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Abstract
The present paper investigates punctual vs. habitual readings of Romanian proper temporal names of the type luni 'Monday' vs. lunea 'Monday.DEF'. These readings are associated with the absence vs. presence of the definite article (Franco and Lorusso 2022). The paper makes two major claims. Firstly, following Longobardi (1994, 2005), and Franco and Lorusso (2020), the paper claims that with bare, i.e., definiteless, proper time names, N-to-D movement triggers individual-like reference, which, in turn, explains why the event is interpreted as punctual. Secondly, the paper shows that the structure of proper temporal names is complex, in the sense that it contains the classifier zi 'day', thus paralleling the structure of complex descriptive proper names of the type 'the planet Venus' (see van Riemsdijk 1998, Cornilescu 2007 a.o.). This classifier is shown to be overt when there is no N-raising, and silent when N raises to D in the structure of proper temporal names.
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1. Introduction and aims

The aim of the present paper is two-fold. On the one hand, the paper aims at investigating punctual readings (1) versus habitual readings (2) of proper temporal names in Romanian, focusing on names of days (see Franco and Lorusso 2020 for Italian): 1

(1) Merg  la film marți.
go.PRES.1SG to movie Tuesday
'I'm going to the movies on Tuesday.' = one specific Tuesday

* I gratefully acknowledge the comments and suggestions of two anonymous reviewers, which helped me to write a much-improved version of the paper. I thank Anna Bondaruk, Marcel den Dikken, and Jacek Witkoś, as well as the audience at LingBaW 2021 for their very helpful comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are my own.

1 The abbreviations used in the paper are the following: ACC – accusative; CL – clitic; DAT – dative; DEF – definite article; DOM – differential object marking; FEM – feminine; FUT – future; IMPERF – imperfective; MASC – masculine; PL – plural; PRES – present; REFL – reflexive; SG – singular
As shown in example (2), when names of days appear as adverbials modifying an event, the event is interpreted as a *habitual* one if the temporal name is accompanied by the definite determiner. The example in (1), on the other hand, shows that the event is interpreted as a *punctual* one if the temporal name is bare.

Following Longobardi (1994, 2005), and Franco and Lorusso (2020), the paper claims that with bare proper time names, N-to-D movement triggers individual-like reference, which, in turn, explains why the event in interpreted as punctual. N-to-D movement is apparent in the syntax of (3 a, b). (3a) illustrates the base position of the noun *marți* / ‘Tuesday’, viz. the N position. In (3b), the noun *marți* / ‘Tuesday’ raises across the adjective *viitoare* / ‘next’ and incorporates the definite article.

The process of N-raising in (3b) is accompanied by an interesting phenomenon, the obligatory emergence of the classifier *zi* ‘day’ (to be discussed in section 3.2). Therefore, the second aim of the paper is to show that, with names of days, Romanian uses *zi* ‘day’ as a
classifier (see also the analysis of restrictive appositives in van Riemsdijk 1998 and complex or descriptive proper names in Cornilescu 2007). The paper shows that the classifier is overt when there is no N-raising (5); it is silent, however, when N raises to D (6).

(4) Merg la film viitoarea *(zi de) marți.
go.PRES.1SG to movie next.DEF (day of) Tuesday
‘I’m going to the movies next Tuesday.’

(5) minunata *(zi de) marți
wonderful.DEF day of Tuesday
‘the wonderful Tuesday’

(6) marțea minunată
Tuesday.DEF wonderful
‘the wonderful Tuesday’

It will be shown that proper temporal names take classifiers, as illustrated in (4), while the role of ‘de’/‘of’ is that of a partitive marker, assigning abstract genitive case (see Tănase-Dogaru 2008, 2009, 2017).

2. The data

In Romanian, the set of proper temporal adverbials that modify verbal events differ in interpretation. This set includes days of the week (e.g., luni, Monday, marți, Tuesday, etc.).

(7) Merg la magazine lunea.
go.PRES.1SG at shop Monday.DEF
‘I go shopping on Mondays.’

(8) Merg la magazine luni.
go.PRES.1SG at shop Monday
‘I’m going shopping on Monday.’

When the temporal modifier is accompanied by the definite determiner (7), the event is interpreted as a habitual one, while when the proper temporal modifier lacks a definite determiner and it, therefore, appears ‘bare’ (8), the event is perceived as punctual, non-iterable3.

