

# Definites and DOM in Romanian. An experimental study\*

Ion Giurgea\* & Alina Tigău\*\*

(\*,\*\* The “Iorgu Iordan –Al. Rosetti” Institute of  
Linguistics of the Romanian Academy  
\*\* The University of Bucharest)

## 1. Introduction: DOM in Romanian, general remarks

### 1.1 Types of DOM and formal means

- (i) General DOM – in all positions
  - formal means: the preposition *pe*, +/- clitic doubling (CID)
  - => subtypes depending on CID: +obligatory CID, +optional CID, no CID
- (ii) Preverbal DOM – only for preverbal objects
  - formal means: CID
  - the type of fronting (wh-, focalization, topicalization) makes no difference => it is a DOM-type phenomenon
  - sensitive only to definiteness and specificity (mostly partitive); animacy is irrelevant
  - the rule is simple: any +def or +spec prev. O must be CID-ed

In this talk we only discuss general DOM, which is a highly complex phenomenon. The rule of preverbal DOM is much simpler: when it comes to definites, *all* need CID.

### 1.2 Types of general DOM and triggering features

- (1) Triggers for *pe*-marking:
  - (a) +human/animate
  - (b) ‘specificity-related’:
    - (b.1) +proper-name
    - (b.2) + definite
    - (b.3) +specific/partitive
  - (c) ‘pronominality-related’:
    - (c.1) +N-ellipsis (nominal anaphora)
    - (c.2) +non-elliptical pronoun (NEP) = incorporated n or [<sub>N</sub>Ø]<sub>non-anaph</sub> (analyzable as an intransitive n); no N-ellipsis

---

\* This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-PCE-2021-0042, within PNCDI III.

## Rough generalizations<sup>1</sup>:

### (2) Obligatory DOM:

- (i) (a)+(b.1) – animate proper names +CID  
\*(L)-a invitat \*(pe) Ion ‘(S)he invited Ion’
- (ii) (b.2/!3)+(c.1) – definite DPs with N ellipsis + some part. indef. with N ellipsis, even inanimate<sup>2</sup>  
\*(L)-am citit \*(pe) acesta/primul/al tău/cel nou/fiecare +CID  
‘I read this one/the first one/yours/the new one/each one’

### (iii) (a)+(c.2) – human NEP (irrespective of definiteness)

[context: no antecedent for the missing N]

- % (L)-am văzut \*(pe) unul în curte / \*(l)-am văzut \*(pe) el  
3MS.ACC-have.1 seen DOM one.MS in yard CL-have.1 seen DOM him  
‘I saw somebody in the yard’ ‘I saw him’

- no gender and no specificity => \*CID:

- (\*L)-am văzut pe cineva în curte  
(3MS.ACC)-have.1 seen DOM somebody in yard  
‘I saw somebody in the yard’

### (3) Optional DOM:

- (i) (a)+(b.2) – definite/ human/animate DPs with overt common N +CID  
*L-am invitat pe profesor / Am invitat profesorul* ‘I invited the teacher’
- (ii) (a)+(b.3) – specific indefinite human/animate DPs with overt N opt. CID  
%(L)-am invitat pe un profesor / Am invitat un profesor ‘I invited a teacher’
- (iii) (b.3)+(c.1) – specific/partitive indefinite inanimate DPs with N-ellipsis opt. CID  
*Dintre cărți, le-am citit pe câteva / am citit câteva*  
‘I read some of the books’

## On clitic doubling

- (4) CID in general DOM is contingent on *pe*-marking (CID → *pe*)
- (5) No (b) among the triggers and no [NØ] (=> no gender) => no CID (see (2)(iii) 2<sup>nd</sup> ex.)
- (6) CID obligatory for personal pronouns in modern Romanian; for other *pe*-marked definite or specific objects, it has been on the rise, gradually becoming obligatory

<sup>1</sup> For these generalizations, see Farkas (1987), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Cornilescu (2000), Tigău (2011, 2014, 2017, 2021), Pană-Dindelegan (2013), Cornilescu & Tigău (2022), Irimia (2020a,b,c, 2023), a.o.

<sup>2</sup> This includes inanimate 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns (e.g. *pe ele* ‘DOM them.FEM’ standing for *cărțile* ‘the books(FEM)’), under an analysis of 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns with grammatical gender as D+[NØ]<sub>anaph</sub> (see Giurgea (2010), Giurgea & Ivan (2023) for Romanian). For other inanimate DPs with N ellipsis, DOM is sometimes optional, for some speakers.

In the process of replacing optional CID by obligatory CID, proper names are ahead of common nouns, and definites seem to be ahead of indefinites:

- (7) a. \*(L-)am            invitat pe {profesor/Ion}           (a-b: personal judgments)  
       3MS.ACC-have.1 invited DOM teacher/ Ion  
       ‘I invited {the teacher/Ion}.’  
   b. ?(L-)            am        invitat pe    un coleg.  
       3MS.ACC-have.1 invited DOM a   colleague  
       ‘I invited a colleague.’  
   c. \*(L-)am            întâlnit pe    vărul tău.       (Dobrovie-Sorin 1987:32, ex.1.18b)  
       3MS.ACC-have.1 invited DOM cousin your  
       ‘I met your cousin’

N.B. in (7)a is definite; the absence of the article is due to the so-called article-drop rule, by which the suffixal definite article is dropped after most accusative-taking prepositions if the maximal projection of N consists only of  $D_{def}$  and the lexical N (see Dobrovie-Sorin 2007, Giurgea 2022)

In our experiments, in the production experiment (using translations) we only found sporadic instances of DOM of definites without CID: 6 overall, produced by 4 informants out of 53 (2 informants produced 2 instances each)

This evolution is a simplification of the system:

- optional CID with *pe*-marked disappears (=> 2 types instead of 3: oblig. CID; impos. CID)
  - the conditions for CID with general DOM are the same as those for preverbal DOM (def./spec.), modulo the requirement that the object should be *pe*-marked
- => in our experiments (which were about DOM of *definites*), we only used CID in the Romanian DOM-examples

### Further generalizations

#### (i) Features of the object triggering *absence of DOM*:

As the specificity involved in optional DOM is sometimes quite elusive (see Cornilescu 2000, Tigău 2014, Tigău & von Heusinger 2019), it might be easier to say when *pe*-marking is impossible (cf. Cornilescu 2000, Tigău 2011):

- (8) Absence of DOM triggered by
- a. property-denotation (=> bare nouns; objects of *have*+relational nouns)  
       (\**Îi*) *invită* (\**pe*) *colegi noi*   ‘(S)he’s inviting new colleagues’
- b. DPs (including human definites) associated to a dative external possessor  
       *Și-a            adus   sora* / \**Și-a            adus(-o)            pe   sora*  
       3REFL.DAT-has brought sister-the 3REFL.DAT-has brought(-3FS.ACC) (DOM) sister  
       ‘(S)he brought his/her sister.’

(ii) Syntactic configurations triggering DOM:

- verbs with accusative quirky subjects:

(9) \*(Îl) dor picioarele \*(pe) un copil 'A child's feet hurt'  
3MS.ACC hurt.3P feet-the DOM a child

- elliptical *ca*-comparatives (see Pană-Dindelegan 2013:131, Irimia 2018)

(10) Bea vinul ca pe apă / ca apa '(S)he drinks wine like water'

## 2. DOM with definite DPs with overt human/animate common nouns: previous generalizations

The generalization in (3)(i), according to which DOM is optional here, is course-grained. Finer distinctions (sub-types) => sometimes DOM is highly preferred, even obligatory, sometimes is impossible

- Generic definites: DOM impossible (Hill & Tasmowski 2008) or dispreferred, but sometimes possible (Cornilescu 2000, Croitor & Giurgea 2023)
- Weak definites: DOM impossible (Cornilescu & Tigău 2022, Croitor & Giurgea 2023)
- More generally, DOM impossible with definites that lack the presupposition of existence (Croitor & Giurgea 2023, Giurgea 2023)
- Anaphoric definites: DOM preferred or maybe even obligatory (Croitor & Giurgea 2023, Giurgea 2023)
- DPs with possessors that would require DOM if they were in object position: DOM obligatory (Croitor & Giurgea 2023, Giurgea 2023)

We tested these generalizations by means of three different experiments

## 3. The design of the experiments

### 3.1 Experiment 1: Definites and DOM in translation

Experiment 1 included several items, which the respondents were required to translate from English into Romanian.

