intervenit pentru a-l stopa.

(no further co-referential expressions)

[1] The vice mayor Neculai Florea from the village Horodniceni, is verified by the police after he shot **a 24-year-old young man** in the leg in the night from Saturday to Sunday in a discotheque.

[2] The vice mayor, who is a PNG member, took his gun out in order to intervene in a quarrel which started in his family's discotheque between some young men.

[3] He is the owner and his wife the administrator.

[4] The police found out that the **young man, Vasile Mihai**, was shot due to alcohol consumption, and that (**he**) was involved in a scuffle, and that the vice mayor intervened in order to stop **him**.

(no further co-referential expressions)

Before taking a closer look at the discourse prominence of the direct objects, it is also important to underline the fact that in (12), it is the other man, Neculai Florea, who is the topic and not the *pe*-marked DO. A striking observation with respect to DOM is the fact that the *pe*-marked introduced direct object in (12) displays a higher discourse prominence than the direct object which was not introduced by *pe* in the discourse. So, discourse prominence is reflected by the fact that it shows the potential to generate further expressions. This feature of DOM marked indefinite direct objects is underlined on the one hand by the fact that the referent of this object is taken up in the next eleven sentences nine times. On the other hand, the referent of the unmarked direct object in (13) was mentioned again in the next eleven sentences only three times. The discourse prominence of the *pe*-marked direct object is also evidenced by the first anaphoric item. In article (12), the newly introduced referent *un tânăr* ('a young man') is taken up in the following discourse by a proper name. However, a proper name can be chosen only in cases in which the presupposition licensed by the proper name can be accommodated within the context. This does not hold for the second article (13), in which the referent of the not *pe*-marked direct object is mentioned again by means of the definite NP *tânărul împușcat* ('the young man that was shot').

In his seminal work, Givon (1983) introduced the concept of “topic continuity” (the situation in which the same topic extends over more clauses) for the behavior of discourse referents across more than one sentence. He showed that the referential form of the referent mirrors its importance in the discourse. Accordingly, zero anaphors are most continuous (anaphorically and cataphorically) and accessible, while indefinite nominal phrases are rather discontinuous and less accessible. So, following Givon (1983) and as a result of our analysis with respect to the referential persistence of indefinite direct objects, we propose the following discourse prominence scale:

² <http://www.9am.ro/stiri-revista-presei/2007-02-13/un-viceprimar-a-impuscat-un-tanar-in-discoteca.html>

(14) *Discourse Prominence Scale*

Topic > Referential Persistence > No prominence

Unmarked indefinite unmodified direct objects are usually less referential persistent in comparison to *pe*-marked direct objects which usually occupy the middle position on the scale. Our claim is that referential persistence is the general feature according to which we can differentiate between different indefinites.

2.4 Bare NPs

Moving along the referentiality scale to the right, after analyzing specific and non-specific indefinite NPs, we come to another category of indefinites which are characterized by their feature [-argumental] (see Leonetti 2003, von Heusinger 2008 for Spanish) and by their morphological “emptiness”, in the sense that they are realized as a “bare NP”. Bare NPs can express different functions, including generic readings, non-argumental direct objects or - as we will discuss in section 3.3. - a certain kind of definite NPs. Bare nouns are generally divided into two classes, depending on whether their head is a plural or a mass noun. Romanian, a language which allows bare countable nouns (both plural and singular), rules out bare singulars³ in subject position⁴. The constructions we are interested in are those in which the bare singular nominal (BSN) takes the position as a DO, the referent of which displays the feature [+human], for example: (15a) non-specific NPs and (15b) kind-denoting NPs:

- (15) (a) Caut elev pentru [...]

Looking for student for [...]

'I am looking for a student for [...].'
- (b) Caut secretară

Looking for secretary

'I am looking for (a) secretary.'

In section 3.3. we will pay special attention to bare NPs like the ones in (15a) and (15b) and compare these with definite *pe*-marked constructions which seem to resemble true bare NPs. One of the characteristics of BSNs is the fact that a certain combination between a verb and a noun or preposition must be given so that bare singulars can appear (Carlson et al. 2006) and this distinguishes bare singulars from other kinds of NPs, which are not restricted to that kind of contexts. A second characteristic of bare singulars is that the lexical identity of the noun itself determines in many cases whether it can participate in the construction or not. In terms of their interpretations, bare NPs invoke “semantic enrichment”. Moreover, BSNs have a number neutral interpretation, which means that they are compatible with atomicity as well as non-atomicity entailments (Farkas and de Swart 2003). Another feature of this type of NPs is that they can combine neither with affective expressions nor with demonstratives or restrictive modifiers. In the next chapter we will test the behavior of definite unmodified *pe*-marked NPs with respect to these features.