3 Not all native speakers share the judgements concerning the data in (7) and (8). However, in out-of-the-blue sentences or natural question-and-answer pairs of the type in (a) (where speaker A inquires about speaker B’s arrangement on a specific Monday, i.e. next Monday).

(iii) A: Ce faci luni?
what do.PRES.1SG Monday?
‘What are you doing on Monday? / this Monday?’

B: Merg la film luni / Luni merg la film.
go.PRES.1SG at movie Monday / Monday go.PRES.SG at movie
‘I’m going to the movies on Monday.’
The same variation can be found in Italian (Franco and Lorusso 2022). (9b) shows the habitual reading, encapsulated by the definite proper temporal name, while (9c) shows the punctual reading, with the bare temporal name. Unlike Romanian, Italian also has the variant in (9a) for the habitual reading, featuring the genitive-assigning preposition *di* (Franco and Lorusso 2022: 2):

(9)

(a) *vado al cinema di lunedì* = habitual reading
go.PRES.1SG to.the cinema of Monday
'I (usually) go to the cinema on Mondays.'

(b) *vado al cinema il lunedì* = habitual reading
go.PRES.1SG to.the cinema DEF Monday
'I (usually) go to the cinema on Mondays.'

(c) *vado al cinema lunedì* = punctual reading
go.PRES.1SG to.the cinema Monday
'I go to the cinema next Monday.'

Franco and Lorusso (2022: 2)

Unlike Italian, where the contrast between the punctual and the habitual reading holds only for irrealis contexts (see Franco and Lorusso 2022), in Romanian the contrast holds for other tenses, the past (10) or the future (11), which indicates that it is the peculiar behavior of proper temporal adverbs that triggers the asymmetry in the aspectual interpretation of the event, and not the interpretation of the tense involved, i.e., realis or irrealis.

(10) *Mergeam la magazin lunea / luni.*
go.IMPERF.1SG at shop Monday.DEF / Monday
'I went shopping on Mondays / I went shopping on Monday.'

(11) *Voi merge la magazin lunea / luni*
will.1SG go to shop Monday.DEF / Monday
'I'll go shopping on Mondays / I'm going shopping on Monday.'

Another relevant observation concerns time adverbs. Time adverbs like *ieri* ‘yesterday’ or *azi* ‘today’ cannot be employed with definite determiners, irrespective of their realis or irrealis orientation (12)-(13). They can convey only a punctual interpretation of the event, just like the ‘bare’ adverbials in (8) (for the Italian data see Franco and Lorusso 2022:6).

(12) *Am mers la magazin ieri / *ieriul.*
have.1SG gone to shop yesterday / yesterday.DEF
'I went shopping yesterday.'

In contrast, in question-and-answer pairs of the type in (b), the habitual interpretation is triggered (speaker A inquires about what speaker B usually does)

(iv) A: *Ce faci lunea?*
what do.PRES.1SG Monday.DEF?
'What do you do on Mondays?'

B: *Merg la film lunea / Lunea merg la film.*
go.PRES.1SG at movie Monday.DEF / Monday.DEF go.PRES.1SG at movie
'I go to the movies on Mondays.'
(13) Merg  la magazine  azi /  *aziul.
go.PRES.1SG at shop  today /  *today.DEF
'I'm going shopping today.'

Similarly, yet another category of proper temporal names in Romanian, i.e., names of months, cannot take a definite determiner either. Since names of months cannot co-occur with the definite article in Romanian, the habitual-punctual distinction is excluded in this case, as illustrated by (14).

(14) Merg  la țară  in mai /  *maiul.
go.1SG at countryside  in May /  *May.DEF
'I'm going to the countryside in May.'

As far as proper names of seasons are concerned, the first observation is that they are able to encode the punctual-habitual distinction by an alternation between a prepositional construction (15) and the emergence of the definite article (16). The prepositional construction in (15) encodes the punctual reading, while the definite article construction in (16) encodes the habitual reading.

(15) Merg  la țară  la primăvară
go.PRES.1SG at countryside  at spring
'I'm going to the countryside this spring.'

(16) Merg  la țară  primăvara.
go.1SG at countryside  spring.DEF
'I go to the countryside in spring.'

The cursory glance at the data indicates, therefore, that an analysis is needed to account for the association between the definite determiner accompanying names of days (and seasons) and the habitual interpretation.