#### 3.1.1 Experimental items

Several configurations were tested:

a) 4 items with DOs containing non-specific indefinite possessors

e.g. *We should also invite **the director of some research institute**.*

b) 8 items with DOs containing specific/definite possessors: 1 specific indef., 7 def., out of which:

- 1 with a possessor that would require DOM in object position:

*They called **John's father**, but he didn't answer*

- 3 with clear or possible (epistemic or scopal) non-specificity ('attributive reading')

e.g. *They still didn't find **the perpetrators of the robbery***

*In such occasions, you should also inform **the director of the institution***

- 3 with specific DOs (and possessors that do not require DOM in object position)

e.g. *They also invited **the president's wife***

c) 4 items with weak definites as DOs

e.g. *We cannot fix it ourselves, we have to call **the plumber**.*

d) 4 items with other DOs that may exhibit an attributive reading (3 unmodified, 1 with a relative clause)

e.g. *We should inform **the manager**.*

e) 4 items with anaphoric definites as DOs

e.g. *Among the guests, there was a politician and several journalists. I asked **the politician** if he supported the tax increase proposals.*

f) 4 items with unmodified familiar definites as DOs

e.g. *I left **the children** at home.*

g) 4 items with generic definites as DOs

e.g. *I came to hate **taxi drivers**.*

**Total:** 32 experimental items

The experimental items were evenly distributed across 2 lists in such a way that each item only appeared in one of the lists. The two lists thus contained 16 experimental items each.

### 3.1.2 Fillers

- 9 fillers were added to each list, probing mainly for the way in which DPs with various degrees of accessibility in the context being resumed in continuation sentences get translated by the Romanian respondents. In the Romanian translations, one would expect either explicit pronouns or null pronouns to be resorted to:

e.g. *However, I could not agree with their views on Vianu. He did not make so many compromises.*

e.g. I met **George** at the party. **He** told me about the dispute between James and Gregory.

- The lists were formatted as Google forms in such a way that the respondents could only see one item at a time.

### 3.1.3 Participants

- 53 (24 + 29) native speakers of Romanian, students of the University of Bucharest, participated in the experiment for course credit.
- The respondents had to provide a translation for each of the items enclosed in the lists
- Each respondent could only fill in one of the lists

### 3.1.4 Analysis and annotation

- For each translated item we annotated the use of DOM on the DO employed in the translation, or the lack thereof.
- In some translated sentences, the respondents did not use a Romanian DO variant for the English DO correspondent but resorted to other syntactic solutions (e.g., indirect objects, prepositional objects, omissions, passivizations etc.). We included these renditions into the category ‘other’
- We calculated percentages only with respect to the total number of translations that used a DO

Code	Item	Features	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15
TP2	Nobody likes anything these days.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T4.2	First of all, ask the driver!	attr. Def.	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM
T1.14	In such occasions, you should also inform the director of the institution.	def. poss.	withDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM
T5.6f	What are you waiting for, invite the girl to dinner!	fam. def.	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM
TP3	The author of this piece must be an accomplished artist.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T1.21	He did not recognize the author of any song.	indef. poss.	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM
T5.2	I came to hate taxi drivers.	gen. def.	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM
TP2.a	They discovered the bones of another man in the yard. He had most likely died in the fire.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T2.1	We cannot fix it ourselves, we have to call the plumber.	weak def.	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM
T4.1	We should inform the manager.	attr. Def.	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM
TP1.a	However, I could not agree with their views on Vianu. He did not make so many compromises.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T3.1	They called John's father, but he didn't answer.	poss. DOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	other	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM
T6.1	Too many students don't respect teachers nowadays.	gen. def.	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM
T2.2	You shouldn't take this pill without asking the doctor.	weak def.	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM
TP4.b	I met George at the party. He told me about the dispute between James and Gregory.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T1.24	They still didn't find the perpetrators of the robbery.	def. poss.	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM
T1.11	He should ask the coach of a basketball team.	indef. poss.	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	other	withDOM
TP6.b	The patients were satisfied. It had been long since they had such a good meal.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T3.2	They summoned the boy's parents to a meeting on Monday.	poss. DOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	other	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM
TP5.b	Gabriel was also there. He had a lot of books on display.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T5.1a	Among the guests, there was a politician and several journalists. I asked the politician anaph.	anaph. def.	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM	withDOM
T5.2f	I left the children at home.	fam. def.	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM
TP1	His friends, he always helps.	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
T5.2a	They discussed some of Cărtărescu's novel. They compared the author to some Soviet anaph.	anaph. def.	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	noDOM	withDOM	noDOM	withDOM	other	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM	noDOM
TP1.a	Then they presented Schubert's piano sonatas. He had started writing in this genre a filler	filler	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f

## 3.2 Experiment 2: Acceptability of continuations

The main aim of Experiment 2 was to check the anaphoric potential of DOM-ed vs. non-DOMed definites, therefore we tested the acceptability of variants offered as continuations of a given sentence.

We also tested various types of non-anaphoric DOMs and DOs containing possessors that would/would not require DOM when occurring as DOs

### 3.2.1 Experimental items

Each experimental item included two parts: the first part set up the context and introduced a salient event or participant. The second part consisted of two possible ways, in which the context could be continued (in the experimental items and in some of the fillers, one continuation sentence featured a non-DOM-ed DO and the other, a DOM-ed DO).

- a) **8 experimental items:** the definite DP used in the continuation sentences was anaphoric, clearly referring back to a salient DP in the preceding sentence (see 11); the variants were DOM+CID and NO-DOM
- b) **16 experimental items:** the continuations had a DO that did not resume a referent of the first sentence; the variants were DOM+CID and NO-DOM; 4 items contained definite DOs with possessors, the other 11 contained other various types of definite DOs (familiar, with a likely attributive reading, associative anaphora etc.)

The respondents had to select the most appropriate of the two continuations. Consider a sample:

- (11) **Senatorul Fenechiu** a făcut mai multe propuneri legislative.  
Senator.the Fenechiu has made more many proposals legislative  
'Senator Fenechiu made several legislative proposals.'

Continuation:

- a) Jurnaliiștii l-au criticat **pe politician.**  
Journalists.the him.cl-have criticized DOM politician.  
'The journalists criticized the politician.'
- b) Jurnaliiștii au criticat **politicianul.**  
Journalists.the have criticized politician.the  
'The journalists criticized the politician.'

Task 1: Which of the two continuations is more suitable:

- a) Continuation a
- b) Continuation b
- c) Both continuations are suitable

Task 2: Do you think that any of the continuation sentences is impossible?

- a) Yes, continuation a is impossible
- b) Yes, continuation b is impossible
- c) Both continuation sentences are impossible

(12) Acolo e o mașină. Farurile sunt aprinse  
there is a car headlights-the are on

Continuation:

a) dar nu văd șoferul.  
but not see.1S driver.the  
'but I don't see the driver.'

b) dar nu îl văd pe șofer.  
but not him.cl see.1S DOM driver.the  
'but I don't see the driver.'

The 24 experimental items were evenly distributed across two lists in such a way that each item only appeared in one of the lists. Each list contained 12 experimental items.