³ The term bare singular means in the present paper a determinerless non-plural count noun.

⁴ Bare singular NPs in subject position are found in rather marginal constructions, which express psychological, physiological or natural phenomena (*Mi se face foame!* ‘I’m getting hungry’, *bate vânt!* ‘the wind is blowing’) and in frozen, idiomatic, negative contexts. Another type of bare nouns realized as external arguments when accompanied by a verb of existence are bare mass terms. However, such constructions do not represent our main interest at this point, so we will leave them out.

2.5 Summary

The following table (16) comprises the referential contexts in which direct objects are *pe*-marked. Besides the type of phrase through which the objects are realized, the table also makes a clear distinction in the domain of indefinite nominal phrases with respect to specificity. So, indefinite non-specific NPs are not differentially marked. Against other accounts, we subsume the contrast between specific and non-specific under referential persistence to account for all cases of post-verbal direct objects.

(16) Referentiality Scale for *pe*-marking in Romanian for human direct objects depending on the Referential Scale and Discourse Prominence:

Ref Scale Disc Prom	<i>pers.</i> <i>pron.</i>	> <i>PN</i>	> <i>def.</i> <i>NP</i>	> <i>indef NP</i>		> <i>non-arg</i> <i>NP</i>
				<i>spec.</i>	<i>non-spec</i>	
topic	+	+	+	+	+	n.a.
ref persistence	+	+	+	+	n.a.	n.a.
non-prominence	+	+	+ (±)	-	-	-

Besides the cases in which the *pe*-marking is obligatory or excluded we showed that there are cases in which the *pe*-marked and the unmarked form coexist. Unmodified indefinites in the direct object position are optionally marked with *pe* and this variance could not be accounted for only in terms of specificity. The non-elucidated cases, in which the difference between a *pe*-marked and a *pe*-unmarked indefinite direct object is minimal, were accounted for in terms of discourse pragmatic prominence. This feature was also integrated in the summary-table above. Indefinite specific objects which are important for the upcoming discourse are characterized through high persistence and will therefore be marked by *pe*. Indefinite specific objects which are not relevant for the discourse will (usually) not be mentioned again in the subsequent discourse. The lack of prominence of such objects is formally expressed by the absence of *pe*.

In what follows we analyze definite unmodified NPs in the same terms as indefinite NPs. We will divide specific definites according to their prominence: those objects which are important for the discourse in question will be *pe*-marked while non prominent objects will be unmarked.

3. Definite “bare nouns”

3.1 Definite unmodified direct objects

As we have already shown, whenever a definite nominal phrase has no further modifiers except the enclitic definite article, the direct object cannot be preceded by *pe*. The blocking of the definite article in the absence of further modifiers applies to almost all nouns preceded by most prepositions in Romanian irrespective of the position of the occurrence of the prepositional phrase (17a)⁵. In order to explain this phenomenon, we repeat the examples presented in (1) as (17) below. Modified definite human definite NPs in the object position are generally *pe*-marked, as illustrated in (17a). The form without *pe* is rather marginal:

⁵ Further evidence for this observation is found in the Gramatica Academiei Române (2005), where several constructions in which a preposition combines with a certain type of PP are listed.

- (17) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
- (a) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiatul bolnav
 Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy.DEF sick
 ‘The doctor examines the sick boy.’
- (b) Doctorul examinează băiatul bolnav
 Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF sick
 ‘The doctor examines the sick boy.’

Romanian shows a general blocking effect of prepositions upon unmodified noun phrases, which also holds for the DOM-marker *pe*. *Pe* blocks the enclitic definite article *-ul* in (18a) in the same way as the preposition *la* (‘at’) blocks the article in (18b). Note, however, that the blocking effect disappears for modified NPs, as in (18c) or (17a):

- (18) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
- (a) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat(*-ul)
 Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
 ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
- (b) Doctorul se uită la băiat(*-ul)
 Doctor.DEF REFL look at boy
 ‘The doctor looks at the boy.’
- (c) Doctorul se uită la băiatul bolnav
 Doctor.DEF REFL looks at boy.DEF sick
 ‘The doctor looks at the sick boy.’