3. Analysis

3.1. N-to-D raising with proper temporal names

This section aims at showing that, in Romanian proper temporal adverbials, like ‘canonical’ proper nouns in Italian (see Longobardi 1994, 2005, Alexiadou 2001, Tănase-Dogaru 2009, a.o.), are able to raise to D. Longobardi (1994) provided evidence for N-to-D raising in Romance languages, by mainly arguing that proper nouns raise to the D-position, the locus of referentiality. Starting from the examples in (17), Longobardi (1994) assumes that the proper noun needs to move from Nᵒ in order to fill in the empty D⁰ position, thus crossing over the adjective/possessive:

(17) a. Il mio Gianni ha finalmente telefonato (Italian)
   the my Gianni has finally called up
b. *Miò Gianni ha finalmente telefonato
   my Gianni has finally called up

   Longobardi (1994: 623)

c. Gianni mio ha finalmente telefonato
   Gianni my has finally called up

In (17), the proper noun Gianni raises from N₀ in (17a) to D₀ in (17c), crossing over the possessive mio ‘my’ and incorporating the definite article. As shown by (17b), in the absence of the definite article, the proper noun cannot remain in N₀. In other words, the proper name either remains in N₀, while definiteness is expressed by the definite article in D₀, or it raises to D₀, where it incorporates definiteness.

In English, on the other hand, as illustrated by the contrast in (18a,b), proper nouns cannot raise to D₀. Therefore, by the logic of the ‘only DPs as arguments’ hypothesis, i.e., a nominal expression is an argument only if it is introduced by a category D, Longobardi (1994) assumes the existence of an empty determiner in the English example (18a), which is responsible for definiteness:

   (18)
   a. Old John came in. (English)
   b. *John old came in.

   Longobardi (1994: 624)

The examples in (17) and (18) show that proper names move to D overtly in Italian, while English shows covert movement of the proper noun to D. In conclusion, Longobardi (1994) proposes a parametric variation for Italian and English: Italian substitutes N for D in overt syntax while English does the same at LF.

In Romanian proper nouns also bear definite articles (19a). As the examples in (19a-c) show, in contrast to languages like German (19b) and Greek (19c), which appear in the company of a proclitic definite article, Romanian proper nouns bear enclitic definite articles.

   (19)
   a. Clujul e frumos. / I-am dat lui Ion cartea.
      Cluj.DEF is beautiful / CL.ACC.DAT.SG-have given DEF.DAT Ion book.DEF
      ‘The city of Cluj is beautiful’ / ‘I gave Ion the book’
   b. Der Hans ist weggegangen. (German)
      DEF Hans is arrived
      ‘Hans left.’
   c. O Kostis efuge. (Greek)
      DEF Kostis ran
      ‘Kostis left.’

   Borer (2005: 85)

A very interesting phenomenon related to the fact that proper nouns have a complex syntactic structure is the behavior of animal names in Romanian. As shown in Tănase-Dogaru (2009: 139), animal names can get a proper noun interpretation when they appear without determiners, i.e., in D. In (20a), the noun is licensed as a common noun while in (20b) it is licensed as a proper noun.
(20)
a. *Viermele este scărbos.* / *Hiena este moartă.*
   worm.DEF is disgusting. / hyena.DEF is dead.
   ‘The worm is disgusting.’ / ‘The hyena is dead’

b. *Vierme s-a supărat pe mine / Hienă a plecat în turneu.*
   Worm is upset with me / hyena left in tour.
   ‘Worm is upset with me’/ ‘Hyena went on tour.’

Tănase-Dogaru (2009: 139)

It is a familiar observation that, in Romanian, Differential Object Marking by means of *pe*
selects type <e> entities, a reading which is reinforced by clitic-doubling. The contrasts in (21)
clearly show that common nouns are licensed as proper nouns in the appropriate syntactic
configurations:

(21)
a. *L-am văzut pe Vierme.*
   CL.ACC.MASC.SG-have.PRES.1SG seen DOM Worm
   ‘I saw Worm.’

b. *Am văzut viermele.*
   have.PRES.1SG seen worm.DEF
   ‘I saw the worm.’

Having shown that proper nouns have a complex structure, and going back to the proper
temporal names or adverbs in (7)-(8), repeated here for convenience as (22)-(23), I claim that
this subset of proper nouns also has a complex syntactic structure.

(22) *Merg la magazine lunea.*
   go.PRES.1SG at shop Monday.DEF
   ‘I go shopping on Mondays.’