### 3.2.2 Fillers

We employed 16 fillers built along the same pattern as the experimental items, with a context sentence and two possible continuations to choose from:

(13) N-am aflat nimic fiindcă Ana nu mi-a răspuns.  
Not-have.1 found out nothing because Ana not me.DAT-has answered  
'I didn't find out anything because Ana did give me an answer.'

Continuation:

a) Atunci, am sunat-o pe Maria.  
Then have.1 called-her.CL DOM Mary  
'I called Mary then.'

b) Atunci, am sunat pe Maria.  
Then have.1 called-her.CL DOM Mary  
'I called Mary then.'

The lists were randomized and formatted as Google forms in such a way that the respondents could only see one item at a time.

- Some fillers were clearly acceptable or clearly unacceptable (=> this allowed us to eliminate some respondents from our analysis)

- Some fillers tested other issues regarding DOM of definites (not discussed here): DPs with N-ellipsis



### 3.2.3 Participants

- 50 native speakers of Romanian (mostly students of the University of Bucharest) took part in the experiment for course credit.
- Each respondent was allowed to only fill in one of the two lists

### 3.2.4 Analysis and annotation

- For each experimental item we annotated the variants chosen as best continuations and also specified if the respondents had found any of the continuations to be impossible

Code	Type	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18
AF42	Filler	b	b	b (a imposib a)	(a imposib b)	b	b	b (a imposib b)	b	b	b	b (a imposib a)	(b imposib b)	b (ambele si b)	b	b	b	b	a si b
A2.5	non-anaphoric	b	a (b imposib a)	a si b	a si b	a (ambele in a)	b	a si b	a	a	a (b imposib a si b)	a	a si b	a	a	a	a	a	a (b imposib
AFE2	Filler	a (b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	a	(b imposib b)	(a imposib a)	a	a	a	a (b imposib a)	b (ambele si a)	a	a (b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib
AS.1	Poss obligatory DOM	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	b (a imposib a)	b	b	b	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	a si b	b	b	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib a)	(b imposib
AF-2	Filler	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b	b	b	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	b	b	b	b	b	(a imposib a)
AFE4	Filler	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib a)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib
A1.4	anaphoric	a (b imposib a)	a	a si b	a si b	a	a	b	a si b	a	a	a si b	a	a si b	a	a si b	a	a	(b imposib a)
AFE3	Filler	a (b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	a	a (b imposib a)	a	a	a (b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	a	a	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib
AFT1	Filler	a	a	a	a si b	a si b	a	b	a	b	a	a	a	b	a si b	b	b	a si b	b
AFE5	Filler	b (a imposib a)	b (a imposib b)	a	a	b (a imposib a)	b	b	a	a	b (a imposib a)	a si b	b	(a imposib a)	a si b	b	b (a imposib a)	(b imposib b)	(a imposib
A2.1	non-anaphoric	b	a	a	a	a (b imposib a)	a	a (b imposib b)	a	a	a si b	a (b imposib a)	a si b	a (b imposib a)	a si b	a	a	a	a
AFP1	Filler	a (b imposib b)	(a imposib a)	a si b	a si b	a	a	b	a	a	a si b	a (b imposib a)	b	a si b	a	a si b	a	a	(a imposib b)
A2.2	non-anaphoric	b	b	b	a si b	b	b	b (a imposib a)	b	b	b	b (a imposib a si b)	a	a si b	b	b	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib
AFE6	Filler	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib
AE.1	non-anaphoric	b	a	a	a si b	a	b	a	a	a	b (a imposib a si b)	a	a si b	a si b	b (a imposib a)	b	b (a imposib a)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib
AF-4	Filler	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)
A1.2	anaphoric	a (b imposib a)	a	a si b	a (b imposib a si b)	a (b imposib b)	a (b imposib b)	a	a	a	a (b imposib a si b)	b	a (b imposib a si b)	a (b imposib a si b)	a (b imposib a si b)	a (b imposib a si b)	a (b imposib a si b)	a (b imposib a si b)	a
AF41	Filler	a (b imposib a)	a	a si b	a	a si b	a	b	a (b imposib a)	a (b imposib a)	a (b imposib a)	(a imposib a si b)	a	a si b	a	a si b	a	a	(a imposib a)
AFE1	Filler	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib a)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib
A2.3	non-anaphoric	a (b imposib a)	a	a si b	a	a si b	a	b	a	a	a (b imposib a si b)	a	a si b	a si b	a	a si b	a	a	(a imposib a)
A1.3	anaphoric	a (b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	a si b	a	a	a (b imposib b)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	(b imposib a)
AFD1-	Filler	a (b imposib a si b)	a	a	a	a si b	a	b	b	a	b	a si b	a	a si b	a	a si b	a	a	(a imposib b)
AF-3	Filler	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib a)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	(a imposib
A2.6	non-anaphoric	b	a si b	b	a si b	a si b	a si b	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a si b	b	a si b	b	(a imposib a)
AF-1	Filler	a (b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib a)	(b imposib
A4.1	Poss no DOM	b (a imposib b)	(a imposib b)	b (a imposib a si b)	a si b	b	b	a (b imposib b)	b	b	b (a imposib a si b)	b	b (a imposib a si b)	b	a si b	a si b	b (a imposib a)	b	(a imposib

### 3.3 Experiment 3 – Acceptability (of a single sentence, without continuations)

This experiment probed for the acceptability of several experimental items including either a DOMed definite or its non-DOMed counterpart.

#### 3.3.1 Experimental items

The experimental items contained several types of definites: DPs with possessors (7 items), non-specific definites modified by a relative clause containing a subjunctive (4), non-specific indefinites modified by a relative clause containing a subjunctive (4), non-specific definite DO in the scope of a modal (1 item).

Each type of experimental item contained two variants: one containing a DOMed DP, another one featuring the non-DOM correspondent. Thus, the total number of experimental items was 34:

e.g.

- (14) a. Vom întreba părinții lui. (Poss. that would require DOM)  
 Will.we ask parents.the his  
 ‘We will ask his parents.’  
 b. Îi vom întreba pe părinții lui.  
 Them.cl will.we ask DOM parents.the his  
 ‘We will ask his parents.’

- (15) a. Nu am întâlnit încă politicianul care să fie  
 Not have.I met yet politician.the who SUBJ be  
 și cinstit și bogat. (Def Subj-Rel)  
 and honest and rich  
 ‘I haven’t yet met the politician who should be both honest and rich’
- b. Nu l-am întâlnit încă pe politicianul care să fie  
 Not him.cl-have.I met yet DOM politician.the who SUBJ be  
 și cinstit și bogat.  
 and honest and rich  
 ‘I haven’t yet met the politician who should be both honest and rich’
- (16) a. Nu am întâlnit încă un politician care să fie  
 Not have.I met yet a politician who SUBJ be  
 și cinstit și bogat. (Indef Subj-Rel)  
 and honest and rich  
 ‘I haven’t yet met a politician who should be both honest and rich’
- b. Nu l-am întâlnit încă pe un politician  
 Not him.cl-have.I met yet DOM a politician  
 care să fie și cinstit și bogat.  
 who SUBJ be and honest and rich  
 ‘I haven’t yet met a politician who should be both honest and rich’

Respondents had to assess the experimental items on a scale of 4 degrees of acceptability:

- a) Acceptable
- b) Almost acceptable
- c) Almost unacceptable
- d) Unacceptable

The experimental items were evenly distributed across 2 lists in such a way that each item only appeared in one of the lists. The two lists thus contained 16 experimental items each.