While “real” prepositions (like in (18c)) always block the attachment of the enclitic definite article on unmodified nouns, in the case of *pe*-marking in its function of DOM, the above mentioned constraint gives rise to an alternation. Speakers of Romanian can either drop the marker *pe*, as in (19a), or drop the definite article, as in (19b):

- (19) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
- (a) Doctorul examinează băiatul
 Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF
 ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
- (b) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat
 Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
 ‘The doctor examines the boy.’

Both sentences (19a) and (19b) represent different possibilities of expressing very similar referential categories. As it could be noticed so far, Romanian shows a variation between modified definite objects and unmodified definite objects. Nevertheless, the alternation is different: for modified definite objects the alternation concerns the marker *pe*, but not the definite article; for unmodified definite objects the alternation affects both: the marker *pe* and the definite article. Furthermore, the semantic-pragmatic conditions are probably quite different: For modified definite objects, the form without the marker *pe* is marginal, while for unmodified definite objects, both forms are acceptable. Depending on the context and language register Romanian speakers tend to prefer one construction over the other; however, both sentences are grammatical and have the same propositional content. Interferences of this type, where speakers are free to choose between a *pe*-marked construction and a *pe*-free construction, provide evidence for the fact that the generally acknowledged local and global criteria (animacy, definiteness, specificity and topicality) cannot thoroughly delimitate between instances with and without *pe*.

The questions that arise at this point are: What kind of reading do *pe*-marked definite NPs in contrast to unmarked definites in direct object position have? What are the decisive criteria that impinge speakers to choose one construction over the other?

3.2 Further blocking effects

Before we further investigate the alternation between the *pe*-form and the article-form of differentially marked direct objects, we have to account for additional blocking effects that trigger one or the other form. In what follows, we offer two examples for such blocking effects: (i.) the lexical semantics of the NP and (ii.) a particular construction (the possessive dative). We will only mention metonymical shifts as a major blocker of the *pe*-marked construction but we will not discuss such examples at this point. (See Chiriacescu 2007, von Heusinger & Onea 2008 for a detailed picture on this aspect).

3.2.1 Lexical type of the noun

Archaic usages of certain terms in direct object position found in written texts at the beginning of the 20th century (Chiriacescu 2007) constitute an exception in the sense that such expressions can be simultaneously suffixed by the definite article and *pe*-marked, even in the absence of further modifiers. However, a direct object like in (20), in which the functional expression *șeful* (‘the boss’) is suffixed by the definite article and simultaneously *pe*-marked, is not a recommended one in synchronic Romanian:

- (20) L -am văzut pe șeful
 CL Aux see PE boss.DEF
 ‘I have seen the boss.’

Another marginal exception is found in the case of expressions of kinship relations (the father/ the aunt). The referents of these NPs are characterized by means of their most salient feature, representing uniquely identifiable entities in the context of utterance; signaling a high degree of individualization:

- (21) (a) Il văd pe tata
 CL see PE father.DEF
 ‘I see the father.’
 (b) Merg la mama
 go to mother
 ‘I go to mother.’

Again, this exception is not only found in combination with differentially marked direct objects, but also in combination with other prepositions, as it becomes obvious in (21b).

3.2.2 The possessive dative

At sentence level, *pe*-marking is ruled out whenever the definite article is modified by a possessive preverbal (22a) or postverbal dative (22b), even in cases where the NP is further modified by an adjective:

- (22) (a) Maria își înțelege (*pe) buna prietenă
 Maria DAT understands PE good.DEF friend
 ‘Maria understands her good friend.’

- (b) Înțelegându -și (*pe) frumoasa soție a făcut
 Understanding- DAT PE beautiful.DEF wife Aux. made
 ‘Understanding his beautiful wife, he made [...].’

The noun involved in such a possessive relation is strongly individuated and combines with the definite article. These are the constructions representing the unmarked modality to convey possession. Nevertheless, besides the examples in (22) there “coexist” other constructions to express possession in which the noun is *pe*-marked and appears with a possessive pronoun in Genitive:

- (23) Maria o înțelege pe prietena ei [dar nu pe a mea]
 Maria CL understands PE friend.DEF her [but not mine]
 ‘Maria understands her friend [but not mine].’