(23) *Merg la magazine lui.*
   go.PRES.1SG at shop Monday
   ‘I’m going shopping on Monday.’

As stated before, when the proper temporal name is accompanied by the definite determiner,
the interpretation is necessarily habitual (22); when the proper temporal name is bare, the
interpretation is necessarily punctual (23). It is the raising of the proper temporal name to D
that gives rise to the punctual interpretation. The proper time adverb can move to the D
position and it is spelt out in D, as illustrated in (24) (following Franco and Lorusso 2022). N-
to-D movement triggers an individual-like reference, in a manner identical to the proper
name movement to D in Longobardi (2005, 2008), the result of which is the interpretation of
the event as punctual.

(24) [IP [VP merg [1SG [PP la magazin] [SpecDP luni … [NP luni]]]]
   go.PRES.1SG at shop Monday
   (see Franco and Lorusso 2020: 5)

This type of analysis is in line with other observations in the literature on proper temporal
367) claims that proper temporal names, or *calendrical* names are hybrid, in the sense that they
are deictically restricted names that can also be used as count nouns (see Anderson 2003: 367). Langendonck (2007: 223) notices the same ambiguity in English examples such as (25a,b):

(25)  
a. June is (usually) a hot month.  
b. June was hot.

(25a) shows a ‘recursive (cyclic, generic, habitual)’ interpretation of the month name June, which indicates the spelling out of June in N. (25b) exemplifies a non-recursive, more ‘prototypical’ deictic reading of the proper name, which shows that the proper name has moved and is spelled out in D (as in (24)). Since English has bare proper names, the punctual vs. habitual distinction can only be encoded by means different aspectual make-ups, i.e. the present in (25a) vs. the past in (25b), unlike languages like Italian or Romanian, which have proper names surfacing in the company of definite articles, proper temporal names included. As originally observed by Franco and Lorusso (2022: 7), the situation in (25a,b) is related to the punctual vs. habitual (or bounded vs. unbounded) value of Italian proper temporal names. As argued throughout in this paper, the same punctual vs. habitual value can be ascribed to Romanian proper temporal names. As Franco and Lorusso put it, “there must be a way to turn a proper name into a countable entity in order to obtain a habitual/iterative value for the event described by means of proper temporal adverbials” (Franco and Lorusso 2022: 7).

This section has shown that proper temporal names can move to D, in a manner similar to the way proper names undergo N-to-D movement. The reflex of this syntactic movement is the punctual interpretation. The next section shows that the syntactic structure of (temporal) proper names contains a classifier; this classifier is overt in the adjective – proper name order, i.e., in the absence of N-to-D movement.

3.2. On classifiers and proper (temporal) names

The main focus of this section is to discuss the complex syntactic structure of proper (temporal) names, illustrated in (26)-(29). (26) illustrates the punctual reading of the proper temporal name marți ‘Tuesday’, while (27) illustrates N-to-D movement across the adjective viitoarea ‘next’ resulting in the punctual interpretation, mainly because of the meaning of the adjective ‘next’. (28) illustrates an interesting property of the proper temporal name accompanied by an adjective like viitoare ‘next’, which triggers the punctual reading, namely the presence of the adjective triggers the overt realization of a classifier zi ‘day’, which would otherwise remain silent. (29) shows that the presence of an evaluative adjective like minunata ‘wonderful’ also mandatorily triggers the overt realization of the classifier.

(26) Merg la film marți.  
    go.PRES.1SG to movie Tuesday  
'I'm going to the movies on Tuesday.'

(27) Merg la film marțea viitoare.  
    go.PRES.1SG to movie Tuesday.DEF next  
'I'm going to the movies next Tuesday.'
The main claim of the section is that this syntactic structure of proper (temporal) names contains a classifier zi ‘day’, which is silent whenever there is N-to-D movement, as shown by (26) and (27); the classifier is, however, obligatorily overt when the proper temporal name stays in N, as illustrated by (28) and (29).

3.2.1. What’s in a name? A classifier

Starting from an investigation of nominal constructions of the type in (30), which go by many names in the literature, such as restrictive appositives, qualificational nouns, descriptive proper names, complex proper names, qualitative classifiers (van Riemsdijk 1998, Löbel 2001, Cornilescu 2007, Tănase-Dogaru 2011, 2013), this section shows that this type of nominal constructions contains an overt qualitative classifier in the syntactic make-up (Cornilescu 2007, Tănase-Dogaru 2013).

