1. Preliminary remarks

Philosophers have always considered proper names (= PNs) as paradigmatic examples of referential expressions, and are currently still debating on the two hypotheses regarding the functioning of PNs, namely (a) the theory of PNs as definite descriptions (in the wake of Frege 1892, an approach recently illustrated by Geurts 1997, Matushansky 2006) and (b) the theory of direct reference /rigid designation (a theory initiated by Mill (1843), and Russell 1905, and made famous by Kaplan 1964 and Kripke 1971). On the other hand, linguists have concentrated on other problems, one of them being the extent to which PNs represent a class distinct from common nouns (= CNs). The distinction was usually set in semantic terms: CNs have descriptive sense, while PNs are devoid of descriptive content. The idea that PNs do not have meaning is apparently contradicted by the possibility of using PNs as predicates: El este un Eminescu. In the present paper we disregard predicative uses of PNs and restrict the discussion to argumental uses of PNs.

In terms of a formal grammar, the difference between PNs and CNs should follow from the fact that they are characterized by distinct formal features, which it is incumbent on us to specify. The aim of this paper is twofold. On the one hand we develop a hypothesis on the structure of DPs headed by PNs in languages like Romanian (Sections 1-4). This will allow us to give an account of the constructions typical of PNs in Modern Romanian. In the second part of the paper (sections 5-6) we discuss the syntax of PNs in Old Romanian, focusing on the passage from CNs to PNs as attested in Romanian and describing the more complex structure of PNs in older stages of Romanian.

2. Syntactic features specific to PNs

There is general agreement that PNs are DPs (Longobardi 1994, Borer 2005), and thus phases, and thus expressions with an interface potential which might account for their being referential (cf. Hinzen 2007). If PNs count as DPs even in the absence of an overt determiner in many languages, Romanian partially included, PNs must be endowed with a feature which is valued in D and may thus activate the D position. There are two influential proposals regarding the identity of this feature.

One proposal (Longobardi 1994, Borer 2005, Tănase-Dogaru 2009 for Romanian) is that PNs are inherently definite, coming from the lexicon with a [+def:___] feature. The assumed inherent definiteness of PNs relies on a variety of semantic and morpho-syntactic arguments.

From a very general semantic perspective, the inherent definiteness of PNs is in harmony with their interpretation as referential definite descriptions (rather than attributive ones, in the sense of Donnellan (1966)), since they presuppose the existence of a referent which is unique in a particular context. Since the proper identification of the intended unique referent of a PN depends on shared contextual knowledge, Borer (2005) interprets PNs as situational anaphors. Anaphoricity is a characteristic property of
From a syntactic perspective, PNs are often in complementary distribution with the definite article occurring in positions which are inaccessible to CNs, as in Longobardi’s (1994) classical examples:

(1)  

a.  

\[
\text{il mio Gianni} \\
\text{the my Gianni} \\
\text{‘my Gianni’}
\]

b.  

\[
\text{Gianni mio} \\
\text{Gianni my} \\
\text{‘my Gianni’}
\]

The initial position of the PN in (1b), replacing rather than preceding the definite article, made Longobardi (1994) propose that an essential aspect of PN syntax is (overt or covert) movement of the PN to the D position (N-to-D), so that at LF, the PN occupies the D position in UG, a widely accepted proposal also adopted here, though in a modified form. Beyond these very general hypotheses, the syntax of PN in a particular language depends on other general morphosyntactic properties of determiners and nouns. Thus, there are languages where article insertion is a semantic-pragmatic process (Roehrs, 2010, Leu ()): English is a case in point; in such languages, PNs do not take articles and it is the presence/absence of the article which distinguishes between PNs and the common names:

()  

a.  

\[
\text{Cat came in running.}
\]

b.  

\[
\text{The cat came in running.}
\]

In other languages, article insertion is more of a morpho-syntactic process, having to do with agreement and locality problems. In languages of this type, PNs are always (e.g. Greek, Portuguese) or at least sometimes morphologically provided with an expletive definite article; which is erased by N-to-D (e.g. many Romance languages, such as Italian, illustrated above). In a subset of the languages which also use the article for syntactic purposes, nouns or nominal stems are specified for definiteness in the lexicon, as a further parametric property, characterizing Semitic languages (Hebrew, Arabic) and Romanian, in the Romance family (see Borer (1999) and especially Danon (2010) for Semitic languages, and Nicolae (2013, present volume for Romanian). In Romanian, nouns may enter the derivation with an uninterpretable definite feature [u+def:__], realized as a suffixal definite article. As marked on nouns, definiteness is clearly a syntactic feature, since semantic definiteness is an attribute of definite determiners. Danon (2010) argues that the existence of a formal definiteness feature in the grammar of a given language must be demonstrated using specific diagnostics, rather than merely assumed. Among the diagnostics that signal the syntactic definiteness feature in Semitic languages, he includes definiteness agreement of the adjectives with the noun, a property shared by Romanian prenominal adjectives. Further evidence for the presence of a syntactic definiteness feature in Romanian is supplied by the existence in this language of a class of polydefinite constructions, as proposed in Nicolae (2013, present volume). The realization of this feature as a suffix on N imposes a particular definiteness valuation mechanism based on local agree, a mechanism at work for both common nouns and PNs. (see Cornilescu& Nicolae (2011) for details). Summing up, the first hypothesis regarding the difference between CNs and PNs is that only the latter are inherently definite.
Longobardi (2008) revisits his analysis of PNs, this time starting from the interpretative similarity between PNs and personal pronouns: both display direct reference and both lack descriptive content. In his interpretation, the similarity between PNs and personal pronouns springs from the fact that both possess a [Person] feature, which is also valued in D. Actually, Longobardi claims that [Person] is the minimal content of the category D, and it is Person, not inherent definiteness, that distinguishes PNs from CNs. The presence of the definite article on PNs in some languages would then be a by-product of [Person], since, as acknowledged by many researchers, [Person] entails [Definiteness] (Harely & Ritters, ...), but not the other way round. Naturally, since [Person] is also valued in D, (some form of) N-to-D continues to exist. In sum, the second influential hypothesis is that the feature which distinguishes PNs from CNs is [Person].