Only sentence (23) emphasizes the fact that the direct object *prietena* (‘the friend’) is Maria’s friend, however, not mine/ yours/ etc. So, the DOM marker adds a discursive contrast to the object it precedes.

3.2.4 Corpus data

In a corpus containing Romanian newspaper articles and in a *Google* survey, we tried to analyze the distributional contexts in which definite and indefinite DOM-marked direct objects appear, paying special attention to definite unmodified objects preceded by *pe*. In order to compare these findings with the ones involving direct objects realized as definite modified NPs, we opted for the same transitive verbs as in 2.1. above, namely: *a omori* (‘to kill’), *a critica* (‘to criticize’), *a impresiona* (‘to impress’) and tested the frequency of *pe*-marked and unmarked definite modified NPs in relation to each verb.

With respect to the frequency of apparition of definite unmodified NPs, our findings were not surprising: the majority of direct objects are not preceded by *pe*. Furthermore, as the table in (24) shows, the three verbs display a different affinity with respect to the marking of their definite unmodified NPs, underlining the impact of the global parameter verb semantics on the distribution of DOM in Romanian (See von Heusinger for Spanish 2008).

(24) Definite unmodified NPs

	Total	<i>Pe</i> -marked (without def.art)	Unmarked (plus definite article)		
			Syntactic restriction	Semantic restriction	
To kill	79	18	54	0	7
To criticize	41	17	10	12	2
To impress	48	16	20	11	1
Total	167	51	84	23	9

Most cases in which the direct objects are realized as definite unmodified NPs can be explained by means of the above mentioned *pe*-blocking or *pe*-favoring factors. So, the possessive dative is syntactically blocking the presence of *pe* before the direct object. The semantic blocking of the appearance of the *pe*-marker is found in cases in which the noun represents a metonymical shift or when it bears a collective reading (e.g. *Un tânăr impresionează juriul*- ‘A young man impresses the jury’). More importantly, besides the regular distributional contexts, we also encountered instances in which the presence or absence of *pe* could not be accounted for only in terms of the semantic or syntactic

restriction, as the example in (25) shows:

- (25) (a) [...] a impresionat trecătorul
 (s/he)Aux. impressed passer-by.DEF
 ‘S/he impressed the passer-by.’
 (b) [...] I -a impresionat pe trecător
 (s/he)CL Aux. impressed PE passer-by
 ‘S/he impressed the passer-by.’

In contrast to the variation found within the class of direct objects realized as definite modified NPs, these cases do not constitute marginal examples, for 9 out of 51 examples could be marked by *pe*. Moreover, no factor that was already mentioned can explain the absence of the DOM- marker *pe* in (25a) or its presence in (25b). Variations of this type, which constitute ca. 20% of the cases, impinged us to look for further criteria that can account for the distribution of *pe*.

Differentially marked direct objects seem to have the same surface structure as that of bare singulars when they are not further modified by the definite article. For this reason, we will concentrate on this apparent similarity in what follows.

3.3 Definite “bare nouns” are not “real” bare nouns

“Bare nouns”, i.e. nouns without determiner (or modifier) can express different referential types: (i) non-argumental indefinites, or what some people may say: narrow scope non-specific indefinites; (ii) kinds and (iii) definite NPs. However, we have clear tests to distinguish between these types in order to identify definite NPs. Furthermore, there are also cases in which the DOM marking is semantically relevant for individualization. In such cases, *pe* is incompatible with a generic reading as exemplified by (26):

- (26) (a) Mihai adoră femeia
 Mihai adors woman.DEF
 ‘Mihai adors the woman/ women.’
 (b) Mihai o adoră pe femeie
 Mihai CL adors PE woman
 ‘Mihai adors the/that woman.’

