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This work follows the progression of a grammatical construction that unifies the Romanian accusative preposition pe with a coreferential pronominal clitic, together forming the cd-pe construction. On the basis of historical texts, it is argued that these two grammatical phenomena evolved into a clause-level construction with a dedicated semantics and pragmatics in the modern language. A corpus analysis illustrates how cd-pe won out against a competitor pe-only construction that persisted until as recently as the early 20th century, and which is still retained in some dialects and registers. The broader scope is to refocus the discussion of clitic doubling on pragmatic motivators in light of diachronic constructionalization processes, and to reflect on the nature of similar clitic doubling phenomena evident in other Romance languages in terms of the entrenchment of language-specific constructionalization processes.
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1. Introduction

In several Western Romance languages (e.g. Spanish, Catalan), Semitic languages, and the Balkan Sprachbund languages (Bulgarian, Greek, Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian, Albanian, Eastern Romance, and others), the direct object of a simple transitive clause can be doubled by a pronominal clitic attaching to the verb, as illustrated by the following sentences:

1. Abbreviations acc: accusative; art: article (definite or indefinite); cd: clitic doubling; cl: pronominal clitic; def: definite nominal suffix; dom: differential object marking; fem: feminine; gen: genitive; masc: masculine; pl: plural; pro: full pronoun; refl: reflexive pronoun; sg: singular. (A note regarding masc: throughout, this gloss identifies nouns that are either masculine
(1) Romanian
   a. Președintele a convocat toți delegații.
      president.def has assembled all delegate.pl.def
   b. Președintele îl-a convocat pe toți delegații,
      president.def cl.3pl.masc has assembled dom all delegate.pl.def
      ‘The president assembled all the delegates.’

(2) Standard Catalan
A ell no el vull.
   DOM him not cl.3sg.masc want
   ‘Him, I don’t want.’  (Vallduvi 1993: 94; Escandell-Vidal 2009)

(3) Albanian
   a. Ana lexoi librin.
      Ana read book.def
      ‘Ana read the book.’
   b. Ana e lexoi librin.
      Ana cl.3sg.masc read book.def
      ‘Ana read the book.’  (Kallulli 2008: 230)

In Romanian, a prepositional accusative pe differentially marks the direct object while a pronominal clitic coreferential with the instantiated noun phrase simultaneously attaches to the verb, a syntactic phenomenon commonly known as clitic doubling (hereafter cd). A differential object marker (hereafter dom) is available in Romanian, Spanish and Catalan, (pe for Romanian, a for Spanish and Catalan), whereas in Albanian and other Balkan Sprachbund languages no dom is present. This study proposes that dom combined with clitic doubling should be analyzed as a single clause-level construction in Modern Romanian, which for current expository purposes will be called cd-pe. Further, there exist generalizations that can extend to other languages exhibiting this construction as opposed to languages exhibiting only cd. This composite construction brings its own pragmatic

2. A sister study (David 2014) focuses on the cross-linguistic comparison of the composite dom+cd construction in two of the languages that possess it, Romanian and Spanish. That comparative study illustrates that Romanian developed a pragmatic clause-level construction while Spanish did not, retaining instead the dom-only version. This is due in large part to (a) the differences in the prototypical prepositional semantics of the dom-markers, pe and a, and (b) the more dominant presence of clitic doubling in Romanian (by virtue of its membership in the Balkan Sprachbund) than in Spanish. While a dom+cd construction does exist in Spanish, it is restricted to pronouns and proper nouns (and only in some dialects), and exhibits no emergent pragmatic function (of the kind explored in the current work).
contribution to the clause independent of, yet semantically inheriting from, its component parts. This view of \textit{cd-pe} as a single construction differs from standard existing syntactic accounts of \textit{DOM} and \textit{CD}, and is based on our current observation that the two component constructions are licensed under similar discourse-contextual conditions and possess semantic commonalities, while \textit{cd-pe} itself has clear pragmatic triggers unique to it. The corpus data in this study help paint a diachronic picture that reveals several waves of entrenchment leading up to the formation of \textit{cd-pe}, whereby semantically radial constructional categories give rise to new categorial extensions in the constructional category network. Each extension in the network becomes part of the grammar of the speaker, residing alongside older entrenched forms. In this endeavor, I take the study of clitic doubling and differential object marking into the cognitive linguistics arena, and offer a construction grammar solution to the issue of both the synchronic status and diachronic development of syntactic phenomena that are usually treated as separately-licensed and cross-linguistically identical.

2. Existing syntactic accounts

Direct object clitic doubling\textsuperscript{3} refers to the co-occurrence in the same clausal domain of a pronominal clitic and the noun phrase with which it is coreferential. In some languages, the direct object noun is marked overtly by a prepositional accusative marker (\textit{DOM}). According to Bossong (1985, 1991, 1998), this preposition is the remnant of an eroded case system that now only differentially marks some direct objects. \textit{DOM} is more widespread on its own than clitic doubling, since it is applicable to subjects as well as to all types of objects. It also surfaces in languages that do not possess clitics (Bossong 1991; Lazard 1984).

Direct object cliticization has received much attention in the generative syntax and formal semantics literature (Anagnostopoulou 2006; Bleam 2000; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Jaeggli 1986; Suñer 1988; Torrego 1998). Some work has also been done from a semantic, functional or pragmatic perspective, as in Chiriacescu (2009), Chiriacescu & von Heusinger (2009), Gabriel & Rinke (2010), Hill & Tasmowski (2008), and Kapia (2012). Kayne (1975) first noted the constraint on clitic doubling that the direct object must be marked by a dummy preposition. The resulting generalization came to be known in the transformational syntax

\textsuperscript{3} There are other forms of clitic doubling, most notably indirect object clitic doubling (Bleam 2000; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). Throughout the current work, \textit{cd} refers exclusively to direct object clitic doubling; indirect object clitic doubling will not be discussed, as I believe it to constitute a wholly different construction.
literature as Kayne’s Generalization (KG), which states that clitic doubling can occur only if the direct object is marked. Not long after Kayne’s proposal, it became clear that this condition does not hold for most clitic doubling languages. Studies were produced focusing on Albanian and Greek (Anagnostopoulou 1999, 2006; Anagnostopoulou & Giannakidou 1995; Kallulli 2000, 2008) and Rioplatense Spanish (Suñer 1988; Estigarribia 2006), illustrating that prepositional marking on the direct object is not necessary (most notably see Suñer 1988). In these languages and their regional varieties, clitic pronouns and direct object arguments are both instantiated without the aid of a preposition.

There is also variety in the morphology of the marking, whether adpositionally unmarked (or inflectionally case-marked) as in Greek; adpositionally marked as in Spanish (with the preposition a) and Romanian (with the preposition pe); or not marked at all, as in Rioplatense Spanish and all Balkan Sprachbund languages other than Romanian. Object type is the most readily observable parameter of variation. Others include sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors alongside syntactic ones. The diversity observed in the range of nouns with which the construction can be used has been successfully analyzed using Optimality Theory (Aissen 2003), ranking constraints relating both referent traits (i.e. animacy, definiteness) and discourse-relevant traits (i.e. specificity, topicality). There has also been work documenting that language varieties exist in which CD and DOM are clearly allowed with inanimate referents (García García 2007; Roegiest 1979).