The grammar of Romanian PNs apparently confirms Longobardi’s second hypothesis, in the sense that, whenever there are major distributional differences between PNs and CNs, they follow from the presence of [Person], not definiteness. The definite article on PNs, i.e. the proprial definite article, is an expletive with a morpho-syntactic role, as has often been remarked in work on Romanian or other languages (Tomescu 2001, van Langendock 2008, ...). Intuitively the special properties of the proprial definite article (i.e. the definite article on PNs) is precisely to signal [Person], an unexpected feature on nouns.

At first sight, it seems counterintuitive to accept that the proprial definite article is an expletive, since a PN – whether endowed with a proprial article or not – expresses the very idea of existence and uniqueness of the referent, which is precisely the semantic content of the definite article (Russell 1905). Moreover, the syntactic position D(eterminer) is usually defined in UG as the locus of definiteness (Lyons 1999) and if PNs are DPs, the proprial definite article would be expected to have its usual semantic role. This is precisely the point made by the description theory of PNs.

A possible solution to this paradox is to redefine the minimal (semantic) content of the category D(eterminer), as done by Gillon (2009) with reference to Skwxwú7mesh / Squamish1, so as to better understand under what circumstances an article counts as an expletive. The determiners of Squamish are not sensitive to the definiteness contrast, in the sense that the same determiner (e.g. ka or kwi) may be used both to introduce a new referent (the function of the indefinite article in European languages) and to make reference to a known object, unique and already mentioned in the discourse/context (the function of the definite article in European languages). Squamish thus cancels out the distinction novelty/familiarity (Heim 1982), which is the content of the (in)definiteness feature. Thus, with respect to their content, the determiners of English and Squamish do not behave like a homogeneous class, and are not universally employed to express semantic (in)definiteness (cf. Lyons 1999). There is, however, a semantic property common to all determiners, which unifies this class, namely the fact that determiners introduce domain restrictions; more exactly, determiners combine with nouns which have a certain extension in context. According to Gillon (2009), a lexical item is a determiner if and only if it introduces a domain restriction (NP). The morpho-syntactic reflex of the relation between the operator and the restriction is inheritance by the determiners of the noun’s φ-features. The definiteness feature in European languages includes both the domain restriction and uniqueness (the opposition familiarity/novelty). One may wonder what is the content of Squamish determiners, except for the introduction of a domain restriction. According to Gillon (2009), Squamish determiners are sensitive to a deictic feature and indicate proximity or distance.

1 A Salish language spoken in British Columbia, Canada.
with respect to the speaker, instead of familiarity or novelty. The minimal content of the category D in UG is thus the introduction of a nominal restriction. In Gillon’s (2009) vision, the definite article in familiar languages is defined by two semantic features: the nominal restriction and (Russellian) maximality / uniqueness. An expletive article may lose one or both features. In our opinion, the proper expletive article suspends both semantic features, merely retaining a morphosyntactic/morphologic role: e.g. it retains syntactic definiteness, with the incumbent properties, and ability to be marked for case.

The question arises as to why the article on PNs is expletive, if present. Intuitively this follows from the absence of descriptive content of the PN, which picks out no restriction (set) in the context. The result of the absence of descriptive content, is that PNs cannot have interpretable phi features and cannot of themselves transmit their phi features to the article.

The φ-features on the PN itself are uninterpretable or, rather, unspecified. One might even say that PNs are morphologically opaque: in and of themselves, they cannot indicate grammatical gender and, as a result, cannot vary according to number either, given that Number always selects Gender, at least in Romance (Picallo …).

With Romanian PNs, absence of both grammatical and semantic gender is apparent in at least two situations.

(i) Their morphophonemic structure does not determine grammatical gender, as CNs normally do. () The PN Toma in (2a) ends in the vowel –a, which is normally interpreted as the singular feminine form of the definite article (compare with (2b)); however, the PN Toma is usually assigned to male referents, and this is visible in the masculine form of the predicative adjective in copular sentences. The uninterpretable feminine gender feature in the article however determines the feminine genitive case form, as in (2c)

(2) a. **Toma este vitează** / *vitează*
b. **Maria este vitează** / vitează.
c. Duminica Tomii/Tomei
d. rochia Mariel

In the same vein, the PN Carmen ends in a consonant, a typically masculine morphophonemic form, but it is mostly assigned to feminine referents, as again shown by adjectival agreement.

(3) **Frumoasă Carmen este lingvistă.**

(ii) Contemporary Romanian possesses quite a few PNs conventionally compatible with referents of both sexes (e.g. Irinel, Alex, Leonida, Pusi, Mimi), in spite of their morphophonemic form. In other words, the grammatical gender of these PNs varies.