In what follows, we will concentrate on the more interesting cases in which bare singulars appear as internal arguments. The two constructions 27 (a) and (c) below have the same morphological structure except for the presence of the DOM marker in the second sentence:

- (27) (a) Caut secretară
 Looking for secretary
 ‘I am looking for a secretary.’
 (b) Caut o secretară
 Looking for a secretary
 ‘I am looking for a secretary.’
 (c) O caut pe secretară
 CL looking for PE secretary
 ‘Looking for a secretary.’ (a certain one)

The sentence 27(b), where the indefinite NP is modified by the indefinite article, is an intermediate step between sentence 27 (a) and (c). Here, the indefinite is understood in a non-

specific way. One question arising at this point is whether the differentially marked direct object in 27 (c) should be analyzed as a true bare NP or not.

To keep the two kinds of phrases apart, we will test in the following the behavior of “true” bare NPs and “definite bare NPs” with respect to the substitution of synonyms, semantic enrichment, and the possibility to combine with restrictive modifiers and referential identity.

One of the salient characteristics of bare singulars is that the lexical identity of the noun itself determines in many cases whether it can participate in the construction or not. Substitution of synonyms does not automatically render a grammatical sentence, as (28a) shows:

(28) *Substitution of synonyms*

- (a) Caut brutar/*băiat
Looking for baker/*boy
'I am looking for a baker/boy.'
- (b) Il caut pe brutar/ băiat
CL looking for PE baker/ boy
'I am looking for the baker/ boy.'

In the case of *pe*-marked bare NPs (28b), the lexical identity of the noun itself does not play such an important role, so the nominals can be switched, yielding a grammatical sentence.

In terms of their interpretations, one of the more salient characteristics of bare singulars is that they invoke “semantic enrichment”. That means that they seem to induce more than a straightforward composition of parts, as the example (29a) shows:

(29) *Semantic enrichment*

- (a) Caut secretară
Looking for secretary
'I am looking for a secretary.'
- (b) O caut pe secretară
CL look for PE secretary
'I am looking for the secretary.'

Looking for a secretary does not simply imply in (29) that the speaker is looking for a secretary but also means that s/he tries to find someone that is qualified as a secretary in order to employ her/him. For this reason, such semantically enriched readings are occasionally referred to in the literature as “activity readings” (see Carlson et al. 2006, Dobrovie-Sorin et al. 2006).⁶ In contrast to the example above, constructions involving marked bare nouns as in (29b) do not have this enriched reading. So, we cannot imply in this case that the speaker is looking for any secretary in order to hire her, but rather that s/he is looking for a certain secretary.

Another criterion differentiating between true bare NPs and marked bare NPs is the fact that true bare NPs do not combine with restrictive modifiers like “all” or demonstratives, as in (30a). Contrastively, marked bare NPs can combine with a restrictive modifier as the example (30b) shows:

⁶ Such constructions also tend to be sometimes called “idioms”, or characterized as having idiomatic readings.

(30) *Combination with restrictive modifiers*

- (a) *Chem această secretară
 Call this secretary
 ‘I call *this secretary.’
- (b) O chem pe această secretară
 CL call PE this secretary
 ‘I call this secretary.’

Another property of bare nominals is that they do not include referential identity:

(31) *Referential identity*

- (a) Bob caută secretară și John la fel
 Bob looks for secretary and John also
 ‘Bob is looking for a secretary and John does too.’
- (b) Bob o caută pe secretară și John la fel
 Bob CL looks for PE secretary and John also
 ‘Bob is looking for the secretary and John does too.’

In (31a), Bob and John are not necessarily looking for the same secretary, but rather after different ones. In contrast to that, marked bare NPs do signalize identity of referents, as we can see in (31b).

After applying many of the tests that distinguish bare NPs from other nominal phrases, we cannot assume that the examples in which the unmodified direct object is preceded by the accusative marker *pe* are true cases of bare singular nominals.

3.4 Fine grained referential properties / Local factors

The alternation between a *pe*-marked direct object and one in which the definite article is suffixed on it may also depend on the referential properties of the definite noun. In this case we can distinguish along four dimensions. The first dimension is the (i) type of definiteness, including uniqueness (*the moon*), familiar definites (*a man/ the man*), kind-readings and weak definites (Carlson et al. 2006). In a first survey we could not find any significant difference between the alternate forms. It is worth noting here that this observation also holds for modified definite direct objects. Another dimension is the distinction between (ii) transparent vs. opaque readings (cf. Keenan & Ebert 1973), as in a sentence like: *We will interview the winner*, where the winner can be understood as: a) the actual winner or b) the one, who will win. The third dimension is (iii) referential vs. attributive reading (Donnellan 1966: *the murderer of Smith*) etc. Again, in both cases we could not find any significant difference between the forms. The only differences we found were (iv) for scopal behavior:

- (32) (a) Toți chiriașii salută proprietarul bogat
 All renters salute owner.DEF rich
 ‘All renters salute the rich owner.’
- (b) Toți chiriașii îl salută pe proprietar / pe proprietarul bogat
 All renters CL salute PE owner/ PE owner.DEF rich
 ‘All renters salute the owner/ the rich owner.’