These works go far in accounting for the range of applicable environments for CD and DOM. However, the question still remains as to what semantic and pragmatic motivators there could be for these two structures to gravitate towards each other, and why they are used together obligatorily with some nouns and optionally with others. Of all languages that have DOM (over 300, according to Bossson 1991), and of all languages that have some form of object doubling, only a handful intersect in having both doubling and object marking (in short, those which inspired Kayne’s Generalization). The patterns by which these come to function together in any given language should be probed for semantic and pragmatic motivations for such a convergence. The current exposition will do so for at least one such language. By providing semantic and pragmatic support, I will aim to illuminate the reasons Aissen’s ranking of constraints should arise as it did. Further, Aissen’s implicational entailment — that if a language allows a form at one point on the scale, it will allow all forms higher but disallow all forms lower relative to that point in the scale — is a valuable observation, and fully compatible with a constructional account: the licensing of one noun type at the expense of another is accounted for by the differentiation between the more central and more peripheral constructions in the constructional network.
3. Construction Grammar and constructionalization

**cd-pe** is analyzed using a constructional approach to grammar (CxG) using the framework laid out in Fried (2004, 2009) and Fried & Östman (2004, 2005), among others. The constructional approach is fruitful in tackling **cd/dom** phenomena for several reasons. First, the broad yet predictable cross-linguistic (as well as diachronic intralinguistic) diversity can be explained by the semantic regularities that analogous structures share in these languages and language varieties. Second, it is an explicit goal of CxG and cognitive linguistics in general to interpret these regularities in terms of pragmatic and social dimensions, dimensions which have proven central to the meaning of clitics, clitic doubling, and clitic dislocation phenomena. Third, the non-modular, usage-based nature of CxG is particularly amenable to addressing historic and geographic variation, in which cognate forms frequently perform deceptively similar yet fundamentally different functions. By tracking the appearance of the **cd/dom** construction in Romanian as observed in literary works across three broad time periods, I suggest that it has come to be established in its present form over several hundred years, arising out of the merging of two semantically related constructions: the canonical pronominal construction (hereafter the **cpc**) and the construction for (non-doubling) differential object marking of human direct objects (hereafter, the **pe**-only or **dom** construction).

**cd-pe** is presented here as one example of *constructionalization* (Bybee 2003; Fried 2013; Noël 2007), an extension of grammaticalization theory (GT) and CxG that focuses on diachronic change in grammatical constructions. GT is concerned with a distinction between lexical and grammatical content (more precisely, the direction of semantic change from the former towards the latter), while in CxG all form-meaning pairings, including lexical ones, are considered constructions. Constructionalization tends to refer to the changes happening at the more schematic, non-lexical and more pragmatic end of the constructional spectrum (see Noël 2007 for a thorough overview of the similarities and differences between CxG and GT views on the diachronic change of constructions).

Here, the term constructionalization is used to capture the change in multi-word material that is complex and schematic, and that is positioned in different slots across a clause. Specifically, it constitutes a diachronic application of the analytic instruments of CxG (as also seen in Fried 2009 and Noël 2008), which follows the emergence of **cd-pe** as a complex pragmatic construction from the constructionally independent components constituting it: namely, the canonical pronominal construction, **cpc**, and differential object marking, **dom**. The analysis in Section 7 explores how these were compatible with each other by being grounded in the same scenario of high accessibility, and how, once formed, the spreading of **cd-pe** to increasingly less accessible NPs coincides with its entrenchment.
as a construction that is distinct from CPC and DOM (although all three are still presently used). Independently, CPC has deictic and referential functions, while DOM serves referential purposes limited to a particular subset of referents (namely, human ones). However, when CPC and DOM are used together, the wholistic constructional meaning can be pragmatic in nature: it serves to strengthen the speaker’s involvement (as pointed out more generally of pragmatic constructions in Traugott & König 1991: 191). CPC and DOM are shown in the current work to come together over the course of three hundred years of linguistic change, during which an intermediate information-structural fronting construction paved the way for the unification of CPC and DOM-marked NPs into a uniclausal configuration (whereas before, only one or the other would occur in a given clause). By the end of the formation of CD-pe as we know it today, layers of entrenchment led to two distinct types of environments in which the construction is still found in the language: environments in which it is obligatory, namely with highly accessible NPs (pronouns and deictics), and those in which it is optional, namely with less accessible NPs. It is in this latter type of environment that CD-pe can be said to be a truly pragmatic construction, while the former type of environment is a historical by-product resulting from the common semantics of CPC and DOM, and is a remnant of earlier stages of linguistic fluctuation. In all environments, the pronominal clitics that are otherwise normally used referentially and deictically in the still-extant CPC construction underwent semantic bleaching as part of the constructionalization process, since they no longer have referential properties when occurring in the pragmatic CD-pe construction. In this sense, doubling clitics grammaticalized into constructionally-relevant pragmatic markers of speaker involvement.

Also, as explored in depth in Section 7, the way in which pe came about as a differential object marker represents pe’s grammaticalization as a proper preposition (from a usage of prepositions where the prepositional object was prototypically animate) into a grammatical marker of animacy, this grammaticalization process preceded the eventual formation of CD-pe, and is instrumental to it. When not functioning as DOM, pe is still used as a regular preposition meaning ‘on’. Overall, pronominal clitics and the DOM preposition pe grammaticalized into non-referential (clitics) and non-prepositional markers of high transitivity (pe), respectively, during the developmental stage of the constructionalization of the CD-pe construction. Their grammaticalization occurred before CD-pe became a pragmatic construction, but while it was undergoing a fluctuating stage of co-occurrence with existing pe-only and non-pe-marked variants over the course of the 1700s and early 1800s (as the data in Section 6.3 will show). Grammaticalization is thus seen in the way that pronominal clitics and the preposition pe have come to lose their semantically contentful meanings only while part of the CD-pe construction,
but these retain their regular semantics when used as part of their regular referential/deictic and prepositional functions.

4. **CD and DOM in Romanian**

Romanian is considered to be a member of the Balkan Sprachbund linguistic group, one that is characterized by shared traits owed to language contact that is sustained over an extended period (Rosetti 1986; Sandfeld 1930; Tomic 2006), clitic doubling constituting only one of many common features. Romanian has always been assumed to share the clitic doubling parameter with languages such as Bulgarian, Greek, Albanian, and Eastern Romance varieties (e.g. Aromanian), as well as with its genetic affiliates in the Western Romance family, Spanish and Catalan. As with all Sprachbund traits, CD’s origins in a particular language at a particular time cannot be pinpointed; thus the generally-accepted explanation for linguistic diffusion throughout the linguistic area tends not to attribute particular traits to any particular source language or region. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that clitic doubling in Romanian operates more along the lines of other Romance languages, and less like Balkan languages, as the data here also aim to show.

The CD merger with DOM in Romanian is attributed to a development pattern that resulted in the unification and entrenchment of the two semantically comparable phenomena into a single construction. In taking a unified approach, I will propose that rather than being a syntactic rule, operation, or phrasal category, cd-pe should be interpreted as an emergent clause-level construction, in the sense that the construction places *simultaneous* constraints on inputs at several constituent positions within the clause (Lambrecht & Lemoine 2005; Michaelis 2003). It can only occur in languages that happen to have had both CD and DOM at some point in their past, independently. I propose that the CD-Pe construction is prototypically employed in clauses involving direct objects with human referents, but can be extended to those containing non-human referents, as the constructional polysemy branches out. Unlike other Balkan languages, Romanian does not have a clitic doubling construction independent of the pe-marking construction, although pe-marked direct objects without CD are found. Preposition-less CD constructions

---

4. In Istroromanian there is no marking on the object, as is the case in other Balkan Sprachbund languages, but doubling can occur optionally:

   (i) Io voi (vo) putę vedę Lara.
   I will (cl.3sg.fem) can see Lara
   ‘I’ll be able to see Lara.’ (from Zegrean 2012: 119)

A historical note is in order. According to several competing hypotheses, it is believed that Istroromanian broke off from Daco-Romanian sometime between the 8th century and 13th
have some very early attestations in Romanian, but even then these were few, and there was free variation with the *pe*-variant, e.g. sentence (9) below.