(30)

a. Profesorul *Ionescu*  
   professor.DEF Ionescu  
   ‘Professor Ionescu’

b. Regina *Elizabeta*  
   queen.DEF Elisabeth  
   ‘Queen Elizabeth’

c. Mătuşa *Tamara*  
   aunt.DEF Tamara  
   ‘aunt Tamara’

d. Priţul *Carol*  
   prince.DEF Charles  
   ‘Prince Charles’

e. Oraşul *Iaşi*  
   city.DEF Iasi  
   ‘the city of Iaşi’

f. Strada *Paris*  
   street.DEF Paris  
   ‘Paris street’

Complex or descriptive proper nouns are proper nouns formed of a common noun + proper noun. The complex or descriptive noun designates a social role (kinship, profession, institutional role), or a sort of place (city, street, river, village, etc.), some other entity (a theatre, a planet, etc.) (see Cornilescu 2007).

---

4 I will refer to this type of construction with the term ‘complex proper noun’ or ‘descriptive proper noun’.
Therefore, in (30), the functional structure of the proper nouns includes not only a D [+def, +phi, + Person] but also a noun designating a social role, a profession, a name of place, etc., which functions as a (qualitative) classifier. This conception reflects the intuition that a complete understanding of a proper noun requires identifying the kind of entity that it names (Cornilescu 2007: 61).

The role of the common noun is that of classifying entities, indicating the kind of entity the proper name denotes, as in Professor Smith. While for simple proper nouns, the proper noun itself checks the classifier feature, by Move or Agree, for complex or descriptive proper nouns, the descriptive common noun merges as the specifier of the nominal-class head, since the feature of this n-head is one of the features of the common noun. With complex or descriptive proper nouns, the classifier head is overt (Cornilescu 2007: 63).

The structure of a Romanian complex or descriptive proper noun is given in (31) (from Cornilescu 2007: 75), where the proper noun is too low to check [+def, +phi + person], so the descriptive NP must be definite, and checks the D [+def] feature.

\[
\text{(31) } \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{nP} \quad \text{[+def…]} \quad \text{NP}[+def] \quad \text{n’} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{N+D} \quad \text{Professoru + 1 [person]} \quad \text{Popescu} \quad \text{Cornilescu (2007: 75)}
\]

3.2.2. Classifiers and names of months and years

This section shows that ‘names’ of years, months and hours also behave like complex/descriptive proper nouns containing (silent or overt) classifiers (see also Tănase-Dogaru 2009, 2013). In Romanian, there is an interesting variation between constructions like (32a) and (32b):

\[
\text{(32) } \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Benedict s-a născut în anul 480.} \\
& \text{Benedict REF L-h as born in year.DEF 480} \\
& \text{‘Benedict was born in the year 480.’ (CoRoLa\textsuperscript{5})}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{O a doua invazie a urmat în 480.} \\
& \text{a second invasion has followed in 480.} \\
& \text{‘A second invasion followed in 480.’ (CoRoLa\textsuperscript{6})}
\end{align*}
\]

Although years prior to 1000 are better with the overt classifier ‘anul’ / ‘year.DEF’, the same variation can be seen with constructions involving more recent years (33a-b):

\[\text{https://korap.racai.ro/?q=%C3%AEn+anul+480&ql=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021}\]
\[\text{https://korap.racai.ro/?q=%C3%AEn+480&ql=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021}\]
The examples clearly show that, when referring to years, there is variation between the silent and the overt classifier ‘anul’ / ‘year.DEF’, which makes years very similar to descriptive proper names.

However, when there is an adjective involved in the syntactic structure of complex proper names of years, the classifier is overt (34). The same phenomenon was illustrated for proper temporal names of days, in the sense that the adjective forces the spelling out of the classifier (see (27) and (28) above):

(34) groaznicul an 1946

‘the horrible year of 1946’

The same variation can be noticed with names of months. The examples in (34a) and (34b) show that, in the case of names of months, the classifier ‘luna’ / ‘month.DEF’ is either silent (34a) or overt (34b).

(34)

a. in aprilie devine din nou un om liber.

‘in April he becomes again a free man’ (CoRoLa)

b. in luna aprilie au loc expoziții și festivaluri

‘In the month of April exhibitions and festivals take place.’ (CoRoLa)

The presence of an adjective which agrees in feminine gender with the overt classifier ‘luna’ / ‘month.DEF’ is either silent (34a) or overt (34b).