In 32(a), the sentence *proprietarul* (‘the owner’) could be interpreted as “Each renter salutes his/her owner”, even if the NP is further modified by the adjective *bogat* (‘rich’). However, the *pe*-marked DO in 32(b) clearly underlines the fact that the mentioned owner is the same for each renter. In this case also, we consider that this might be a secondary effect of an un-

derlying feature. We assume that this feature has to do with the discourse prominence of the definite NP.

3.5 Discourse prominence

Topicalization is also not a reliable feature which can be used to distinguish between a marked and an unmarked NP, because it clearly triggers the *pe*-marking. Starting from the common question (A), speakers of Romanian have at least two possibilities to answer it, as (33a) and (33b) show:

- (33) A: Iar băiatul? (What about the boy?)
 (a) Pe băiat *il* strigă parinții
 PE boy CL call parents
 ‘The boy is called by the parents.’
 (b) Băiatul *il* strigă parinții
 Boy.DEF CL call parents
 ‘The boy is called by the parents.’(not preferred)

The correct answer for sentence A is 33 (a), with the direct object in topical position marked by *pe*. Because topicalization cannot differentiate between certain alternations with and without *pe*, and because in transparent contexts the generally acknowledged parameters triggering DOM seem not to be able to help us either, we need another feature to account for such instances. We assume that the function of *pe*-marking is the same for indefinite as well as for definite direct objects. Therefore, we will try to look at the persistence of definite direct objects as well, analyzing only such sentences in which DOM is optional.

Consider following examples taken from two newspaper articles:

(34) *pe*-marking⁷

<p>„[1] Lăcrămioara Călin de 40 de ani din localitatea Pîrjol, este o altă mamă care-și va petrece revelionul în spital alături de <i>copilul</i> ei rănit la ochi [...].</p> <p>[2] Făceam pregătiri de Crăciun când il văd pe băiat, plin de sânge, (pro) adus de un coleg de clasă.</p> <p>[3] M-am speriat și I-am dus imediat la spital în Moinesti.</p> <p>[4] De acolo I-au transferat de urgență la Spitalul de Urgentă Bacău și I-au internat aici.</p> <p>[5] Așa mi-am dat seama că băiatul este lovit grav la ochi.</p> <p>[6] Nu-mi rămâne decât să fac sărbătorile la biserica din spital și să mă rog pentru sănătatea copilului meu.</p> <p>[7] Regret că nu mi-am învățat copilul, despre pericolul pe care-l [...].”</p> <p>[8] “(Eu) Nu mi-am dat seama ce se va întâmpla dacă mă joc cu petarde, dar dupa ce (pro) am pus în bidon praf de carbid și (pro) am aprins, nu luase foc, de aceea (pro) am aruncat o petardă aprinsă care întârzie să explodeze.</p> <p>[9] Curios fiind (pro) de ceea ce se întâmplă de nu pocneste, (pro) mi-am apropiat ochii de gura bidonului să văd (pro) cauza dar, [...] în dreptul ochiului meu.</p>	<p>“[1] 40-year-old Lăcrămioara Călin from the Pîrjol locality is another mother who will spend her New Year’s Eve in the hospital near her <i>child</i>, who has been wounded in the eye [...].</p> <p>[2] We were preparing for Christmas, when I saw the child, bleeding and (pro) being brought by a classmate.</p> <p>[3] I got scared and brought (pro) immediately to the Mointesti Hospital.</p> <p>[4] From there, they transferred (pro) to the Bacau Emergency Hospital and hospitalized (pro) here.</p> <p>[5] This is how I realized that the boy was seriously injured in his eye.</p> <p>[6] I have no other choice but to spend the holiday in the hospital’s church, praying for my child’s health.</p> <p>[7] I regret not having taught my child about the danger caused by [...]”.</p> <p>[8] I didn’t realize what would happen if I played with petards, but after I [...] and I lighted it but it didn’t burn; I threw a lighted petard which exploded after a delay.</p> <p>[9] Being curious about what was happening why it did not explode, I came closer to the mouth of the tank to look for the cause but [...] in front of my eyes.</p>
--	--