\textbf{CD} in Romanian can co-occur with a vast range of direct object noun phrases, making Romanian one of the languages for which \textbf{CD} is licensed across a broad variety of verbal complements. When the direct object is a pronoun, a bare noun, a proper noun, a bare demonstrative, a partitive pronoun, a bare superlative, or a bare quantifier, the \textbf{CD-\textit{pe}} construction is mandatory, and there is no variant available without \textbf{CD-\textit{pe}}:

(4) Pronouns

a. \textit{Preşedintele *(-)a salutat *(pe)\textsuperscript{5} mine.}
   president.def (cl.1sg-) has greeted (dom) me.acc
   ‘The president greeted me.’

Bare nouns

b. \textit{Preşedintele *(l-)a salutat *(pe) delegat.}
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-) has greeted (dom) delegate
   ‘The president greeted the delegate.’

Proper nouns

c. \textit{Preşedintele *(l-)a salutat *(pe) Ion.}
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-) has greeted (dom) Ion
   ‘The president greeted Ion.’

Bare demonstratives

d. \textit{Preşedintele *(l-)a salutat *(pe) acela.\textsuperscript{6}}
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-) has greeted (dom) that one
   ‘The president greeted that one.’

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{5}Throughout, multiple elements in parentheses in the same sentence should be understood as being licensed or prohibited together.
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{6}It can occur with bare demonstratives even when the referents are inanimate. This has been noted for Balearic Catalan as well (Escandell-Vidal 2009: 878).

\textsuperscript{century. This time range represents a stage in the language when clitic doubling existed but no object marking was yet in place. This suggests that the pure clitic doubling construction may have existed in Proto-Romanian, but it is clear from the written record that once \textit{pe}-marking enters the language, unmarked doubling quickly disappears. Based on the blend of \textit{pe}- and non-\textit{pe}-marked forms evident in data such as that illustrated in sentence (9) later in this paper, I would conjecture that \textit{pe}-marking started sometime around or just before the start of the 16th century. Unfortunately, the earliest written document in Romanian is from 1521 (Neaşcu’s letter), a short letter that does not happen to contain any tokens of \textit{pe} or any instances of doubling. Thus, it would be impossible to state with certainty that Romanian had a Balkan type of unmarked doubling prior to 1521; however, it is likely that it did, given the status of other Balkan languages around that time, and given the shape of other contemporary Eastern Romance languages, such as Istroromanian.

5. Throughout, multiple elements in parentheses in the same sentence should be understood as being licensed or prohibited together.

6. It can occur with bare demonstratives even when the referents are inanimate. This has been noted for Balearic Catalan as well (Escandell-Vidal 2009: 878).
Partitive pronouns + adjectives
e. *Președintele *(l-)a salutat *(pe) cel înalt.
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) the one tall
   ‘The president greeted the tall one.’

Bare superlatives
f. *Președintele *(l-)a salutat *(pe) cel mai înalt.
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) the one tallest
   ‘The president greeted the tallest one.’

Bare quantifiers
g. *Președintele *(l-)a salutat *(pe) fiecare.
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) each of them
   ‘The president greeted each of them.’

With these types of direct objects, cd-pe is mandatory. Consequently, cd-pe in these cases does not provide the speaker with the option of varying the pragmatic force of their utterance in response to information-structural and discourse factors. On the other hand, when the direct object is a modified definite noun, an indefinite noun, a demonstrative NP, a superlative NP, or a quantified NP, the speaker has a choice between a cd-pe and a non-cd-pe variant for the same sentence, with differing pragmatic implications:

(5) Modified definites
   a. *Președintele (l-)a salutat (pe) delegatul înalt.
      president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) delegate.def tall
      ‘The president greeted the tall delegate.’
   b. *Președintele (l-)a salutat (pe) un delegat înalt.
      president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) a delegate.def tall
      ‘The president greeted a tall delegate.’

7. In the most detailed diachronic study of object marking in Romanian, von Heusinger & Onea-Găspăr (2008) focus on the variation between +cd+dom and -cd+dom, arguing that the fluctuation in frequencies of clitic doubling constructions as an alternate to the cd-less default ones over the past three centuries, with a surge in -cd+dom between the 19th and 20th centuries, is due to “an overlapping effect between clitic doubling and dom of indefinite NPs” leading to “a semantic re-interpretation, resulting in a fine-structured specificity scale linked to the combination possibilities of clitic doubling and dom (2008:70).” They conclude that the alternation was spurred in favor of clitic doubling constructions by an enriched specificity scale for indefinites, and this preference for cd spread to other NP types. The current proposal is compatible with and builds on this view: pe-only establishes a finer-grained distinction, in terms of referential accessibility with which it can occur, while cd-pe, once entrenched, picks out only the most highly accessible noun interpretations. When combined with indefinite NPs, this results in a specific interpretation.
Demonstrative nouns
c.  **Președintele** (l-)a salutat (pe) acel delegat.  
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) that delegate.def  
   ‘The president greeted that delegate.’

Superlative NPs
d.  **Președintele** (l-)a salutat (pe) cel mai înalt delegat.  
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) the one tallest delegate  
   ‘The president greeted the tallest delegate.’

Quantified NPs
e.  **Președintele** (l-)a salutat (pe) fiecare delegat.  
   president.def (cl.3sg.masc-)has greeted (dom) each delegate  
   ‘The president greeted each (of the) delegate(s).’

The range of direct objects for which **cd-pe** has a possible non-**cd-pe** alternative and the range with which **cd-pe** is obligatory is illustrated in the constructional network I provide in Section 7, Figure 2. The two sets of data in (4) and (5) show that **cd-pe** is established as obligatory with some direct objects and optional with others. When optional, speakers have a choice, and choosing **cd-pe** over the relatively simpler clause indexes the presence of conversationally and textually dependent pragmatic factors.

5. **The pragmatics of cd-pe: Prominence**

The questions to be considered in this section are as follows: why should clitic doubling and differential object marking appear so consistently in the same utterance? Further, why should they both be obligatory with direct objects of some types and optional with others? And finally, among those direct objects with which **cd-pe** is optional, what governs the choice of **cd-pe** and non-**cd-pe** variants? The current section is dedicated to addressing these questions in light of existing semantic approaches to **cd** and **dom**.

As observed by Aissen (2003), there exists great diversity in the types of nouns that can become the direct objects of **cd**, **dom**, or **cd/dom** clauses. This diversity is governed by one or several semantic hierarchies and scales, collectively referred to in the literature as the *prominence scales*. The tradition of looking at animacy and definiteness scales in order to make sense of argument selection and argument linking reaches beyond studies of **cd** and **dom**, having roots in the study of alignment systems (Dixon 1994; Silverstein 1976). It is well known, for instance, that across languages clitic doubling historically tends to spread along the definiteness scale (Aissen 2003; Leonetti 2008; von Heusinger & Kaiser 2005).
(6) Personal pronouns > proper names > definite NPs > indefinite specific NPs > indefinite non-specific NPs (Aissen 2003: 437)

This scale is used for tracking the referentiality of a direct object, representing the degree to which a referent is identifiable over the course of discourse (Anagnostopoulou 1999). The specialized notion of specificity is also frequently called into play when the direct object is an indefinite NP. The literature treats specificity as the givenness of nouns in discourse when those nouns are morphologically indefinite, while referentiality as the givenness of nouns in discourse when those nouns are morphologically definite (this conceptual distinction is mostly observed in Leonetti (2008) and von Heusinger (2002)). In this sense, pronouns, which figure quite high along the definiteness scale, are highly referential, and by definition their clitic counterparts are as well.