(4) **Irinel / Leonida e doctor / doctoriţă.**

We claim that precisely because of their unspecified φ-features, PNs require the presence of a classifier, which, among other things, introduces the intended interpretable grammatical gender/number features of the expression, as will be discussed below.

(5) a. **(Doctorul) Irinel este un bun specialist.**
b. *(Doctorița) Irinel este o bună specialistă.*

To conclude, PNs have a specific feature matrix which includes: an interpretable [Person] feature, as well as an entailed uninterpretable definiteness feature, (often) realized as an expletive article. The functional structure of nominal phrases headed by PNs includes (at least) Classifier Phrase (ClassP) which supplies interpretable phi-feature and a DP projection:

(6) \[ \text{DP} > \text{ClassP} [i_{\phi}] > \text{PN} \ [\text{Person:__}, u_{\phi}, (u+\text{def})] \]

3. Expletive article vs referential article

In agreement with previous research on Romanian, we preserve the hypothesis that the definite article is affixal and the definiteness feature is valued in a *strictly local configuration* (Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011). In this section, we review the syntactic differences between the expletive and the referential definite article. While in languages like English, it is the absence of the definite article which announces a PN, in Romanian the PN is hailed precisely by the very different distribution of the definite article with PNs as compared with CNs. Simplifying somewhat, we might say that the referential and the expletive articles are morphologically identical, but differ considerably from a syntactic perspective. As with the referential article, the morphology of the expletive article expresses gender (8), number (9), case (10), (11), and even definiteness (12) differences (if the name also has an indefinite form). An important aspect in the morphology of Romanian PNs (detailed in the second part of the paper) is the difference in the realization of the case paradigm between masculine and feminine proper names. Briefly, feminine PNs have the same morphology as feminine definite common nouns, exhibiting the regular enclitic article throughout the declension. In contrast masculine PNs have lost the article in the N-Acc cases and show a proclitic definite article in the Gen-Dat cases. The only regards the many masculine PNs that nevertheless are marked by the feminine definite article –a (12’’):

(8) *Ionel / Ionela*
(9) *Ionescu / Ionești*
(10) *Maria / Mariei*

\[ (11) \text{ci au descalecat la Cocorăștii din Grind, la casele Vladului comisul} \text{ (Old Romanian, Let.} \]
\[ \text{Cantcuz, p. 50) \rightarrow move to second part!} \]

(12) *Aceeași Mărie cu altă pălărie. / Maria*

(12’’) *Toma, Preda, Șendrea […]*

Despite morphological similarity, the syntactic differences between the two types of articles are considerable. Notice first the co-occurrence of a prenominal definite adjective with an article-suffixed PN (13a), against the constraint of realizing the definiteness feature *only once* on the highest [+N] term of the DP ((13b) vs (13c)) active with DPs headed by CNs:

---

2 In the genitive-dative cases, the case inflection is enclitic for feminine PNs, and proclitic (i.e. expressed by a proclitic article) for masculine PNs; however, Old Romanian also had the option of an enclitic definite article on masculine PNs (see (12)).
Secondly, definite PNs may also be followed by definite suffixed adjectives, unlike CNs (which are followed by definite adjectives only in construction with the adjectival article *cel*).

Furthermore, PNs may appear not only in double definite, but also in polydefinite, structures. A first characteristic polydefinite structure has two definite adjectives preceding the PN, as in (16a). The adjectives are stacked, not coordinated. In contrast, in the CN structure only the highest adjective is definite (17b), unless there is coordination (17c):

In a second polydefinite structure, unlike CNs, PNs may be preceded and followed by nouns or adjectives suffixed by the definite article:

One more piece of evidence that that the article on PNs is not referential is its possible co-occurrence with an indefinite article:

To conclude, the syntax of the two articles is completely different. In our view, these differences follow from the presence of the [Person] feature, typical of PNs.

4. The internal structure of PNs: classifiers and close appositions
Given the numerous syntactic differences between PNs and CNs, an analysis of PNs as definite descriptions, which assimilates PNs to definite CNs in an attempt at unification and simplicity (Matushansky (2006)) encounters substantial empirical problems. We therefore opt for a syntax that acknowledges the difference between PNs and definite descriptions. Moreover, in line with Longobardi (1994, 2008) and Hinzen (2007), we believe that the much discussed rigidity of the PNs is an effect of their syntax, which somehow guarantees their atomicity, hence their lack of variation in different contexts or possible worlds. Of the several internalist accounts of PNs that we are aware of (Longobardi (1994, 2008), Uriagereka 1998, Hinzen 2007) we have opted for a variant of Longobardi’s account, as already stated. Essentially, Longobardi’s view is that definite DPs are compositional, minimally formed out of an operator ($D$) + restriction ($NP$). The operator takes scope at LF (adjoining to the DP (Dobrovie Sorin, 1994) and finally to the sentence (May(), Heim (1982)). At LF the $D$ position is filled by a variable and the DP exhibits a quantifier + variable structure. It is the operator + variable + restriction syntactic configuration which secures variability of reference for definite descriptions, different members of the restriction set possibly being picked in different possible worlds.

\[
\text{DP} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{NP} \\
x \quad \text{king}
\]