### 3.3.2 Fillers

To each list we added 20 fillers, divided into 5 unacceptable sentences, 5 acceptable sentences and 6 sentences of average acceptability + 4 tested for a different study: demonstratives in bridging + covariation contexts (4):

- (17) De câte ori văd un film bun, verific acel regizor pe internet. (Anaph. Dem)  
 Whenever see.I a film good, check.I that director on internet  
 ‘Whenever I watch a good movie, I check that director on the internet.’
- (18) De câte ori văd un film bun, îl verific pe acel regizor  
 Whenever see.I a film good, him.cl check.I DOM that director  
 pe internet. (Anaph. DOMed Dem)

on internet

‘Whenever I watch a good movie, I check that director on the internet.’

Ex. of unacceptable sentence as a filler:

- (19) Poezia aceasta i-am învățat-o deja pe copii.  
Poem.the this them.CL.DAT-have.I taught-it.CL.FEM already DOM children  
‘This poem, I have already taught it to him the children.’

### 3.3.3 Participants

- 40 Romanian native speakers took part in the experiment, mostly students of the University of Bucharest
- Each respondent could only fill one of the two lists
- The respondents could only see one item at a time

### 3.3.4 Analysis and annotation

We assigned acceptability scores ranging from 1 to 4, where 1 corresponded to the label *unacceptable*, 2 = almost unacceptable, 3= almost acceptable, 4 = acceptable

Id	Item	Type	DOM	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9
1	B3.1a'	Vom întreba și părinții lui.	Poss.	no	3	2	2	4	2	3	3	4
2	BF-2	N-am găsit-o încă pe persoana cea mai potrivită.	Filler	no	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	1
3	B1.4b	I-am invitat și pe frații lui Gheorghe.	Poss.	yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4	BF-3	Toate mamele din cartier și-au adus copiii la dentistul acesta pentru că este foarte bun.	Filler	no	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3
5	B4.4b	N-am găsit-o încă pe secretara care să știe Excel.	Nonspec def subj	yes	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	1
6	BF01	În anul următor, au cucerit Rouen-ul.	Filler	no	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	2
7	B2.2b	Am informat părinții băiatului despre ce s-a întâmplat.	Poss nu cere DOM	yes	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	2
8	BF-4	Filip este un utuc incurabil: întotdeauna își lasă lucrurile de undă apucă și apoi uită unde a pus-o.	Filler	no	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1
9	B3.2a	De câte ori văd un film bun, verific acel regișor pe internet.	Dem anaph	no	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
10	BF02	L-am făcut să-i dea profesorii note mari.	Filler	no	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1
11	B4.4c	N-am găsit încă o secretară care să știe Excel.	Nonspec indef subj	no	3	3	2	1	4	4	4	4
12	BF+1	Am întrebat fiecare participant ce șanse își atribuie.	Filler	no	3	1	3	3	4	2	4	4
13	B4.1d	N-am găsit-o încă pe o secretară care să facă și cafea bună și să știe și două limbi străine.	Nonspec indef subj	yes	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
14	B3.2b	De câte ori văd un film bun, îl verific pe acel regișor pe internet.	Dem anaph	no	4	2	2	2	2	3	3	1
15	BF+2	Orice tânăr o duce pe prietena lui acasă la părinți înainte de a o cere în căsătorie.	Filler	no	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	1
16	B1.4a	Am invitat și frații lui Gheorghe.	Poss.	no	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	4
17	B4.3c	Încă mai caut pe un sofer care să mă ducă la Brașov sâmbătă.	Nonspec indef subj	yes	1	2	3	1	1	4	1	1
18	BF04	L-am făcut să-l laude toată lumea.	Filler	no	2	1	3	4	2	2	2	1
19	B1.5b	I-am informat pe părinții lui Ion despre ce s-a întâmplat.	Poss.	yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
20	BF-3	Poezia aceasta i-am învățat-o deja pe copii.	Filler	no	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1
21	B4.3b	Încă îl caut pe soferul care să mă ducă la Brașov sâmbătă.	Nonspec def subj	yes	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	4
22	BF03	L-am făcut să-l intereseze propunerile mele.	Filler	no	4	2	3	4	3	3	4	4
23	B1.5a	Am informat părinții lui Ion despre ce s-a întâmplat.	Poss.	no	4	2	4	4	2	2	3	4
24	BF02	În anul următor, au cucerit Rouen.	Filler	no	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4
25	B1.1b'	Îl vom întreba și pe părinții lui.	Poss.	yes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
26	B4.4c	N-am găsit încă pe o secretară care să știe Excel.	Nonspec indef subj	yes	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	1
27	BF01	L-am făcut să-i placă muzica.	Filler	no	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
28	B4.3a	Încă mai caut soferul care să mă ducă la Brașov sâmbătă.	Nonspec def subj	no	4	2	4	4	3	3	3	4
29	BF05	Încercarea ei de a-i plăcea de toată lumea a eșuat.	Filler	no	4	2	4	2	2	2	3	3
30	B4.3b	Încă mai caut un sofer care să mă ducă la Brașov sâmbătă.	Nonspec indef subj	no	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
31	BF-5	Ion l-a cerut Mariei câștig înșipoi, dar nu l-a dat.	Filler	no	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1
32	B4.4a	N-am găsit încă secretara care să știe Excel.	Nonspec def subj	no	4	1	3	1	3	3	3	4
33	BF06	Astfel, tânărul s-a deprimat să-l intereseze multe lucruri.	Filler	no	1	1	3	3	4	1	3	4
34	B2.2a	Am informat părinții băiatului despre ce s-a întâmplat.	Poss nu cere DOM	no	4	2	3	4	3	4	4	4
35	BF-1	Nu l-a invitat pe același profesor ca mine.	Filler	no	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1

## 4. DOM and presupposition of existence

### 4.1. A semantic requirement: from specificity to presupposition of existence

- Optional DOM has usually been correlated to specificity (Farkas 1987, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Tigău 2010)

- Various notions of specificity: scopal, epistemic, partitive (see Farkas 1994, 2002)
- For DOM with indefinites, the relevant notions appear to be *epistemic* and *partitive* specificity (see Cornilescu 2000, Tigău 2011, 2014, a.o.); scopal specificity obtains sometimes but may be a by-product of epistemic specificity
- Presupposition of existence may be the common feature of these two specificity flavors

N.B. Although definites normally introduce *iota* and thus carry a presupposition of existence (see e.g. Elbourne 2005, 2013, Schwarz 2009), there are instances of DPs that are at least formally definite but do not carry a presupposition of existence – see Coppock & Beaver’s (2012, 2015): ‘indeterminate definites’ – if P is instantiated, it is uniquely instantiated; but instantiation is not presupposed.

(N.B. for plural and mass terms, this requires the application of a MAX operator, otherwise the nominal property P will never have a singleton in its extension)

Giurgea (2023), Croitor & Giurgea (2023): presup. of existence is a necessary condition for DOM of definites:

(i) internal *same* and attributive *only* (Ro. *singur*) taking sentential scope, in which case they can fall in the scope of negation:

- (20) a. Nu au folosit(??-o pe) aceeași balerină pentru cele două roluri.  
 not have.3P used (3FS.ACC DOM) same ballerina for the two roles  
 ‘They didn’t use the same ballerina for the two roles’  
 b. Nu (\*îl) are (\*pe) singurul copil cu probleme.  
 not (3MS.ACC) has DOM only-the child with problems  
 ‘(S)he doesn’t have the only child with problems’ (= ‘(S)he’s not the only one to have a child with problems.’)

(ii) DPs with “relative” superlatives – known to have indefinite semantics (cf. Szabolcsi 1986, Heim 1999):

- (21) Cine (\*îl) are (\*pe) tatăl cel mai bogat?  
 who (3MS.ACC) has (DOM) father-the SUP COMP rich  
 ‘Who has the richest father?’