The animacy scale is also of central importance: because cross-linguistically, clitic doubling tends to apply mostly to animate or human nouns (Bossong 1991; Comrie 1980; Hall & Clair-Sobell 1955; Jaeggli 1982). In Romanian, as opposed to those dialects of Spanish that most closely approximate the Romanian pattern, there is a stricter (albeit not absolute) constraint against the use of CD-pe with non-human direct objects.

The scales discussed thus far rank nouns along a continuum based on an inherent lexical property of the noun. However, there are also discourse-level and pragmatic constraints proposed for CD and DOM. Topicality (Kalluli 2008), referential anchoring (von Heusinger 2002), referential persistence (Chiriachescu & von Heusinger 2009), and the accessibility of antecedents (Ariel 1988 and later) are the principal discourse phenomena that are found to correlate with CD-pe usage. Of these, referential persistence most persuasively captures the pragmatic nature of CD-pe; it refers to how often a referent is mentioned in the subsequent discourse once the appropriate high-referentiality marking has applied on an introduced noun. For example, Chiriacescu & von Heusinger (2009) give corpus results showing that speakers use pe-marking in order to keep referents active for projected future reference to them in subsequent discourse. An orthogonal and often equally important trigger of the construction is a high degree of affectedness of the patient, where the predicate is high on the transitivity cline (as per Hopper & Thompson 1980). Along with high topicality of referents, referential persistence and high affectedness of the object give CD-pe the power to override many of the lexically specified scales previously mentioned. For example, should the verb express a particularly high degree of affectedness of the direct object, the humanness constraint weakens and the CD-pe construction becomes usable with animal
or even inanimate direct objects, as in *N-am făcut-o pe mâncarea asta niciodata* 'I have never made this dish before'.

Rather than focusing solely on individual subscales such as animacy, definiteness, topicality, etc., a more general notion of *prominence* is needed in order to make sense of the pragmatics of *cd-pe*. As understood in the current work, the referent of a prototypical direct object in a *cd-pe* construction is prominent if reference to it is resolved within a scenario of high *accessibility*, i.e. a scenario where the speaker and addressee both have access to the referent because the referent is physically present and can be deictically referred to. This is true of first and second person pronouns, and it extends naturally to third person pronouns and demonstratives; not coincidentally, these are the types of direct objects with which *cd-pe* is mandatory, as seen in sentences (4a, d-g). However, it is clear that not all occurrences of *cd-pe* must occur only in such deictic contexts; after all, we can use the construction even when the referent is not physically present. That is why this notion of prominence is rooted in a set of core uses. As the construction extends from core referents (those that are deictically accessible) to increasingly diverse types of referents (i.e. all those in (5)), these extensions are still linked via a constructional network to the core accessibility scenario. This network and the relation between core and peripheral uses will be detailed in Section 7.

The latter constitutes a schematic form of prominence, one that is abstracted away from a scenario in which the referent is physically accessible to all instances in which the addressee has any kind of attentional focus onto the direct object referent. Various subsets of the prominence scales license the constructional components of *cd-pe*: namely, animacy and high affectedness for *pe*, and high topicality and accessibility for *cd*. Via its access to this schematic form of prominence (which is not attributable to any particular subscale but which all subscales share),

8. Uses with inanimate direct objects are nearly impossible to find in written texts, but are occasionally heard in spoken Romanian. The following example is anecdotal:

   (ii) *N-am făcut-o pe mâncarea asta niciodata.*

      not-have.1sg made-cl.3sg.fem dom food.def this ever

      ‘I have never made this dish before.’

   (iii) *Tot internetul a văzut-o pe pisica morocânoasă.*

      all internet has seen-cl.3sg.fem dom cat.def grumpy

      ‘The whole internet has seen a grumpy cat.’


9. The notion of accessibility used here is that proposed by Ariel (1988, 1990, 2001, 2004). The theory of accessibility states that referring expressions are not specialized for amounts and types of knowledge one has about their respective referents. Rather, they flexibly encode varying degrees of mental accessibility, based on discourse and physical context, that the speaker assumes the addressee to have with respect to a referent (Ariel 1988, 2001).
Clitic doubling and differential object marking

CD-pe aids in bringing the force of the proposition to the attention of the addressee, whether to re-activate a topic from previous discourse (and potentially keep it active in the discourse to follow) or to signal strikingly new information to which attention needs to be directed. This is similar to the definition of prominence offered in Goldberg (2006: 136), where prominence constitutes the common pragmatic trait shared by topical and focal information as opposed to backgrounded or presupposed information, with both topic and focus motivated by the speaker’s focus of attention. In that view, topic and focus are specific subcases of types of prominence, but share a more schematic trait of salience in the minds of the speaker and the addressee. With CD-pe, high animacy, high identifiability, high topicality and high affectedness all constitute specific forms of prominence, but share a common trait of accessibility. While animacy constraints in particular continue to be strong in prototypical uses of the construction, the prominence-raising value of the construction makes it applicable to any transitive clause selecting any type of direct object noun.

Sentence (1) is repeated here as (7) in order to illustrate CD, pe-only, and CD-pe versions of the same utterance:

No CD-pe

(7) a. Preşedintele a convocat toţi delegaţii.
   president.def has assembled all delegate.pl.def
   ‘The president assembled all the delegates.’

CD-pe

b. Preşedintele i- a convocat pe toţi delegaţii.
   president.def cl.3pl.masc has assembled dom all delegate.pl.def
   ‘The president assembled all the delegates.’

pe-only

c. Preşedintele a convocat pe toţi delegaţii.
   president.def has assembled dom all delegate.pl.def
   ‘The president assembled all the delegates.’

 CPC

d. Preşedintele i- a convocat.
   president.def cl.3pl.masc has assembled
   ‘The president assembled them.’

e. *Preşedintele a convocat ei
   president.def has assembled pro.3pl.masc
   (As ‘The president assembled them.’)

The pragmatic difference between sentence (7a) and (7b) is one of prominence: in a particular context, (7b) has a prominence-raising effect, owing to some rhetorical purpose in the context. (7b) would be chosen over (7a) for any number of
reasons previously discussed: to mark the referent as topical, to ensure referential persistence, or to emphasize that the direct object noun referents are highly affected by the action denoted by the verb. Thus, the relationship between (7a) and (7b) is one of constructional alternation: they are in complementary distribution with respect to pragmatic force. The difference between (7b) and (7c), on the other hand, is more subtle. The latter represents a remnant from a previous development stage; it seldom occurs in the modern language, and it is highly marked when used. The pe-only construction in (7c) represents a transitional stage in the grammaticalization of cd-pe, one that sets up the radial structure upon which cd-pe eventually builds. (7d) demonstrates a common use of the CPC, while (7e) demonstrates that the CPC is the only way to express a pronoun as the sole argument.

The CPC and the pe-only constructions have in common discourse prominence, which is here defined as the necessity for a high degree of accessibility of the instantiated NP in the pe-only construction, and a high level of accessibility of the referent of clitic pronouns. On the basis of this shared pragmatics, the two constructions have good reasons to gravitate toward each other, given the right discourse conditions.