In sharp contrast to definite description, PNs do not have a compositional interpretation; the PN itself fills the $D$ position through (overt or covert) movement of the PN to the $D$ position. In the resulting configuration, there is no variable and no nominal restriction. The PN is found in an unanalyzable atomic structure. In Longobardi’s view it is precisely the absence of an operator-variable-restriction structure which produces the rigid designation of PNs.

\[
\text{(i)} \quad \text{DP} \\
D \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{[Person]} \quad \text{Petrui}
\]

Thus the essence of PN syntax is that the PN itself becomes an exponent of the $D$ category, via N-to-$D$, thus cancelling the quantificational structure. Crosslinguistic differences of PN syntax follow from several parameters, such as; a) the interplay of person and definiteness; c) the level where N-to-$D$ occurs: syntax or LF. According to Longobardi (2008), in languages where PNs do not raise in syntax, a CHAIN is formed between the $D$ position and the lower NP position. The same chain values the uninterpretable $\phi$-features in $D$. The $D$ position will be filled by the PN at LF. This is the case of English type languages.

As will be seen, there are certain problems that must be solved before extending Longobardi’s analysis to Romanian. At this point it is enough to show that Romanian PNs do move inside the DP, as shown by their initial or final position with respect to classifiers:

(20) a. \textit{Actorul George Vraca} (with the PN in a lower position)
b.  *George Vraca actorul* (movement of the PN to the D domain)

In the rest of the section, we detail these two PN patterns in Romanian, neither of which is possible for definite CNs: *actorul eroul/ *eroul actorul.

4.1. On classifiers and PNs

As in Cornilescu (2007), we assume that in the functional structure of a PN there is a *qualitative classifier* (henceforth Class), with a double, syntactic and semantic, role. This hypothesis reflects the intuition that an adequate understanding of a PN requires understanding the type of entity denoted by the PN, i.e. there is an implicit categorization process, at the end of which the PN is minimally supplied with interpretable phi features. It follows that from a syntactic perspective, Class is a nominalizer, a form of little n, which supplies valued interpretable φ-features for the PN, in agreement with the entity denoted by the PN in some particular context of use.

The presence of Class accounts for the many instances of gender variation in the use of the same PN. Thus in (21a), *Venus* denotes a name, having what Kaplan (1964) called syntactic reference. Accordingly, its grammatical gender is Neuter. In (21b), *Venus* refers to the goddess, its grammatical gender is feminine, and there is differential object marking.

\[
\begin{align*}
(21) & \\
\text{a. } & \text{*actorul eroul/ *eroul actorul.} & \text{[Neuter]} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Toţi o iubeau pe Venus.} & \text{[Feminine]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(i) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{[Pers:val]} \\
[\varphi: \_\_] \\
\text{ClassP} \\
\text{[PERSON-GENDER: MALE]} \\
\text{NP} \\
[\text{Pers: \_\_, GENDER: \_\_\_]} \\
[\text{EPP}] \\
\text{ion}
\end{array}
\]

(ii) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{[Pers:val]} \\
[\varphi: \_\_] \\
\text{ClassP} \\
\text{[Person: \_\_, GENDER: MALE]} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{[PERSON-GENDER: MALE]} \\
\text{Class’} \\
[\text{EPP}] \\
\end{array}
\]

The PN enters the derivation with an unspecified gender feature, the gender of the DP being given by Class. Gender specification makes possible number specification, given that, in Romance, the NumP, where available, selects for a GenP (Picallo mss., see also Bernstein 1993).

The suggestion of using classifiers to specify the nature of the entity denoted by the PN is directly supported by languages which employ classifiers to denote types of entities, such as Mandjaku\(^3\), analyzed by Kihm (2005: 474). A root like \(\text{vlik}\) (‘to draw water’) may be classified in different manners, by choosing different nominalizing affixes such as \(\text{pë- / i- / m- / ka-}\), thus deriving words like \(\text{pë-lik / i-lik (‘well(s)’), m-lik (‘water’) şi ka-lik (‘fruit juice’)}\). These examples show that classifying elements have a descriptive content, denoting a certain kind of object. Our proposal is that classifiers also operate on PNs, specifying the type of entity which bears the respective name; in addition to this semantic role, classifiers play an essential syntactic

\(^3\) A Bak language, spoken in Guinea-Bissau and Senegal.
role, specifying interpretable phi features for (particular uses of) the PN, interpretable gender in the first place. Class contains interpretable features such as PERSON (anthroponyms), PLACE (toponyms), OBJECT (e.g. the word (Venus)), etc. Agree between Class and the PN endows the latter with interpretable phi features, necessary for DP-internal and DP-external concord processes. Class is endowed with an EPP feature, triggering movement of the PN to Spec, ClassP, as shown in (21) or merger of a lexical classifier as amply shown below. Technically, Class is a functional head which selects an N [Person], an analysis which may be extended to personal pronouns as well (Cornilescu & Nicolae (2014)).

As will be immediately shown, the existence of classifiers is fully confirmed by the category of “descriptive PNs” / “complex PNs” in the sense of Scott Soames (2002).