⁷ <http://www.cronicaromana.ro/sarbatori-explozive.html>

[10] N-am (pro) mai văzut nimic și [...]. [11] Dacă (pro) voi scăpa, (pro) am să învăț pe toți copiii să se ferească de astfel de jocuri”, a spus copilul cu teamă că-și va pierde vederea	[10] I could not see anything and [...]. [11] If my eyes heal, I will teach all children to keep away from such games”, said the boy frightened of losing his sight.
---	--

(35) no *pe*-marking⁸

<p>“[1] Revin cu informații noi privind starea lui <u>Mădălin</u>.</p> <p>[2] În primul rând, aș vrea să îmi cer scuze că atâta timp nu ați mai auzit nimic despre <u>el</u>.</p> <p>[3] Au fost niște probleme [...].</p> <p>[4] Astăzi am fost să văd băiatul, că tocmai pro s-a întors dintr-o internare în București.</p> <p>[5] (pro) Era puțin supărat că nu venise moșul deloc anul acesta.</p> <p>[6] A venit astăzi, dar deja era târziu.</p> <p>[7] Nu mai era aceeași bucurie.</p> <p>[8] În fine, dureros este că (pro) a răcit puțin, dar la imunitatea lui [...].</p>	<p>“[1] I return with new information regarding <u>Mădălin</u>’s state. [2] Firstly, I want to apologize for the fact that you did not hear anything about <i>him</i> lately. [3] Some problems interfered [...]. [4] Today, I went to see the boy, for he just returned from a hospitalization period in Bucharest. [5] (pro) was a little bit upset because Santa Clause did not come at all this year. [6] He came today but it was already too late. [7] It wasn’t the same happiness anymore. [8] Anyway, the fact that he came down with a cough is painful, but keeping his immunity in mind [...].</p>
--	--

The same observations we made with respect to the discourse prominence of indefinite NPs introduced with and without *pe* into the discourse are also valid for definite NPs. The newspaper articles in (34) and (35) above underline the special status of the referent that was introduced by *pe* in the discourse. This referent is taken up in the subsequent discourse more often than its unmarked counterpart in (35), as can be seen in the two structures below:

	(34) def. NP. [+ <i>pe</i>]	(35) def. NP [- <i>pe</i>]
Antecedent	def. NP	PN pers.pron ∅
Occurrence	pe+def.NP, pro	def.NP, pro
Sentence 1	cl	pro
Sentence 2	cl, cl	∅
Sentence 3	def. NP	∅
Sentence 4	def. NP	Pro, pron
Sentence 5	cl. NP	∅
Sentence 6	pron, pron, pro, pro, pro	∅
Sentence 7	pro, pro, pro, pron	∅
Sentence 8	pro	∅
Sentence 9	pro, pro	∅

4. Summary

In this paper we provided an explanation in terms of discourse pragmatic prominence that accounts for the interesting, however not yet elucidated, cases in which unmodified definite NPs in direct object position are sometimes used with the suffixed definite article and other times with the DOM-marker *pe* to express the same idea.

Based on a previous study concerning the distribution of indefinites in DO position (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009), we showed that the generally acknowledged local conditions licensing DOM for definite unmodified NPs are insufficient in order to account

⁸ http://forum.desprecopii.com/forum//topic.asp?ARCHIVE=true&TOPIC_ID=38547&whichpage=2

for their alternation. After eliminating those contexts in which other blocking effects were responsible for the usage of one form over the other (kinship expressions, archaic usages, possessive dative) and after differentiating between the so called “definite bare nouns” and “true” bare NPs, we proposed that the global factor of discourse prominence also influences the case-marking of definite direct objects. Case marked definite direct objects also show the property of referential persistence. We chose two newspaper articles to measure the discourse prominence of the *pe*-marked and *pe*-unmarked direct object referents, by counting their subsequent co-referential expressions. We showed that *pe*-marked definite unmodified NPs are more referential persistent than their not *pe*-marked counterpart and that referential persistence is the general feature according to which we can differentiate definite unmodified NPs. However, there are several open questions that remain open at the end of this paper; especially with respect to the tests measuring discourse prominence, which should also be further developed.