6. Constructional analysis

6.1 The Canonical Pronominal Construction

Like all other Romance languages, Romanian sentences can contain direct objects instantiated purely by means of a weak pronoun (Gerlach 2002; Lambrecht 2004). (8) represents an instance of the CPC (data from Hill & Tasmowski 2008: 154):\(^{10}\)

(8) Şi vine Isus în casa judelei şi o văzu raposată.
and came Jesus in house Jew.gen and cl.3sg.fem saw dead
‘And Jesus came to the judge’s house and saw her there dead.’ (COR)

Given that, aside from the clitic doubling construction, this is the only means of having pronouns as direct object arguments in Romanian, it would be simplest to consider the verb-adjacent clitic position the canonical argument position for pronominal direct objects in Romanian. That is, when one sees a full pronoun in direct object position in Romanian, such as el ‘he’ or ea ‘she’, it is always a pe-marked

---

\(^{10}\) Hill & Tasmowski (2008) supply data from four distinct sources, here drawn upon for examples of attestations that predate those from the corpus used in the current study. For examples throughout, I retain the abbreviations from Hill & Tasmowski’s description:

SIB Sibiu manuscript, 1551–53, Chapters 4–27 of the Book of St. Matthew
COR Coresi’s Tetraevanghel manuscript, 1560/61, Brașov
Clitic doubling and differential object marking

direct object in a cd-pe construction. As illustrated in (7e) above, ei ‘them’ as a full pronoun cannot appear in direct object position without pe-marking, so sentences such as (7d) with a weak pronoun would have to do the job of referring. When there is no instantiated lexical direct object noun, the clitic pronoun mandatorily possesses a high degree of accessibility, performing deictic and anaphoric functions. For this construction, the animacy value of the denotatum is not a factor; clitic pronouns in Romanian can refer to animate and inanimate referents alike, while full pronouns cannot. Clitic pronouns capture information about the number and grammatical gender of the noun, but not about its animacy, while full pronouns such as el ‘he’ and ei ‘them’ additionally encode the humanness of the referent. Pragmatically, as with most weak pronouns, clitic pronouns tend to be topical, and refer to given and identifiable information (Ariel 1990; Lambrecht 1996; Prince 1984), while also being deictic. For this reason, clitic pronouns are more semantically bleached than full pronouns, as they do not encode information about the animacy of the referent (while full pronouns do), all the while retaining a high degree of accessibility.

6.2 The pe-marking construction

I will now discuss the pe-only construction and its role in the development of cd-pe. The prepositional marker is pe (and its prior reflex pre), originally from Latin per (Rosetti 1986). From the earliest attestations, pe is used to mark direct objects that are very high in the animacy hierarchy: human nouns, deictic pronouns and anaphors. However, it is unclear when and why pe assumed this function. The Sibiu manuscripts are the earliest written documents available with sufficient data illustrating DOM, providing attestations of CD and DOM from 1551–1553 (data from Hill & Tasmowski 2008: 155). At this juncture there is still a mix of pe- and non-pe-marked direct objects:

(9) a. şi atunce voi spuine că
and then will.1sg say that
nece dinoari n-am cunoscut voi-[pe]
never once not-have.1sg known you.2pl
‘Then I will tell them plainly: I never knew you.’ (SIB)

b. Cine va primi pre voi-[+pe] mine primişte-[pe],
who will.3sg receive dom you.2pl me.acc receives
şi cine pre mine-[+pe] primeste
and who dom me.acc receives
‘He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me…’ (SIB)
As these attestations from the Sibiu manuscript demonstrate, there was a period during which *pe*-marked and non-*pe*-marked human direct objects, including pronouns, were in mixed usage, even within a single sentence, as illustrated in (9b) above.

The dom construction with definite NPs indicates high accessibility, because definiteness signals a space where the speaker and addressee have immediate access to the referent, as is demonstrated by the obligatory presence of *pe* with pronouns, demonstratives, and proper nouns (as in the sentences in (4)). It is precisely a high level of accessibility that definite NPs and topical NPs have in common. In the formation of cd-*pe*, that common feature of prominence (i.e. the pragmatic value of a referring expression in a context of high accessibility) is passed up to the more schematic clausal construction from the more substantive nominal construction of the definite NP. The *pe*-marked noun phrase was originally unified into the structure due to the humanness of the noun (and not specifically the noun’s definiteness), since *pe*-marking arises out of a transitive scenario with a human affectee. Both animacy and definiteness specifications are inherited from the lexical items substantiating the NP, because pronouns (with human referents), as the core types of *pe*-marked direct objects, are definite. The role of highly transitive predicates in establishing cd-*pe* will be detailed in Section 7.

In the next section, I lay down evidence taken from corpus data to show the development of several constructions that sprang up between the 16th century and today, finally leading to the current cd-*pe* configuration.

6.3 Constructionalizing cd-*pe*

The data for the diachronic portion of this study are drawn from three sources. The first is a historical epic from 1716 by Constantin Cantacuzino, a historian and geographer of Wallachia. The second source of data is a series of 19th century (1875–1885) short stories as well as an autobiography by Ion Creangă, one of the canonized prose and poetry writers from the age of Romanticism. The third source of data is the 1935 fictional novel *Huliganii* [The Hooligans] by early 20th century writer and philosopher Mircea Eliade. In these texts, there is still a markedly high occurrence of the *pe*-only construction, whereas in the modern spoken and written language *pe*-only is very rare. The documents analyzed provide a range of genres and literary styles, ranging from historical description to personal narrative to fables. In the Creangă and Eliade texts in particular, there are also instances of direct quotations from characters’ dialogues, while Cantacuzino’s writing contains no direct dialogue, but rich and detailed description of the thoughts and actions of the historical figures discussed. These types of texts were purposely selected because they contain actions by people directed towards people, and would thus have a higher likelihood of containing dom usages of *pe* by providing many transitive
contexts; otherwise *pe* would appear mostly as a preposition\textsuperscript{11} if the texts consisted predominantly of descriptions of landscapes, geography, customs and laws.

The texts were selected in order to yield relatively comparable corpus sizes across periods, and produced comparable token counts for *pe* and *pre*. Table 1 offers a summary of the corpus data.

### Table 1. Corpus statistics for texts spanning three periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Text size/ # of words</th>
<th>Pe/pre total tokens</th>
<th>Normalized pe/pre for DOM per 1,000 words</th>
<th>Normalized pe/pre for DOM per 1,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantin Cantacuzino, <em>Istoria Țării Românești</em></td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>74,521</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>15.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion Creangă, 19 short stories</td>
<td>1875–1885</td>
<td>108,029</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>16.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mircea Eliade, <em>Huliganii</em></td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>115,365</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the occurrence of DOM-marked direct object constructions with and without a doubling clitic. The relative frequencies suggest a diachronic trend in which a construction reinforcing the markedness of the direct object with both DOM and CD elements is favored over time, while the alternative (a construction that marks the prominence of the direct object only with DOM) is dispreferred over time.

### Table 2. DOM with and without CD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pe/pre DOM Total</th>
<th>Pe/pre DOM with CD (CD-pe)</th>
<th>Pe/pre DOM without CD (pe-only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantin Cantacuzino, <em>Istoria Țării Românești</em></td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>20% (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion Creangă, 19 short stories</td>
<td>1875–1885</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>40% (157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mircea Eliade, <em>Huliganii</em></td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>56% (219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This demonstrates the overlap of constructions in any given span of time; constructions do not replace each other instantly, constituting an overlap phenomenon as

\textsuperscript{11}. *Pe* also functions as a preposition, with the meaning of ‘on’ or ‘against’.
described in Hopper (1991), Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994), Traugott & Dasher (2002), and Hopper & Traugott (2003), among others. Remarkably, as recently as the early 20th century, the pe-only construction was still widespread, accounting for 44% of all dom-marking uses of pe/pre in the corpus. Today, this form is nearly obsolete in the standard modern language, and is reserved only for constructions in which the direct object is inherently human but whose referent cannot be known (such as with the existential quantifiers ‘somebody or other’, ‘nobody’, etc.).