### 4.2. Complex proper names: classifier + (bare) PN configuration

#### 4.2.1 Overt classifiers

A central set of data, whose significance has not always been appreciated, is that “partially descriptive names”, first included in the semantic category of rigid designators by Scott (2002), who offers a semantic account of sentences with descriptive PNs. A partially descriptive proper name \( n \) is made up of a CN+ a bare PN (as in (22) below). A partially descriptive proper name is semantically associated with both a descriptive property \( P_D \), contributed by the CN, and some referent Object, contributed by the PN. The proposition expressed by a sentence \( n \) is \( F \), with \( n \) a partially descriptive PN is the same as that expressed by the proposition: \([\text{the } x: P_D \ x \ & \ x=y] \ F_x\). This proposition is true at \( w \) iff the Object has the property \( P_D \) and \( F_x \) is true at \( w \). In other words the descriptive content \( (P_D) \) is a means of fixing the referent (in the sense of Kripke 1970) but is not part of the proposition \( F_x \) evaluated as true or false in a context, a proposition which has an atomic subject (PN). From now on, we will refer to partially descriptive PNs as complex proper names or descriptive names and will be paying special attention to their syntax.

The category of descriptive or complex PNs brings valuable information regarding the syntactic structure of PNs. As mentioned, complex PNs are made up of a common name plus a proper name. The CN designates a social role (kinship, profession, institutional role), a type of location (city, street, village, river), other entities (institutions, names, planets):

(22) a. Profesorul Ionescu; Regina Elisabeta; Mătuşa Tamara
b. Oraşul Bucureşti; Strada Paris; Râul Dâmboviţa
c. Teatrul „I. L. Caragiale”; Planeta Venus

It has been suggested that these are appositive constructions rather than complex PNs (GLR 1966). English however clearly shows their status as PNs through the obvious absence of the definite article:

(23) **Prince Charles** not *The Prince Charles*

The hypothesis that there is a classifier in the extended projection of PNs offers a natural analysis of CPNs, since the classifier is overt in their structure. Intuitively, the CNs have a classifying role, denoting the kind of entity which is the referent of the PN as in *Professor Ionescu*. If for simple PNs it is the PN itself that values the classifying feature of Class\(^0\) through MOVE, in the case of descriptive PNs the CN merges as the specifier of ClassP, since the
semantic feature of Class⁰ (PERSON, for example) is among the semantic features of the CN
(prince; king, doctor, etc.). In other words, with descriptive PNs, the classifier is overt.

It can be proved that in descriptive PNs, the PN is not part of an appositive structure.
Appositional modification is a form of DP-modification, in contrast with NP-modification (see
Potts 2005, Larson & Marusik): both the modifier and the modifiee are DPs, often
interchangeable, as in (28):

\[
\begin{align*}
(28) & \quad a. \quad \text{Îl admirau pe autorul piesei, cel mai bun dramaturg englez.} \\
    & \quad b. \quad \text{Îl admirau pe cel mai bun dramaturg englez, autorul piesei.}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that the PN in the descriptive PN construction is an NP, not a DP, as can be seen
from the impossibility of replacing the PN with a definite noun or a personal pronoun (i.e. a
complete DP) in this construction:

\[
\begin{align*}
(29) & \quad a. \quad \text{Profesorul Popescu} \\
    & \quad b. \quad *\text{Profesorul el / muncitorul}
\end{align*}
\]

In genuine appositive structure, PNs are interchangeable with personal pronouns and
represent DPs; the two DPs are separated by an intonational break:

\[
\begin{align*}
(30) & \quad a. \quad \text{Brâncuși, cel mai mare sculptor al românilor.} \\
    & \quad b. \quad \text{El, cel mai mare sculptor al românilor.}
\end{align*}
\]

Classifiers may be considered semi-lexical categories, in the sense of Lobel (2001): semi-
lexical nouns become relational, selecting a non-theta marked complement, marked \[N \text{ Person}].
They are not referential, since in a phrase like Mister Popescu, as shown in Scott’s analysis given
above, there is only one referent, namely that of the PN. The descriptive term may sometimes be
abbreviated, which could be interpreted as a linguistic marker of a functional element (DNA.
Ionescu, Dr. Jones, Mr. Smith). Finally, with certain (masculine) classifiers, the definite article
may be dropped, which shows that the classifiers has become a part of the PN:

\[
(31) \quad \text{Sunt doctor(ul) Ionescu.}
\]

One last remark is that the descriptive nouns may head an extended classifier phrase.
While with conventionalized complex PNs, the classifier is simple, in the classifier + PN
structure the classifier may attract any modifier, prenominal (32a) or postnominal (32b), and the
classifier structure is recursive (33):

\[
\begin{align*}
(32) & \quad a. \quad \text{Profesorul de matematică Marin Miroiu, Omul de afaceri Grigore Bucsan,} \\
    & \quad \text{ambasadorul UNESCO al Romaniei la Paris Valentin Lipatti} \\
    & \quad b. \quad \text{Celebrul/ilustrul actor (de dramă şi comedie) Toma Caragiu}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(33) & \quad a. \quad \text{Domnul Ionescu} \\
    & \quad b. \quad \text{Domnul doctor Ionescu} \\
    & \quad c. \quad \text{Domnul doctor rezident Ionescu}
\end{align*}
\]
The presence of the nominal classifier above the PN is also shown by the possible presence of intensional modifiers in the class fost(ul) ‘(the) former’, fals(ul) ‘(the) false’, pretinsul ‘(the) alleged’, etc. These adjectives are reference modifiers, not referent modifiers, in the sense that they are functions whose argument is a property, not an object.

(34) falsul (ţar) Dimitri, pretinsul Boris, fostul (rege) Mihai de Romania, adevăratul Sfânt(ul) Niculai

It is plausible that in examples like (34), the adjective is a modifier of the classifier, overt or null.