(iii) definites including possessors whose existence is not presupposed:

- (22) Ar mai trebui să- ??#(l) invităm și ??#(pe) directorul unui institut  
 would still must SUBJ-3MS.ACC invite.1P also DOM director-the a.GEN institute  
 de cercetare. (with a non-specific reading)  
 of research  
 ‘We should also invite the director of some research institute.’

(iv) Definites in the scope of intensional verbs such as ‘seek, look for’, ‘find’:

- (23) N-am găsit-(\*o) încă (\*pe) {cea mai potrivită persoană /  
 not-have.1 found(-3FS.ACC) yet (DOM) SUP<sub>DEF</sub>.FS COMP appropriate person(F) /

persoana cea mai potrivită}.  
 person-the SUP.FS COMP appropriate  
 ‘We haven’t found the most suitable person yet.’

Here the superlative is absolute, so the DP should be definite; but the existence of the entity only holds at worlds introduced in the VP headed by ‘find’, scoping below negation  
 See also definites with subjunctive relative clauses:

(24) N-am găsit-(\*o) încă \*(pe) persoana care să îndrăznească să  
 not-have.1 found(-3FS.ACC) yet (DOM) person-the who SBJV dares SBJV  
 i se opună.  
 him.DAT REFL opposes  
 ‘We still haven’t found the person who may dare to oppose him.’

(25) Nu \*(l-)am întâlnit încă \*(pe) politicianul care să fie și cinstit și bogat.  
 not 3MS.ACC-have.1 met yet DOM politician-the who SBJV be and honest and rich  
 ‘I haven’t met the politician who should be both honest and rich yet’ (Tigău 2010:(26))

(v) Weak definites → see section 5

## 4.2. The results of the experiments

### The acceptability experiment:

(26) N-am găsit-o încă pe persoana cea mai potrivită 2.02 (34%)  
 not-have.1 found-3FS.ACC yet DOM person-the SUP more suitable  
 ‘We haven’t found the most suitable person yet.’

This example is not good but still scores higher than some ungrammatical control examples:

- clitic doubling of a secondary accusative object: 5%
- number mismatch in an anaphoric pronoun: 9%,12%

Examples with subjunctive relative clauses:

- (27) a. N-am găsit-o încă pe secretara care să facă și cafea bună și  
 not-have.1 found-3FS.ACC yet DOM secretary-the who SUBJ does also coffee good and  
 să știe și două limbi străine.  
 SUBJ knows also two foreign languages  
 ‘We/I haven’t yet found the secretary who should make good coffee and also know  
 two foreign languages’
- b. Nu l-am întâlnit încă pe politicianul care să fie și cinstit și bogat.  
 ‘We/I haven’t yet found the politician who should be both honest and rich.’
- c. Încă îl caut pe șoferul care să mă ducă la Brașov sâmbătă.  
 ‘I’m still looking for the driver who should give me a ride to Brașov.’
- d. N-am găsit-o încă pe secretara care să știe Excel.  
 ‘We/I haven’t yet found the secretary who should know Excel.’

We also tested these examples without DOM and with indefinites +/-DOM ('We haven't yet found a secretary who should make good coffee and also know to foreign languages', etc.)

Table I: DPs with subjunctive relative clauses (acceptability)

	def+DOM(+CID)	def-DOM	indef+DOM-CID	indef+DOM+CID	indef-DOM
a	74%	84%	28%	22%	72%
b	68%	86%	40%	19%	82%
c	68%	84%	35%	21%	100%
d	48%	67%	21%	23%	81%
mean	<b>65%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>84%</b>

Possible reason for the higher acceptability of definites +DOM, as opposed to indefinites: definiteness here may trigger a type interpretation: 'that kind of secretary who...'; these kinds are taken to exist, even if in an ideal world; in any case, their existence is not in the scope of the negation. This may explain why definiteness sounds better if the property is remarkable – see (I)a,b as opposed to d

### The translation experiment

- We tested examples with indefinite possessors; in calculating the percentages we only consider examples where the translation used a direct object.

Table II: DPs with indefinite possessors

	non-specific possessor (intended)	+DOM (+,-CID)	-DOM
a	He should ask the coach of a basketball team.	8(38%)	13(62%)
b	He did not recognize the author of any song.	0 (0%)	19(100%)
c	We should also invite the director of some research institute.	17 (65%) (54%+CID,7%-CID)	9 (35%)
d	They interviewed the dean of some faculty.	13 (65%)(57%+CI,5%-)	7 (35%)
	total	42%	58%
	specific possessor (intended):		
e	They invited the wife of a well-known poet.	17 (57%)	13 (43%)

Here scopal specificity proved to be the most important – see (II)b.

Narrow scope wrt. a modal may explain the difference between (II)a and (II)d, but (II)c is unexpected.

There is however a contrast between these and similar examples with definite possessors:

Table III: DPs with definite possessors

		+DOM	-DOM
a	In such occasions, you should also inform the director of the institution.	11 (48%) (1:-CID)	12 (52%)
b	They still didn't find the perpetrators of the robbery.	10 (48%)	11 (52%)
c	We finally found the director of the institute.	18 (64%)	10 (36%)
d	She saw the manager of the company.	20 (80%)	5 (20%)
e	They summoned the boy's parents to a meeting on Monday.	17 (85%)	3 (15%)
f	They also invited the president's wife.	25 (89%) (1:-CID)	3 (11%)
	total	69%	31%

Here we see a significant contrast between (III)a-b and (III)c-f.

(III)a: the object tends to be read as scopally non-specific (narrow scope)

(III)b: the object is clearly epistemically non-specific

(III)c: more instances of -DOM than in (III)d-f possibly because the object in this example may be more easily interpreted as epistemically non-specific

### 4.3 Weak definites

'Weak definites' (Carlson and Sussman 2005) are new and non-unique/non-maximal, being semantically equivalent to narrow scope indefinites (they have variable reference in various environments, showing narrowest scope); they are arguments involved in prototypical activities => they are restricted to specific lexemes and specific selecting predicates and allow only a restricted number of modifiers (see Carlson and Sussman 2005, Carlson et al. 2006, 2013, Aguilar-Guevara & Zwarts 2010, Aguilar-Guevara 2014, Schwarz 2014, Krifka & Modarresi 2016, Brocher et al. 2020, Krifka 2021).

Giurgea (2023): weak definites disallow DOM (in the relevant interpretation of (28), each of the two persons called a different plumber and there is no plumber among the familiar entities in the context):

(28) Amândoi au chemat instalatorul / #l-au chemat pe instalator.  
 both have called plumber-the 3MS-have.3PL called DOM plumber  
 'They both called the plumber.'

The translation experiment:

Table IV: weak definites

		+DOM	-DOM
a	We cannot fix it ourselves, we have to call the plumber	0	19
b	You shouldn't take this pill without asking the doctor	5 (25%)	15 (75%)
c	Did they call the fire fighters?	5 (24%)	16 (76%)
d	I had to visit the dentist as I had a terrible toothache.	0	3
	total	<b>12%</b>	<b>88%</b>

(IV)b-c: maybe some informants conceived the example as about a specific doctor/a specific group of fire fighters

## 5. Other definites where DOM is dispreferred (in the translation experiment)

### 5.1. Particular epistemically non-specific definites

Table V:

		+DOM	-DOM
a	We should inform the manager.	8 (35%)	15 (65%)
b	First of all, ask the driver!	6 (25%)	18 (75%)
c	We will invite the politician who will get the highest score in the polls.	12 (41%) (38%+CID,3%-CID)	17 (59%)
d	She should have waited for the doctor.	6 (21%)	79(%)
	total	<b>30,5%</b>	<b>69,5%</b>

### 5.2. Generic definites

Table VI:

		+DOM	-DOM
a	Too many students don't respect teachers nowadays.	5 (24%)	16 (76%)
b	I came to hate taxi drivers.	1 (4%)	23 (96%)
c	All the democratic countries elect the president by universal vote.	1 (5%)	21 (95%)
d	This plate represents the Neanderthal man.	2 (7%)	26 (93%)
	total	<b>10%</b>	<b>90%</b>

Obs. For (VI)a and c, some informants chose a construction with the possessive dative, where DOM is independently ruled out (see section 1).