The diachronic progression of differential object-marking pe, occurring clausally both with and without a doubling clitic, illustrates that the occurrence of pe with a clitic is a fairly recent phenomenon, and one that came to be the dominant form only gradually.

We are now in a position to seek to uncover some of the motivating factors leading to the eventual unification of constructional elements that led to a common pragmatic meaning. A closer investigation of the data also suggests that the key may lie with an interim fronting construction, which acted as a stepping-stone to cd-pe. Specifically, the increasingly frequent use of left-dislocation for rhetorical effects allowed an association to be formed between the shared semantics of pe-only and CPC, and for the latter to become entrenched as a composite cd-pe (also observed in Lehmann 2008). Thus, in the corpus texts analyzed, structures such as the following are frequently seen ([_] indicates the non-dislocated position of the underlined text):

10. a. Şi pre multi i- au scos [ ]
    and dom many cl.3pl.masc have.3pl taken out [ ]
    tocma din gura diavolului
    right from mouth devil.gen
    ‘And they took many out of the mouth of the devil…’ (Cantacuzino)

10. b. că omul învăţat înţelept va fi şì pe cel neînvăţat
    that man learned wise will be and dom the one unlearned
    slugă- l va avea [ ]
    servant cl.1sg.masc will have [ ]
    ‘…that the learned man wise shall be, and the unlearned one servant he will make.’ (Creangă)

10. c. Cu Anișoara va fi același lucru
    with Anișoara will.3sg be same thing
    deși pe ea o iubesc mai mult [ ]
    although dom her cl.3sg.fem love even more [ ]
    ‘With Anișoara it will be the same, although I love her even more.’ (Eliade)

10. d. au început pe ascuns hicleșug
    have.3sg begun on stealth
pe  Traian să omoară [ _ ]
dom Traian to kill
‘…he began surreptitiously to kill Traian…’ [ _ ]  (Cantacuzino)
e.  fosositi-vă de ele şi vă luminaţi,
use.2pl refl of them and refl illuminate
şi pe  Domnul lăudaţi [ _ ]
and dom God.def praise [ _ ]
‘…make use of them and cheer up; and praise the Lord!’  (Creangă)

This fronting construction occurs both with (10a–c) and without cd (10d–e). Traditionally, the form with cd is called clitic left-dislocation, CLLD, while the form without a pronoun in the main clause is called fronting.

Fronting itself constitutes a separate unique construction: the sentences in (10) would have radically different information structure values, should the direct object appear in its canonical position. The clause would have general sentence focus as a completely new proposition, without attentional highlights on any individual piece of information within the clause. Fronting results in the prominence of the pe-marked element, by rendering it either topical or focal. Importantly, the preposing does not exclusively correspond to either topicalization or focalization, but can reflect either of the two, depending on the intention of the speaker and the intonational contour, echoing Goldberg’s (2006) definition of prominence. For instance, in (10c): relative to its own clause, pe ea could perform a topical function (‘as for her, I love her more’), while relative to the entire utterance, it could perform the function of contrastive focus (‘it is her whom I love more’), with the appropriate intonational contour.

Analysis of the corpus data regarding the clausal placement of the direct object constituent (Table 3 below) shows that preposed variants were dominant earlier

12. Prince (1984) distinguishes topicalization from left-dislocation in English as having two separate but overlapping pragmatics. Furthermore, left-dislocation and clitic left-dislocation are themselves distinct, primarily because in LD the reduplicant is a strong pronoun occurring in canonical position while in CLLD it is a weak pronoun occurring in clitic position. In truly left-dislocated constructions of the kind found in French (Delais-Roussarie, Doetjes & Sleeman 2004), a variety of resumptive elements can be inserted in the clause, while in Romanian only weak clitic pronouns can be used. As far as CLLD is concerned in Romanian, it can be safely considered pragmatically homonymous with non-reduplicated fronting, and the cd and non-cd versions can be seen as interchangeable variants of the same construction. Romanian also differs from English (and French) in placing the fronted element in the same clause, with no intonational dip between the fronted element and the rest of the sentence. For these reasons, I will simply call the phenomenon here fronting, in order to avoid drawing unnecessary distinctions amongst dislocation types.
historically, and this is true with both *cd*-*pe* and *pe*-only variants, but noticeably more so for *cd-*pe.

Table 3. Token frequencies for *pe*/pre-marked arguments in left-dislocated and canonical positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pe/pre</th>
<th>CD-<em>pe</em></th>
<th>pe-only</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (N)</td>
<td>% (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantin Cantacuzino, <em>Istoria Țării Rumănești</em></td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preposed: 72% (81)</td>
<td>canonical: 28% (32)</td>
<td>preposed: 4% (20)</td>
<td>canonical: 96% (446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion Creangă, 19 short stories</td>
<td>1875–1883</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preposed: 32% (50)</td>
<td>canonical: 68% (107)</td>
<td>preposed: 2.5% (6)</td>
<td>canonical: 97% (233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mircea Eliade, <em>Huliganii</em></td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preposed: 17.4% (39)</td>
<td>canonical: 80% (180)</td>
<td>preposed: 0% (1)</td>
<td>canonical: 100% (171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the earliest period, even though *cd-*pe is in the minority, it occurs almost exclusively in preposing constructions (72%, compared to 4% for *pe*-only). This is an expected result, if we think of the preposing construction and the then-novel *cd-*pe as both reflecting a marked type of information structure. When an author of one of the earlier texts employed fronting as a strategy for drawing attention to some element of discourse, they were more likely than not to bring along for the ride clitic doubling in the main clause below.

Also noteworthy is a trend of decrease in frequency in the preposed order and increase in the canonical postverbal placement over time. However, because with *cd-*pe the proportion of preposed objects is much greater than with *pe*-only to begin with, the decrease is more noticeable in the former than in the latter. Coupled with the fact that there is a relative increase overall in *cd-*pe at the expense of *pe*-only regardless of clausal position, it seems fronting is losing out as a prominence-enhancing mechanism in the face of a newly-formed and increasingly widely-used *cd-*pe construction, which is occurring more and more in the canonical word order.

As I have stated before, the coming-about of *cd-*pe as we see it today is owed to a series of sequential entrenchment episodes, whereby at each stage some constructions that are already in place are unified, leading to a new construction that is more dominant in the subsequent stage. At least over the course of the 300-year window between Cantacuzino and today, the succession of constructions can be summarized as in Figure 1:
In the earliest phase (Phase 1), only \textit{pe}-marking and the \textit{cpc} were available in the language, with internal fluctuation and variation as to \textit{pe}-marking of direct objects (where even pronouns were unmarked at times), and no overlap between \textit{pe} and \textit{cpc}. The Sibiu sentences (9) exemplify this early stage. The next phase is one in which fronting of the direct object becomes entrenched, with human nouns being \textit{pe}-marked. This is illustrated by the sentences in (10). All of the constructions from Phase 1 continue to co-exist during Phase 2, as marked by the dotted lines indicating chronological persistence. In Phase 3, the fronting construction has two variants: with and without the doubling clitic inside the main clause. We can call the variant containing a doubling clitic inside the main clause a clitic left-dislocation (CLLD) variant. All of the corpus data used in this study show this free alternation, but as Table 3 shows, there is a much stronger preference for the CLLD variant throughout the historical window explored in this study (although inquiry further back in history may prove otherwise). All of the constructions available at Phase 2 coexist with those of Phase 3. Finally, in Phase 4, the kind of canonical order found in \textit{pe}-only sentences and the kind of \textit{cd}+\textit{pe} combination found in CLLD unify into a single \textit{cd}-\textit{pe} construction.