4.2.1. Valuing Person and Definiteness. A few important assumptions

The time has come to have a closer look at the feature valuation mechanisms involved in generating complex PNs. We will adopt the following hypotheses:

1. PNs always value a Person feature in D.
2. Since [Person] entails [Definiteness], a syntactic feature in Romanian, definiteness valuation is always involved in deriving PNs. The mechanism of definiteness valuation is the same as for DPs headed by CNs, always involving local Agree. The definiteness feature in D is valued by a definite [+N] constituent in the specifier of the projection immediately below D.

   The definite feature should be realized only once, on the highest [+N] constituent. Apparent exceptions in polydefinite structures will be interpreted as PF effects of the coexistence of [Person] and definiteness. More specifically, the definiteness-realizing morpheme is not erased if definiteness is dominated by [Person] in the feature hierarchy. This amounts to saying that the definiteness morpheme is realized or at least realizable (other things being equal) on nouns (or adjectives) which are (part of) proper names or are treated as such. However, it remains true that outside of the PN itself, only one definite constituent, the one in the highest specifier projection below D realizes definiteness.

   [Person] and [definiteness] may have distinct valuation properties. The fact that [Person] and [Definiteness] are different features even if they are both valued in D, is immediately apparent in English. Definiteness of a common noun is a strong feature and requires the overt presence of an article throughout narrow syntax. [Person] may be valued through long distance Agree, but long distance agree is followed by N-to-D at LF. This contrast is apparent in pairs like the following. (24a) with long distance agree is a PN checking [Person], 24b is a PN re-analysed as a CN, hence the obligatory merger of the article.

(24) a.  
      Tall Kim
      a’ the tall Kim

   3. In line with other researchers (e.g. Roehrs 2006, ), we will also assume that articles raise to the D position from a lower Article Phrase, on the edge of the lexical nP domain. The assumed functional structure of a PN is then the following:

   ( ) DP> ArtP> ClassP> NumP

4.2.2 Deriving CPNs in the structure classifier + PN
Recall the two complex proper name constructions mentioned above, which differ in the position of the PN with respect to the classifier. To account for this contrast, we propose that while PNs always check Person, the [Person] feature in D is strong only in examples of type 20b.

(20)  
a.  *actorul George Vraca (the PN is in a lower position)  
b.  George Vraca actorul (the PN raises to the D domain)  
c.  *actorul el/ el actorul

Notice that only in (20b) can the PN be substituted by a personal pronoun and it has been shown that Romanian personal pronouns also raise to D, if not further. Thus in (20b) the person bearing element is in initial position. In 20a) the definite classifier (not endowed with [Person]) occupies the highest position.

Before giving a, roughly Longobardian analysis of Romanian PNs, we should somewhat reconsider Longobardi’s analysis, from two points of view.

The first is a more general consideration: late Minimalism dispenses with covert movement in favour of long distance agree, involved in valuing weak features of heads. Hence, N-to-D should be used only if there is evidence for it in narrow syntax. In the particular case of Romanian it has long been known that both Nouns and Adjectives move as phrases; (Grosu, Corni 1992, Cinque) hence, adoption of an N-to-D story for PNs is quite undesirable.

The second consideration is interpretative and has to do with the fact that the LF representation of a DP headed by a PN should be such that the D position has no content, so that no quantificational interpretation arises. N-to-D achieves this end by having a meaningless [i.e. featureless] constant (the PN) fill the D position, an operation which not only fills D, but also vacates the NP restriction.

We propose an alternative implementation of the same idea. At LF, D contains no *interpretable features*, being radically empty, since valued uninterpretable features are deleted. At the same time, since as already proved, PNs are DPs, if the D head is not itself visible at LF being empty, it is the Spec, DP position that must be filled by *phrasal movement*. Grossly simplifying at this point, we propose replacement of the PN LF representation in (a), by the one in (b). Essentially, we capitalize on the fact that valued uninterpretable features are cyclically erased and stipulate the [Person] feature on PNs is interpretable, while the Person feature in D is uninterpretable and strong (EPP). The representation in b has the same interpretative property as the one in a), D is featureless and may not count as an operator, and the restriction position (lexical NP) has been vacated.

()  
a.  DP  
  D   NP
  [Person]  
  N    N  
  John   John  
b.  DP  
  NP   D'  
  [iPerson]  
  D   NP
  [uPerson]
We adopt this analysis for Romanian, where, however things are more complex since [Person] is accompanied by syntactic definiteness.

In our interpretation, it is the feature structure of D and of the PN which ultimately determines the internal syntax of PN-headed DPs, more exactly the position of the PN with respect to the classifier. As far as [Person] is concerned, we will assume that, as in English, [Person] is always interpretable on the PN, but may be valued or unvalued. Moreover, when [Person] on PN is unvalued, it will be valued in the same local configuration as definiteness. Again as in English, [Person] in D is uninterpretable and unvalued. As to definiteness, definite Romanian Nouns are uniformly specified as [u+def:__] and valuation takes place in a strictly local configuration. The definiteness feature in D is valued by the specifier of the projection under D and it may as well be valued by the head of this first lower projection. Given that the proprial article is expletive, the definiteness feature in D is also uninterpretable. Since in D, both [Person] and [definiteness] are uninterpretable, at least one of them (possibly) both must have the EPP property to secure movement to Spec, DP, and thus visibility of the DP projection.