5. References

- Ariel, Mira 1988. Referring and Accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24, 65-87.
- Carlson G., R. Sussman, N. Klein, & M. Tanenhaus 2006. Weak definite NPs. In: C. Davis, A.R. Deal & Y. Zabbal (eds.). *Proceedings of NELS 36*. UMass/Amherst: GLSA/Chicago.
- Chiriacescu, Sofiana 2007. *Pe-Markierung und Diskurs-Prominenz im Rumänischen*, Magisterarbeit, Universität Stuttgart.
- Chiriacescu, S.& von Heusinger, K. 2009. Discourse structure and case marking in Romanian. To appear in: *SinSpec*.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra 2001. Direct Objects at the Left Periphery, the Case of Romanian. In: *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, Bucharest, 1-18.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Tonia Bleam & M. Teresa Espinal 2006. Bare nouns, number and types of incorporation. In S. Voegeler & L. Tasmovski (eds). *Non-definiteness and plurality*. Benjamins, Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today series, 51-81.
- Donnellan, Keith 1966. Reference and Definite Descriptions. *Philosophical Review* 75, 281-304.
- Farkas, Donka 1978. Direct and indirect object reduplication in Rumanian. In: D. Farkas, W.M. Jacobsen & K.W. Todrys (eds.). *Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS 14)*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 88-97.
- Farkas, D.& H. de Swart 2003. *The Semantics of Incorporation*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Gierling, Diana 1997. Clitic doubling, specificity and focus in Romanian. *Clitics, pronouns and movement*. J. Black and V. Motapanyane. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Givon, Talmy 1981. On the Development of the Numeral 'one' as an Indefinite Marker. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 2, 35-53.
- Givon, Talmy 1983. Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction. In: T. Givón (ed.). *Topic Continuity in Discourse. A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1-41.
- Gramatica Limbii Romane* 2005. Vol I. Cuvantul. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei.
- von Heusinger, Klaus 2008. Verbal Semantics and the Diachronic Development of Differential Object Marking in Spanish. *Probus* 20, 1-33.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Onea, Edgar 2008. Triggering and Blocking Effects in the Diachronic Development of DOM in Romanian. *Probus* 20. 71-116.
- Keenan, Edward & Ebert, Karen 1973. A Note in Marking Transparency and Opacity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 421-424.
- Leonetti, Manuel 2003. Specificity and Object Marking: the Case of Spanish *a*. In: K. von Heusinger & G. Kaiser (eds.). *Proceedings of the Workshop Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Specificity in Romance Languages*. Universität Konstanz: Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft (Arbeitspapier 113), 67-101.
- Malchukov, Andrei & Helen de Hoop 2007. On fluid differential case marking: A bidirectional OT approach. *Lingua*, Vol. 117, Issue 9, 1636-1656.
- Munn, Alan & Schmitt, C. 2001. Bare nominals and the morphosyntax of number. In: Cresti, D., Tortora, C., Satterfield, T. (eds.). *Current Issues in Romance Linguistics, Selected Papers from the 29th Linguistics Symposium on Romance Languages, Ann Arbor, April 1999*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, 217-231.
- Niculescu, A 1965. Obiectul direct prepozitional in limbile romane. In: *Individualitatea limbii romane intre limbile romane*. Bucuresti: Editura Stiintifica.

- Pană-Dindelegan, Gabriela 1997. Din nou despre statutul prepoziției. Cu referire specială la prepoziția PE. *LR XLVI. Nr. 1-3*, 27-55.
- Popescu, Alexandra 1997. *Objektklitika und Argumentlinking im Rumänischen*. Magisterarbeit. Universität Düsseldorf.
- Stark, E & Sora Sanda 2008. Why is there differential object marking in Romance? *29th Annual Meeting of the German Society for Linguistics in Bamberg, Germany*.
- De Swart, Peter 2007. *Cross-linguistic Variation in Object Marking*, PhD. Dissertation, University of Nijmegen.
- Wright, S. & Givon, T. 1987. The pragmatics of indefinite reference: quantified text-based studies. *Studies in Language 11*, 1-33.