Figure 1 should be understood as a sequence of entrenchment phases, i.e. phases in which a construction becomes cognitively real and productive, rather

\footnote{Dotted lines mean persistence of a construction through multiple phases, alongside new emergent constructions. Solid arrow-tipped lines indicate constructions acting as input to the unification of subsequent complex constructions.}
than as a chronological ordering. In fact, Phases 2, 3, and 4 must have occurred fairly closely in time. cd-pe has been available since the earliest period studied here (there are no texts old enough, in which cd-pe is completely absent). However, even at this stage, its frequency was extremely low as compared to the already deeply entrenched pe-only construction. On the other hand, pe-only went from being widespread to being isolated to a small niche today, either because it was semantically constrained (as with indefinite pronouns) or dialectally and rhetorically specialized. Once in the constructional inventory, and once cognitively entrenched, a construction never really disappears completely, but either wanes and becomes specialized or lingers as a free variant of the more dominant construction to which it lent its semantics (see Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994 among others). Thus, the sequence illustrated in Figure 1, and the main point throughout this paper, is that combinations of constructions already existing in the language led to new constructions via semantic unification. This occurred, perhaps, with a time lag between the instance of formation of the new surface form of the construction and the subsequent instance, when the semantic and pragmatic specifications of that construction became sufficiently cognitively entrenched to become productive with a variety of new clausal fillers and in a variety of new contexts. With respect to cd-pe, the interval between the creation of the form of a new schematic construction and its entrenchment is one during which the new construction seems to be in free variation with existing constructions.

7. The cd-pe constructional network

As previously described in the introduction, the spread of the cd-pe construction (as well as all interim constructions) has proceeded from a central case, subsequently spreading to peripheral members as the constructional network expanded over time. The network has a center, namely that which is formed around verbs that represent more prototypical causal events and objects that are closest to prototypical or individuated patients. Thus, the construction as a whole has semantics grounded in the highest degree of transitivity (Hopper & Thompson 1980; Næss 2007). On the other hand, non-core meanings and uses occur with a much broader set of verbs and objects, which become available in subsequent spread. This core/noncore distinction echoes the prototype view of constructions, as discussed in Lakoff (1987), Goldberg (1995), Geeraerts (1997), and Taylor (1998). Here I will explain this spread and the network links and will draw parallels with observations made in the literature with respect to the diachronic and synchronic asymmetries in the use of clitic doubling.

Asymmetry is apparent synchronically, in that for any given language at any given time cd is not combined with all nouns; and it is present diachronically, in
that for any given language across time CD shows a general trend towards broadening its scope of applicability while never applying uniformly across all nominal constituent types. The direction of spread, as has been repeatedly shown in the literature, progresses from more topical to less topical elements (Farkas 1978; Gabriel & Rinke 2010), from more definite and referential to less definite and referential elements, from more to less specific reference (von Heusinger & Onea-Gáspár 2008), and from elements higher to those lower on an animacy scale (Suñer 1988).

Based on the analysis in the current work, we can now reinterpret ‘spread’ as constituting the formation of new constructional extensions, by virtue of new types of fillers being able to occupy the verb complement slot. Any new nouns to which the construction spreads encode a bundle of several semantic traits (animacy, definiteness, topicality) true of one referent during one referring instance. The core construction is one for which the highest points on each of these scales converge in the same referent in that instance of referring, and the construction spreads to entities and referring scenarios that encode lower and lower points on these scales. In this view, we pull together all of the aforementioned prominence scales into a single model, and at the same time connect it with the observation that object marking goes hand in hand with verb semantics, namely with high degrees of affectedness in prototypical causation scenarios (Torrego 1998; von Heusinger 2008). Crucially, the construction arises because the pe-only construction and the CPC are together, encapsulated in a core accessibility scenario, one in which the speaker and addressee have maximal accessibility to discourse referents, because the exchange happens in the context in which speaker, addressee, and the discourse referents are physically present in the processing of the event. CPC and pe-marking have this central accessibility scenario in common because pe evokes a core transitivity scenario — a human agent performs an affective action on a patient, thereby changing the patient — in which the affected entity is necessarily present, and thus identifiable (see also Langacker 2007 for a relevant discussion on pronoun meaning, identifiability, and accessibility).

Figure 2 below illustrates the central case of the pe-only construction in Romanian, as well as peripheral pe constructions that extend from the central cases. Constructions are connected by dotted lines to the NP types that can occur in those constructions. The left-to-right placement of the constructions and their associated NPs reflects the temporal sequentiality of entrenchment phases. The central cases, and the first for which CD-pe was constructionalized, are those involving pronouns, proper nouns, and bare determiners. For these, CD-pe is mandatory, and is not subject to pragmatic choice. It is only with the peripheral constructions that CD-pe begins to acquire its pragmatic and discourse functions: enhanced topicality, referential anchoring, referential persistence, and overall prominence-raising functions.
Core Accessibility Scenario: speaker refers to a referent to which both speaker and addressee are attending and is physically present in context.

CPC Pe-marking

Deictic Reference Scenario: speaker and addressee have same referent in mind, and the referent is physically present at time of speaking.

Core Transitive Scenario: human agent affects human patient directly; both are present in the scene; both their identities fully known.

Peripheral pe-marking construction 1
identifiability is stronger than animacy as a constraint

Peripheral pe-marking construction 2
animacy is stronger than identifiability as a constraint

Peripheral pe-marking construction 3
pe-marking with animal and inanimate nouns

1st and 2nd person pronouns
3rd person

proper names
bare determiners (demonstratives, superlatives)
bare nouns
modified nouns
referential indefinite nouns
non-referential indefinite pronouns

animacy is stronger than identifiability as a constraint

Figure 2. Core and peripheral cd-pe constructions with associated NP types

CD-pe core (semantically entrenched)

CD-pe periphery (pragmatic functions)
As part of the pragmatics of cd-pe, there are three additional peripheral constructions: an identifiability-marking pe construction, which occurs with bare nouns, modified nouns, and referential indefinite nouns, and an animacy-marking pe construction, which occurs with non-referential indefinite pronouns. The former is more likely to be used with inanimate NPs (leading to a third peripheral construction), while the latter is exclusively used when the NP is known to be human but cannot be identified. This is the case with indefinite pronouns such as in (*il caut pe cineva ‘I’m looking for somebody.’ The differences between the two peripheral pe constructions and the core ones are differences in the degree to which the two semantic traits of the core transitive scenario — animacy and identifiability — are suppressed, or strengthened. In the former, the identifiability of the object argument is more salient, and its animacy is suppressed, while in the latter, the animacy of the object argument is more pronounced.

The identifiability of the object argument is clearly important in discerning the extent of affectedness in a transitive scenario. However, equally important in the transitive scenario is the agentivity of the causer in the scenario. Thus, Torrego (1998) and Torrego Salcedo (1999, from García García 2007: 64) point out cases such as the following in Spanish:

(11) a. *La diva conoce a muchos aficionados.
  'The diva knows many fans.'

b. *La ópera conoce (*a) muchos aficionados.
  'The opera knows many fans.'

dom cannot occur in Spanish on the direct object if the subject is not human, thus metaphorical sentences such as (11b) do not work. This is true in Romanian as well:

(12) a. *Diva (ii) cunoaşte (pe) mulţi fani.
  'The diva knows many fans.'

b. *Opera (*ii) cunoaşte (*pe) mulţi fani.
  'The opera knows many fans.'