## 6. Anaphoric definites and +/- specific non-anaphoric definites

Croitor & Giurgea (2023), Giurgea (2023):

- DOM is strongly preferred with anaphoric definites:

- (29) a. Am întâlnit acolo un scriitor, un critic și alte persoane. L-am invitat  
 have.1 met there a writer a critic and other people 3MS.ACC-have.1 invited  
**pe (acel) scriitor** la cină / ? Am invitat **scriitorul (acela)/acel scriitor** la cină.  
 DOM that writer to dinner have.1 invited writer-the (that) that writer to dinner  
 'I met there a writer, a critic and other people. I asked the writer to dinner.'
- b. [Senatorul Fenechiu]; a făcut mai multe propuneri legislative. Jurnaliștii  
 senator-the Fenechiu has made several proposal legislative journalists-the  
 {I-au criticat **pe politician<sub>i</sub>** / ?? au criticat **politicianul<sub>i</sub>**.}  
 3MS.ACC-have criticized DOM politician have criticized politician-the  
 'Senator Fenechiu made several legislative proposals. The journalists criticized the politician.'

- When the context allows an epistemically non-specific reading, the unmarked version tends to receive this reading. Thus, (30)b is appropriate in a context where the only reason for inviting that person is him or her being the manager:

- (30) a. Îl vom invita pe director.  
 3MS.ACC will.1P invite DOM manager



b. Vom invita directorul.  
will.1P invite manager-the  
'We'll invite the manager.'

- But epistemically specific definites do sometimes allow absence of DOM:

(31) Am adus fata acasă.  
have.1 brought girl-the home  
'I brought the girl home.'

### The translation experiment

Table VII: anaphoric definites

	(unmodified definites)	+DOM	-DOM
a	Among the guests, there was a politician and several journalists. I asked the politician if he supported the tax increase proposals.	19 (83%)	4 (17%)
b	They discussed some of Cărtărescu's novel. They compared the author to some South American writers.	8 (44%)	10 (56%)
c	It was hard to find tickets at Eminem's concert, because many people appreciate and admire the singer, even though not necessarily his music.	13(65%)	7 (35%)
d	The first to come were Mary and her boyfriend. While I was leading the guests into the garden, I got a phone call from Alice.	7 (25%)	21 (75%)
	total	<b>54%</b>	<b>46%</b>
	total eliminating VII.d (maybe understood as non-anaphoric)	64%	36%

Table VIII: non-anaphoric familiar definites

	unmodified definites:	+DOM	-DOM
a	I left the children at home	6 (25%)	18 (75%)
b	What are you waiting for, invite the girl to dinner!	2 (10%)	19 (90%)
c	I brought the girl home	12 (41%)	18 (59%)
d	I'm still waiting for the guests	2 (8%)	24 (92%)
	total	<b>21%</b>	<b>79%</b>
	BUT: the definites with familiar possessors from tables II-III:		
e	She saw the manager of the company	80%	20%
f	They summoned the boy's parents to a meeting on Monday	85%	15%
g	They also invited the president's wife	89%	11%
	total e-g	<b>85%</b>	<b>15%</b>

## The acceptability experiment with continuations

Table IX: **anaphoric** definites – preferred continuation, impossible continuation

	+DOM	NO	both	*NO	*DOM
(a) Senatorul Fenechiu a făcut mai multe propuneri legislative. Jurnaliștii {l-au criticat pe politician/ au criticat politicianul} 'Senator Fenechiu made several legislative proposals. The journalist criticized the politician'	78%	4%	18%	28%	0%
(b) Simona Halep a fost audiată în ancheta referitoare la dopaj. Jurnaliștii {au așteptat-o îndelung pe sportivă/au așteptat îndelung sportiva} să dea declarații 'Simona Halep was cross-examined in the doping investigation. The journalist waited a long time for the sportswoman, to give her statements'	67%	7%	26%	32%	0%
(c) Jurnalista i-a luat un interviu lui Klaus Johannis. Între altele, l-a întrebat pe președinte ce părere are despre gestionarea fondurilor PNRR 'The journalist interviewed Klaus Johannis. Among other things, she asked the president what he thought about the management of the NRDP funds'	85%	0%	15%	24%	4%
(d) Șoferul mașinii și câțiva martori dădeau declarații presei. Apoi, polițiștii {l-au dus pe șofer/au dus șoferul} la secție 'The driver of the car and several witnesses were giving statements to the press. Then, the police took the driver to the station'	55%	4%	41%	12%	0%
(e) Câteva legi au fost propuse de un politician din opoziție. Jurnaliștii {l-au criticat pe politician/au criticat politicianul} pentru inițiativă 'Some laws were proposed by an opposition politician. The journalists criticized the politician for his initiative'	35%	3%	62%	11%	0%
(f) Va veni și Ed Sheeran la festival. Se vor vinde bine biletele, mulți {așteptau/îl așteptau pe} acest cântăreț. 'Ed Sheeran will also come to the festival. The tickets will sell well, many people were waiting for this singer'	45%	3%	52%	19%	0%
(g) L-am ascultat și eu pe Chomsky. Mulți {citesc / îl citesc pe} acest lingvist, dar puțini îl înțeleg. 'I also listened to Chomsky. Many read this linguist, but few understand him'	41,5%	17%	41,5%	30%	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Obs.:

- DOM in (IX)e may score lower because the definite object has an indefinite antecedent.
- In (IX)g DOM may score lower because the object of *read* is not actually animate, but refers to the production of a person

Table X: non-anaphoric definites – preferred continuation, impossible continuation

(i) <b>familiar, general human terms</b>	+DOM	NO	both	*NO	*DOM
(a) Ce mai aștepti, {Invită fata/Invit-o pe fată} la cină! 'What are you waiting for? Invite the girl to dinner'	26%	37%	37%	12%	0%
(b) Cred că în curând o să înceapă o furtună. {Cheamă copiii în casă/Cheamă-i pe copii} în casă 'I think a storm is about to break out. Call the children inside!'	33%	7%	59%	4%	0%
Total	30%	22%	48%	8%	0%
<b>(ii) unique/maximal in a restricted situation, based on shared knowledge (names of professions)</b>					
(c) De ce sunt atâția jurnaliști strânși la intrarea în palat? {Așteaptă președintele/Îl așteaptă pe președinte}, care va da o declarație 'Why are so many journalists gathered at the palace entrance? They are waiting for the President, who will make a statement'	66%	4%	30%	21%	0%
(d) De ce sunt echipe de televiziune în fața hotelului? {Îi așteaptă pe fotbaliști/Așteaptă fotbaliștii}, ca să le ia interviuri 'Why are there TV crews in front of the hotel? They are waiting for the football players to interview them.'	56%	0%	44%	12%	0%
(e) Ancheta în cazul de dopaj se extinde. {Îl vor chema și pe/Vor chema și} fostul antrenor la audieri 'The investigation into the doping case is expanding. They will also call the former coach to the hearings'	67%	7%	26%	29%	0%
Total	<b>63%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>33%</b>	21%	0%
Total clearly familiar	50%	11%	39%	16%	0%
<b>(iii) familiar, but the function is relevant (=&gt; possibly, narrow scope under a modal)</b>					
(f) Acesta e un caz grav, ce ține de securitatea națională. Trebuiau {să-l informeze pe președinte / să informeze președintele} 'This is a serious national security case. They should have informed the president'	48%	7%	44%	12%	0%