Consider now the following examples which illustrate the classifier + PN configuration. Example (a) is bare NP configuration, (ib) involves a nominal classifier, (ic) involves an evaluative adjective, representing (part of) the classifier phrase:

(a) a. Maria
    b. Secretara Maria
    c. Marele Stefan/om

Let is turn to (ib, c) first, which have a more perspicuous structure, exhibiting the classifier +PN configuration. Since the PN does not occupy the first position, it is safe to assume that the uninterpretable [Person] feature in D does not have the EPP property, and then to secure visibility of the DP projection, the (uninterpretable) definiteness feature in D must have the EPP property. In other words, the feature structure of D is as follows D[ [u[def:___, EPP], u[Person:___]]

As far as the PN itself is concerned, it has a valued interpretable Person feature, which entails the presence of the usual uninterpretable unvalued definiteness feature of Romanian nominal stems, i.e. Maria [i[Person:val, u[def:___]]

Let us survey the derivational steps involved in generating (ib), an example where the classifier is overtly expressed and undergoes definiteness agreement, the feature [u+def:___] becoming part of the classifier’s matrix. At the next step the Art head merges so that both of the unvalued uninterpretable definite features under ClassP are valued. Since definiteness in ArtP is strong, after definiteness valuation by agree, ClassP raises to Spec, ArtP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ClassP</th>
<th>Class’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>[i[Person: val]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen:fem</td>
<td>Gen:fem</td>
<td>[u+def:___]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.sg</td>
<td>Nr.sg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[u+def:___]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretara</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the final step of the derivation, D[[udef:___, EPP], [uPerson:__]] merges and should get its uninterpretable features valued. It should be obvious that both features may be valued by Agree with constituents within ArtP. The ArtP head itself values definiteness in a strictly local configuration, since ArtP [i+def:val] is the head of the projection immediately below D. Next, ArtP is attracted to Spec, DP, since definiteness is strong when it is uninterpretable. The
The [uPerson;__] feature in D may be valued by the interpretable matching feature on the PN, which is in the c-command domain of D (long distance Agree).

At the end of the derivation ArtP is in Spec D, there are no interpretable features in D and the NP position, i.e. the restriction is empty, this being a legitimate LF representation for a DP which has rigid designation.

In the Classifier + PN structure, the [Person] feature of the PN plays an important syntactic and morpho-phonological role, even if it is interpretable and valued. Syntactically, the [Person] is responsible for the generation of the ClassP, as well as for introducing syntactic definiteness.

Morpho-phonologically [Person] determines the conditions of realization of the definiteness feature, to which we now turn. In a DP headed by a CN, only the higher definiteness feature on the classifier would have been realized. However, definiteness features which are dominated by [iPerson] may or must be realized, irrespective of their position with respect to D. In our example, definiteness is realized not only on the highest definite NP, the classifier secretara, but also on the feminine PN, Maria, where definiteness is below [iPerson]. Structure (ib) is polydefinite. In contrast, in MR, a valued definite feature ([udef(umasc):val]) under [iPerson] is not realized on a masculine PN in the N-Acc cases (ic).

When a classifier no longer realizes definiteness, behaving as a masculine PN, it becomes part of the PN, a complex PN which may be reclassified.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad [\text{Class P rezidentul [PN Alin Popescu]}] \\
\text{b.} & \quad [\text{Class P medicul [PN resident Alin Popescu]}]
\end{align*}
\]

Classifiers proper, which function as such, remaining outside of the PN are always definite because of definiteness agreement. This double treatment of categorizing phrases leads to instances of systematic variation in the realization of definiteness, as shown in (35). To maintain the generalization that with the exception of masculine “traditional” PNs, definiteness is realized only once, on the highest [+N] constituent, one should analyze doctorul in (35b) as part of the PN. In other words 35a and 35b have different constituent structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{tânărul doctor Popescu} \\
& \quad [\text{ClassP [tânărul doctor]} \text{Class [NP [N Popescu(*l)]]}] \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{tânărul doctorul Popescu} \\
& \quad [\text{ClassP [tânărul]} \text{ Class [NP doctorul Popescu(*l)]}]
\end{align*}
\]

**Conclusions**

1. Romanian PNs come from the lexicon with a specific feature structure: a (valued) interpretable [Person] feature and an uninterpretable definite feature.

2. [Person] is responsible for ClassP, whose role is to supply interpretable φ-feature for the PN, which, by virtue of being meaningless, is also devoid of interpretable φ-features. ClassP is a functional projection typical of PNs.

3. In Romanian type languages [Person] entails [definiteness], realized as the suffixal definite article. Having no contentful features, the article is expletive so that the article-bearing PN is semantically atomic. The syntactic definiteness feature is active, it induces definiteness agreement between the PN and the classifier, if the latter is overt. Definiteness valuation involves strictly local Agree as with CNs.
4. The characteristic syntactic property of the expletive article is occurrence in polydefinite DPs. This is a property which distinguishes DPs headed by CNs, which realize definiteness only once on the highest [+N] term, and DPs headed by PNs. 

5. Following Longobardi (1994, 2008) we have proposed an account in which PNs are rigid since they are atomic and do not exhibit a quantifier + variable+ restriction structure. In our analysis the D is uninterpretable since it contains no contenful features. The PN (construction) moves as a phrase to Spec, DP so that there is no restriction.