The CD-pe construction in (12b) is never acceptable despite the fact that object-marking is not usually thought of as being licensed by the animacy of the subject. However, when the construction is underscored by a semantics based on an experientially-based cognitive prototype grounded in a transitive scene, the involvement of the subject is not only possible, but necessary. The construction is a gestalt, one that as a whole interacts with the frame evoked by the verb with which it merges, as well as with the frames evoked by the subject and object fillers.
Thus, in spite of the immense variety of the type and nature of the direct object cross-linguistically, one of the more resilient constraints of the construction has to do with the nature of the subject. This piece of evidence enforces the importance of the core transitive scenario, which is sustained regardless of the type of direct object, but changes immensely if the subject is not naturally agentive.

On the other hand, the humanness constraint on the object is not necessarily consistent with the core transitive scenario, which usually has an agentive causer performing an action on and affecting an inanimate object, prototypically changing its state. Therefore, to account for the humanness constraint on the object, an explanation proffered in the literature for the tendency to mark human direct objects in DOM languages is one that draws on markedness constraints (Comrie 1980; Dixon 1994; Silverstein 1976). Such theories create a parallel with split ergative systems, which have a special marking of subject NPs that fill the agent function. Mirroring this system, in DOM languages there is a marking of direct objects if they are less likely to perform a typical patient function (Anagnostopoulou 1999); this refers to human entities, which are highly agentive and are thus less likely to appear in direct object position of transitives. If we accept this markedness explanation to account for the humanness constraint on the object, we must conclude that there is a cognitive blend between the argument marking pattern and the core transitive scenario; that is, the resulting construct retains the high animacy of the subject of a transitive and the high animacy of an object of a markedness-based system.

However, there may be another explanation for the emergence of the constraint that the direct object be human. It pertains to the genesis of the pe construction, based on an early analysis by Hatcher (1942). Hatcher proposes that pe-marking arose out of intransitive constructions with verbs of attack or violence, whereby the preposition heading the prepositional phrase is reanalyzed as a differential object marker and the content of the prepositional phrase is reanalyzed as the direct object of a transitive sentence. If pe marking arose in this manner, with intransitives being reanalyzed as transitives starting with a small cluster of verbs that bring about sudden affect in their objects, and spreading to other verbs, then the types of direct objects that are pe-marked are the types that tend to appear as affectees with those types of verbs. Hatcher writes:

Once the two constructions came to be felt as representing alternate expressions of the same idea, it became possible in Rumanian for a similar alternation to be adopted, by analogy, for purely transitive verbs (‘he conquered her’ [expressed as] ‘he conquered over her’); because of its greater affective nuance the prepositional construction tended to displace the other in the case of a personal object. And thereby the stage was set for the ultimate extension of the use of p(r)e, with transitive verbs in general, as a sign of a personal accusative (pp. 422).
Lyons (1990) echoes this view, interpreting the Spanish *a* and the NP it introduces as an adjunct that reinforces or clarifies the reference of a null pro in the object position. Indeed, from my own corpus, most of the earliest instances of *pe* and *pre* occur with verbs of conquering, attacking, defeating, etc., particularly since the Cantacuzino text is a text recounting historical events: *pre turci îi biruia* ‘the Turks, they defeated them’, *pre toți vrâjmașii lui i-au supus* ‘all the enemies, they subjugated them’, etc.

Thus, in Figure 2, the definiteness and animacy scales, previously proposed to explain marking behavior, are organized in a constructional network and this network is organized around a central *pe* marking construction grounded in a central transitive scenario. The eventual spread of *pe*-marking to nouns and verbs on the periphery of the transitive scenario enabled coupling with indefinite noun phrases as well. The construction may have started as a type of intransitive with an affectee instantiated in a PP, as Hatcher proposes, but eventually, once *cd-pe* was formed, it became mandatory (rather than optional, as is the case with NPs) with pronouns, proper nouns and bare demonstratives due to the core accessibility scenario shared by the *pe* construction and the CPC.

8. Conclusion

By charting the replacement of a *pe*-marking construction with one that incorporates a more general and canonical pronominal argument construction (CPC), particularly considering the semantics they share in terms of high accessibility, we see that a new construction came into being which shares the trigger of high referentiality and high degree of accessibility of the two original constructions. The resulting composite construction canonically requires that its direct object be human, a trait inherited from the *pe*-only construction and the central transitivity scenario from which it emerges. The diachronic data indicate that *pe*-only constructions waned in the modern era, and gradually were substituted by *cd-pe*, which is licensed in discourse scenarios when the schematic feature of prominence is the trigger. This resulted in all types of pragmatic effects: topicality, referential persistence, referential anchoring, and high affectedness. The *cd-pe* construction owes its emergence to interim fronting and left-dislocation constructions, as well as the eventual merger of the CPC into the main clause of these constructions. *cd-pe*’s constructional network reflects that *pe*’s meaning was originally compatible with only human direct objects but came to be used with any direct object as long as the pragmatic force of the utterance is sufficiently high, or when a high degree of affectedness of the direct object is emphasized. The fact that *cd-pe* is mandatory with some objects and optional with others (and those with which it is mandatory fall
higher on the prominence scales), points to a center-with-extensions structure of 
the network that it represents. By virtue of the constructionalization of cd-\textit{pe}, pro-
nominal clitics and the preposition \textit{pe} grammaticalized into a doubling clitic and a 
differential object marker, respectively. When part of the \textit{cd-pe} construction, these 
items lose their semantic meanings but retain them elsewhere in the language, such 
as when clitics are used in the \textit{cpc} and when \textit{pe} is used as a locative preposition. 
All constructions (\textit{cpc}, \textit{pe-as-preposition}, \textit{pe-only DOM}, obligatory \textit{cd-pe}, and op-
tional pragmatic \textit{cd-pe}) all co-exist in the modern language, but the more complex 
these arose during different periods and when they did, they introduced choice 
of expression for those speakers, resulting in temporary expressive diversity.

From this case study of Romanian, we can infer that \textit{CD+DOM} may have a differ-
ent semantics or pragmatics than \textit{CD} alone cross-linguistically, and that the marking 
on the direct object is not simply in free variation with unmarked counterparts, 
but may signal a significant change in the meaning of the utterance. The potential 
meaning contribution of \textit{DOM} to a \textit{CD} construction is not explicitly addressed in 
the existing literature on clitic doubling; thus, by illustrating the pragmatic dimen-
sion of the \textit{cd-pe} construction in Romanian, the current work advocates that simi-
lar diachronic constructional accounts be pursued for other languages as well.
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*Amintiri din copilărie* [Stories from my childhood], 1879.

*Capra cu trei iezii* [The goat and her three kids], 1875.

*Cinci pâini* [Five loaves of bread], 1883.

*Dănilă Prepeleac*, 1876.

*Fata babei și fata moșneagului* [The old lady’s daughter, and the old man’s daughter], 1877.

*Făt frumos fiul iepe* [Prince charming, son of the goat], 1877.

*Ioan Roată și Voda Cuză* [Ioan Roată and Voda Cuză], 1882.

*Ivan Turbincă*, 1878.

*Moș Ion Roată* [Old man Ion Roată], 1885.

*Moș Nichifor Coțcariul* [Old man Nichifor Coțcariu], 1880.
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