<b>(iv) unique in a restricted situation, but the function is relevant (possibly bridging)</b>					
(g) Văzând ce s-a întâmplat, {Putin i-a convocat pe generali / A convocat generalii} 'Seeing what happened, Putin summoned the generals'	24%	0%	76%	4%	0%
(h) Am stat până seara la căpătâiul bolnavului, la spital. {Am întrebat asistenta/Am întrebat-o pe asistentă} când îl mai pot vedea 'I stayed by the bedside of the sick man until evening, at the hospital. I asked the nurse when I could see him again'	21%	7%	72%	7%	0%
(j) Câte persoane poate duce nava asta? Nu știu, trebuie {să întrebăm căpitanul/ să-l întrebăm pe căpitan} ( <i>possibly familiar</i> ) 'How many people can this ship carry? I don't know, we must ask the captain.'	17%	7%	76%	11%	0%
<b>(v) most likely bridging (associative anaphora)</b>					
(i) Acolo e o mașină. Farurile sunt aprinse, {dar nu văd șoferul / dar nu-l văd pe șofer} 'There's a car over there. The headlights are on, but I can't see the driver' ( <i>clearly bridging</i> )	10%	14%	76%	0%	0%
<b>(vi) associative anaphora + covariation</b>					
(k) De câte ori aude o lucrare nouă, {caută autorul pe Wikipedia / îl caută pe autor pe Wikipedia} 'Whenever he hears a new work, he looks up the author on Wikipedia'	7%	28%	65%	4%	7%

## Conclusions

### - On anaphoric vs familiar definites:

- Anaphoric definites do show a preference for DOM, but only some speakers require DOM in this case (we found 22% in the acceptability experiment; 36% of the translations that used a direct object did not use DOM)
- The preference for DOM with anaphoric definites is more or less equal to the preference for DOM with new definites unique in a restricted situation, based on shared knowledge (see (X)(ii): 63% DOM); this preference seems to extend to cases where the familiar referent is a possessor inside the descriptive part of the object – see (VIII)e-g (85% DOM in the translation exp.).
- There are however unmodified familiar referents for which there is no preference for DOM – see *fata* 'the girl', *copiii* 'the children' in (X)(i): general human-denoting terms; the translation experiment (see (VIII)a-d) suggests even an opposite preference (79% NO-DOM in the translation exp.)

- '**Attributive definites**' – the speaker does not have a specific referent in mind, but any entity satisfying the description will do:

see (V)c:

(32) We will invite the politician who will get the highest score in the polls.

Ro.: (Îl) vom invita (pe) politicianul care va obține cel mai bun rezultat în sondaje.

DOM: 12 (41%), NO-DOM 17 (59%)

Although there is a preference for NO, there are enough examples with DOM, showing that epistemic specificity is not a condition for DOM.

The other examples in table V are likely to receive an attributive interpretation (without requiring it); we see a preference for NO-DOM (mean: 69,5%).

Likewise, (X)g-h, j (where the function is relevant: ‘Putin summoned the generals’, ‘I asked the nurse when could I see him (the patient)’, ‘We should ask the captain’) and the bridging examples (see especially (X)i: ‘The headlights are on, but I can’t see the driver’): the preference for DOM disappears, but there is no preference for NO-DOM either: most informants reported equal acceptability for both variants (around 75%)

A possible attributive reading, with narrow scope under a modal, explains the lower preference for DOM in (X)f compared to (X)c.

- Attributive + covariation (clear scopal non-specificity): here, we see the highest preference for NO-DOM and also a few answers ruling out DOM, but the bulk of the answers goes for equal acceptability – see (X)k: 65% both.

## 7. DOM required with possessors that would require DOM in object position

Giurgea (2023): DOM required if the possessor is a personal pronoun or a proper name (see (33)a,c), but sometimes plural number seems to bring an improvement (see (33)d); moreover, indefinite pronouns, although they require DOM as objects, do not seem to impose DOM when used as possessors, see (33)b.

(33) a. \*(Îl) vom întreba \*(pe) părinții {lui/ tăi/ lui Ion }.

3MP.ACC will.1PL ask DOM parents-the his/your/ GEN Ion

‘We’ll ask his/your/Ion’s parents.’

b. ?(Îi) vom întreba ?(pe) părinții fiecăruia.

(3MP.ACC) will.1P ask (DOM) parents-the every.MS.GEN

‘We’ll ask every one’s parents.’

Cf. \*(Îl) vom întreba \*(pe) {el / Ion / fiecare}.

3MS.ACC will.1P ask DOM him Ion every-one

c. Au invitat și profesoara (?? lui Ion).

have.3P invited also teacher-the GEN Ion

d. Am întrebat și {??colegul/ ? colegii} lui.

have.1 asked also colleague-the/colleagues-the his

‘I also asked his colleagues.’

## The translation experiment

Table XI: proper name possessors vs. other familiar possessors with common Ns:

		+DOM	-DOM
a	They called John's father, but he didn't answer.	<b>23(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>
b	They summoned the boy's parents to a meeting on Monday.	17 (85%)	3 (15%)
c	They also invited the president's wife.	25 (89%)	3 (11%)
d	She saw the manager of the company.	20 (80%)	5 (20%)
e	We finally found the director of the institute.	18 (64%)	10 (36%)

## The acceptability experiment

Table XII: personal pronoun possessors and proper name possessors

<b>(i) NO-DOM, Possessor=personal pronoun or proper name</b>	accept.	mean
(a) Vom întreba părinții lui. 'We'll ask his parents'	56%	<b>54%</b>
(b) Vom întreba și părinții lui. 'We'll ask his parents too'	67%	
(c) Am întrebat și colegii lui. 'I also asked his colleagues'	51%	
(d) Am invitat și colegul lui. 'I also invited his colleague'	40%	
(e) Am invitat și frații lui Gheorghe. 'I also invited Gheorghe's brothers'	44%	
(f) Am informat părinții lui Ion despre ce s-a întâmplat. 'I informed Ion's parents about what happened'	67%	
<b>(ii) DOM, Possessor=personal pronoun or proper name</b>		<b>90%</b>
(a') Îi vom întreba pe părinții lui. 'We'll ask his parents'	86%	
(b') Îi vom întreba și pe părinții lui. 'We'll ask his parents too'	89%	
(c') I-am întrebat și pe colegii lui. 'I also asked his colleagues'	94%	
(d') L-am invitat și pe colegul lui. 'I also invited his colleague'	93%	
(e') I-am invitat și pe frații lui Gheorghe. 'I also invited Gheorghe's brothers'	97%	
(f') I-am informat pe părinții lui Ion despre ce s-a întâmplat. 'I informed Ion's parents about what happened'	89%	
<b>(iii) NO-DOM, Possessor=familiar human def. with common N</b>		
(g) Am informat părinții băiatului despre ce s-a întâmplat. 'I informed the boy's parents about what happened'	86%	<b>86%</b>
<b>(iv) NO-DOM, unmodified definite relational N</b>		
(h) Vom invita și părinții. 'We'll also invite the parents'	93%	<b>93%</b>
<b>(v) DOM, unmodified definite relational N</b>		
Îi vom invita și pe părinți. 'We'll also invite the parents'	86%	<b>86%</b>
Total NO-DOM in other semantically similar DPs: (iii)+(iv)		<b>89,3%</b>

Conclusion: DOM in (XII)(i) is felt as marginal (54% acceptability), not quite ungrammatical.

Control examples:

- clitic doubling of a secondary accusative object: 5%
- number mismatch in an anaphoric pronoun: 9%,12%
- DOM without presup. of existence (ex. (26) above): 34%

vs. other instances of NO-DOM – see (iii)-(iv): around 90% = acceptable (note that for 2 fillers clearly unproblematic, we got around 75% acceptability)

However, it is telling that no DOM occurred in the translation test (see (XI)a vs. b-e).