4.3. Integrated appositions: the PN+ classifier structure

Romanian PNs appear in one more characteristic classifier construction. Namely, in Romanian there is a second integrated apposition structure (in the sense of Potts (2005)), available for both personal pronouns and proper names, illustrated below.

| (36) | a. Eminescu gazetarul este la fel de viu ca Eminescu poetul. |
|      | b. El lingvistul stie cum sa scrie. |
|      | c. *M-am întâlnit cu eroul poetul. |

Just as with the Class+PN construction, there is no intonation break between the PN and the ‘apposition’, a hint that this is a close or integrated apposition. The striking difference with the preceding CPN structure lies in word order, in this second case the order is not classifier + PN (e.g. *poetul Eminescu), but PN + classifier (e.g. Eminescu poetul):

In MR, this construction has the following properties:

(i) It is available to both PNs and personal pronouns, but not to common nouns. As shown in (36) above

(ii) In the PN+ classifier, the classifier is prosodically marked, representing an information focus.

Since this second structure allows both PNs and personal pronouns, but excludes definite CNs, it is likely to be based on the [Person] feature, since this is the feature that distinguishes pronouns and PNs from definite descriptions. Moreover, since the PN or the personal pronoun occupies first position in the DP, the [uPerson] feature in D must be strong this time. Accordingly, D will attract to its specifier (only) the constituent bearing the [iPerson] feature, i.e. the PN. The feature structure of D is as before, except that both [uPerson] and [u definite] are EPP. Under a foot-driven approach to movement, we will assume that [uPerson] is strong in D because, in this construction, [iPerson] on the PN is unvalued and valuation of [iPerson] is strictly local.

Let us examine the derivation of an integrated appositive construction like (.), under these assumptions. Assume that ClassP has merged and there has been definiteness agreement, producing the configuration (a). As in the preceding construction, the two [udef:___] features are valued by the Art head. At this point, the PN still has an unvalued feature, [iPerson:___], a feature which is too low to be accessible to D when it merges. To get its [Person] feature valued, the PN raises to Spec ArtP by means of an equidistance derivation. The resulting configuration is given in (.), Finally the PN legitimately moves to Spec, DP to satisfy the EPP property of the features in D.

(36a) Vracă actorul
(37) a. ClassP
    NP            Class’
The noun phrase in Spec, DP continues to be interpreted as a proper name, even if the post-nominal classifier is stressed and highlights the nature of the referent. As explained by Scott Soames, the descriptive content of the classifier is a simply a means of fixing a rigid referent. This is in line with the syntactic representation of this close appositive construction. In (d) there are no interpretable features in D so that no operator variable structure is created. This derivation is not permitted to common nouns which do not have a \([\text{Person}]\) feature. The prediction is that this structure, based on a feature common to PN in UG is available in many languages, presumably in most languages that have a definite article, unlike the preceding structure, which is based on a syntactic definiteness feature, available only in certain languages (syntactic definiteness). This prediction is confirmed.

(38)

a.  

\textbf{Michael the Brave/ Richard the Lion-Hearted}

b.  

\textit{Mihai Viteazu}
4.4. Other types of complex proper names

There are also other types of complex PNs, a particularly frequent class being that based on possessive constructions. From the syntactic point of view, these complex PNs are standard definite descriptions, containing two DPs, unlike the previously discussed structures, which contain only one DP. In the following examples the classifier is a nominal head which assigns Genitive to the PN.

(39)  
| a. | Cetatea Branului |
| b. | Apa Sâmbetei |

At the same time, since the PN itself is a nominal definite head, it may license the genitive of any other name, proper or common, this also being a productive source of complex PN formation.

(40)  
| a. | Ion al Glanetașului |
| b. | Nica al lui Stefan a Petrei/ Apetrei. |
| c. | Stefan al Moldovei |
| d. | Elisabeta a doua a Angliei/ |

Finally, as well-known, Romanian has a large number of so-called double definite constructions. PNs are expectedly possible in all of them, occupying the highest position in the double definite construction (Spec, DP outer). Since, as their name shows, these structures involve a double valuation of definiteness and proper names are syntactically definite, it is expected both that they are possible in these constructions, and that in these constructions they are interchangeable with common definite NPs. Below we list the double definite constructions and show the alternation of definite common NPs and PNs in these structures:

(41)  
| a. | the postnominal demonstrative structure  
eroul acesta; Stefan ăsta |
| b. | the adjectival article structure  
eroul cel viteaz; Stefan cel Mare |
| c. | structura cu numeral ordinal postnominal  
competitorul al doilea; Richard al treilea |
| d. | the postnominal superlative structure  
compozitorul cel mai celebru;  
Mozart cel mai celebru nu este Leopold, ci Wolfgang. |

We conclude that double definite structures are not specific to PNs and do not deserve any special considerations in presenting the syntax of PN.
Conclusions

In this first part of the paper, we have reviewed the major syntactic constructions available to PNs in MR. What is characteristic for Romanian PNs is the interplay of [Person] and [definiteness]. Romanian PNs are syntactically definite. As such they appear in all the so-called double definite constructions. In addition, they also appear in constructions where [Person] plays the crucial role: these are classifier constructions: the classifier + PN construction and the PN +classifier construction. On the basis of this analysis in the next two sections we investigate Romanian PNs from a diachronic perspective.