=> maybe there is a new rule requiring DOM with pronoun and proper name possessors, and because examples without DOM can still be found in older texts or are produced by conservative speakers, the examples are not felt as ungrammatical

## 8. General conclusions

DOM with human/animate DPs with overt common nouns ranges from compulsory to unacceptable, depending mostly on semantics, but not exclusively (see the possessors in §7).

- Definites lacking the presupposition of existence: DOM ruled out according to previous studies, but not always so in the experiments:
  - for definites in the scope of Neg or an intensional V: marginal according to the acceptability experiment; we tested 5 ex., 4 of which had a subjunctive relative (narrow scope under Neg or an intensional V); for such cases, maybe a type interpretation explains the acceptability of DOM, which is higher than for DOM-ed indefinites
  - definites containing non-specific indefinite possessors: the translation experiment produced quite a number of instances of DOM (42%); this may be due to accommodation of a presup. of existence
  - weak definites: very few ex. in the translation experiment (maybe due to misinterpretation of the context)
- Lack of epistemic specificity => no preference for DOM, but DOM is not ruled out (in the acceptability experiment, most results gave both variants as equally acceptable – around 70%; in the translation experiment, NO-DOM predominates at 69,5%)
- DOM is preferred for anaphoric and familiar definites, for some speakers it is even obligatory; but in the case of non-anaphoric familiar definites, there are situations for which DOM is not preferred: with general human-denoting nouns (*fata* ‘the girl’, *copiii* ‘the children’), see also *oaspeții* ‘the guests’ in the translation exp. ((VII).d)
- DOM is also preferred if the DP contains a familiar possessor
- If the possessor is a pronoun or proper name (i.e., DPs that require DOM in object position): DOM marginal in the acceptability experiment and not produced in the translation experiment (=> maybe there is a new rule that bans DOM in this environment)

## References

- Aguilar-Guevara, Ana, 2014, *Weak definites: Semantics, lexicon and pragmatics*, PhD diss., Utrecht.
- Brocher, Andreas, Frederike Weeber, Jet Hoek, and Klaus von Heusinger. 2020. Referent Management in Discourse: The Accessibility of Weak Definites. *CogSci*. 2829-2835.

- Carlson, Gregory & Rachel Sussman, 2005, “Seemingly indefinite definites”, in Stephan Kepser & Marga Reis (eds.), *Linguistic Evidence*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 26-30.
- Carlson, G., Sussman, R., Klein, N., & Tanenhaus, M. 2006. Weak definite noun phrases. In A. Davis & Y. Zabal (Eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 36*, 179–196. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Coppock, Elizabeth & David Beaver. 2012. Weak uniqueness: The only difference between definites and indefinites. In A. Chereches (ed.), *Proceedings of SALT 22*, 527–544. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Coppock, Elizabeth & David Beaver. 2015. Definiteness and determinacy. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 38:377-435.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra, 2000, “Notes on the Interpretation of the Prepositional Accusative in Romanian”, *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2 (1), 91–106.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra & Alina Tigău, 2022, “On the Syntax of Romanian DOM”, in Isabela Nedelcu, Irina Paraschiv, Andra Vasilescu (eds.), *Actele celui de-al XXI-lea Colocviu Internațional al Departamentului de Lingvistică*, Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 53–70.
- Croitor, Blanca & Ion Giurgea. 2023. On the differential marking of definite objects in Romanian. In Adina Dragomirescu, Carmen Mârzea, Cristian Moroianu, Isabela Nedelcu, Andra Vasilescu (eds.), *Rodica Zafiu: lingvistica, profesora, colega, prietena*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 271-292.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1987. *Syntaxe du roumain. Chaînes thématiques*. PhD dissertation, Université de Paris 7.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, 1994, *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Elbourne, Paul, 2005, *Situations and Individuals*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Elbourne, Paul, 2013, *Definite descriptions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farkas, Donka. 1987. Direct and indirect object reduplication in Romanian. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 14, 88-97.
- Farkas, Donka. 1994. Specificity and scope. In L. Nash & G. Tsoulas (eds), *Langues et Grammaires* 1, 119–137.
- Farkas, Donka, 2002, “Specificity distinctions”, *Journal of Semantics* 19, 1–31.
- Giurgea, Ion. 2010. *Pronoms, Déterminants et Ellipse Nominale. Une approche minimaliste*. Bucharest: EUB.
- Giurgea, Ion, 2022, “Definite article drop after prepositions in Romanian, a reassessment”, in G. Alboiu, D. Isac, A. Nicolae, M. Tănase-Dogaru, A. Tigău (eds.), *A Life in Linguistics: A Festschrift for Alexandra Cornilescu on her 75<sup>th</sup> birthday*, Bucharest, EUB, 309–330.
- Giurgea, Ion. 2023. On DOM of definites in Romanian. Paper presented at the 24th Annual International Conference of the English Department (AICED), University of Bucharest, June 9-10.
- Giurgea, Ion and Rodica Ivan. 2023. On the internal structure of pronouns, from the perspective of noun ellipsis. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, no. 4.
- Heim, Irene, 1999, “Notes on Superlatives”, ms. MIT.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Alina Tigău. 2019. Clitic-doubling and differential object marking in non-specific contexts in Romanian. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 64/4, 409-430.
- Hill, Virginia & Liliane Tasmowski. 2008. Romanian Clitic Doubling: A view from pragmatics-semantics and diachrony. In D: Kallulli, L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitics in the Balkan Languages*, 135-163. John Benjamins.
- Irimia, Monica, 2020a, “Variation in differential object marking : On some differences between Spanish and Romanian”, *Open Linguistics* 6: 424–462, <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2020-0110>
- Irimia, Monica, 2020b, “Types of structural objects”, in András Bárány and Laura Kalin (eds.), *Case, Agreement, and their Interactions. New Perspectives on Differential Argument Marking*, Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 77–126.



- Irimia, Monica, 2023, “Oblique DOM and co-occurrence restrictions: How many types?”, in B. Bullock, C. Russi & A. Toribio (eds.), *A half century of Romance linguistics: Selected proceedings of the 50th LSRL*, Berlin: Language Science Press, 157–180. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7525106
- Krifka, Manfred & Fereshteh Modarresi, 2016, Number neutrality and anaphoric update of pseudo-incorporated nominals in Persian (and weak definites in English), *Proceedings of SALT 26*, 874–891.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2021. Weak definites and their anaphoric potential. Paper presented at the Zürich Center of Linguistics: <https://www.linguistik.uzh.ch/en/forschung/idaroe/Unterseite.html>
- Pană-Dindelegan, Gabriela, 2013, “The structure of root clauses: 3.2. The direct object”, in Gabriela Pană-Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwarz, Florian, 2009, *Two types of definites in natural language*, PhD diss., Univ. of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Schwarz, Florian, 2014, “How weak and how definite are weak indefinites?”, in Ana Aguilar-Guevara, Bert Le Bruyn & Joost Zwarts (eds.), *Weak Referentiality*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 213–235.
- Szabolcsi, Anna, 1986, “Comparative superlatives”, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 8, 245–266.
- Tigău, Alina, 2010. Towards an account of differential object marking in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 12(1):137–158.
- Tigău, Alina, 2011, *Syntax and Interpretation of the Direct Object in Romance and Germanic Languages with an Emphasis on Romanian, German, Dutch and English*, Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Tigău, Alina, 2014. Specificity effects with clitic doubling and pe marking. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 16(1), 43-61.
- Tigău, Alina, 2020, *Experimental Insights into the Syntax of Romanian Ditransitives*. De Gruyter Mouton.