An anonymous reviewer and the text.

10 https://korap.racai.ro/?q=%C3%AEn+luna+aprilie&ql=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021
11 https://korap.racai.ro/?q=%C3%AEn+luna+aprilie&q=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021
This section has argued that ‘names’ of years and months behave syntactically in a fashion parallel to descriptive proper names of the type the planet Venus (van Riemsdijk 1998). These constructions possess a classifier in their make-up, a classifier that is either silent or overt. The spelling out of the classifier is related to the presence of an adjective in the structure. The next section takes a look at expressions involving the classifier hour, which in turn, is argued to be part of the syntactic make-up of expressions telling the time.

3.2.3. Classifiers and names of hours

Kayne (2005: 258) notes that in the English example (35), HOUR acts as a silent classifier:

(35) a. minunata lună aprilie
   wonderful.FEM.DEF month.FEM April
   ‘the wonderful month of April’

b. minunatul aprilie = minunatul MONTH aprilie
   wonderful.MASC.DEF April = wonderful.MASC.DEF MONTH.MASC.DEF April
   ‘the wonderful April’

c. *minunata aprilie
   wonderful.FEM.DEF April
   ‘the wonderful April’

As for Romance languages, Kayne (2005) notes that French (36) differs from Italian (37) with respect to time, in that the classifier heures / ‘hours’ must be overt in French:

(36) Il est six heures.
    It is six hours
    ‘It’s six o’clock.’

(37) Sono le sei.
    are the six
    ‘It’s six o’clock.’

In Italian, the corresponding noun can be present, although that is less usual:

(38) Sono le ore sei.
    are the hours six
    ‘It’s six o’clock.’

Kayne (2005: 259) argues that the obligatory presence of the classifier in French is related to the presence of the definite article le in Italian (38) versus its absence in French (36). I take this to mean that the presence of overt lexical material in the D layer is able to license silent classifiers, i.e. the case of Italian, while the absence of the D layer correlates with the overt classifiers, i.e. the case of French.
Romanian exhibits the contrast in (39a,b), which shows that the classifier may be either silent or overt. However, the most common way of telling the time is (39a), where the classifier is silent.12

(39)

a. E șase.
   is six
   'It's six o'clock.'

b. E ora șase.
   is hour six
   'It's six o'clock.'

The classifier HOUR is overt in examples such as (40):

(40)

a. De la ora 6 dimineața am plecat.
   of at hour.DEF 6 morning.DEF have.1.SG left.
   'I left at 6 o'clock in the morning.' (CoRoLa13)

b. Era dimineața la ora 6.
   Was morning.DEF at hour.DEF 6
   'It was six o'clock in the morning.' (CoRoLa14)

Like Italian, Romanian also has the variant in (41), which is, however, perceived as bookish and obsolete. In this case, the overt classifier surfaces in the plural.

(41) pe la orele 6 am făcut un mic popas
   on at hours.DEF 6 have.1.SG made a small stop
   'at about 6 o'clock we had a short break' (CoRoLa15)

Therefore, it seems safe to assume that, in telling the time, classifiers are also present, whether silent or overt.

The presence of an adjective in the complex structure of these proper names triggers the overt realization of the classifier (42):

(42)

a. groaznică oră 6
   horrible.FEM.DEF hour 6
   'the horrible 6'

b. *groaznică / groaznicul 6
   horrible.FEM.DEF / horrible.MASC.DEF 6
   'the horrible 6'

Section 3.2 has shown that the structure of complex proper names, including names of social roles, names of places, and names of years, months and hours, contains a classifier. In the case

12 The preference of (39a) over (39b) may be related to the clash between a plural feature of the cardinal for 6 and the singular feature of the classifier ora 'hour'. I leave this matter to further research.
13 https://korap.racai.ro/?q=ora+6&ql=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021
14 https://korap.racai.ro/?q=ora+6&ql=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021
15 https://korap.racai.ro/?q=orele+6&ql=cosmas2&cutoff=1, accessed September 27, 2021
of proper names of years, months, and hours, the classifier may be silent or overt. The classifier, however, is (necessarily) overt when the noun is accompanied by an adjective.

4. The syntactic structure and the role of de/di ‘of’

This section capitalizes on what has been said so far with respect to the syntactic structure of complex proper names, including proper temporal names, and proposes a syntactic structure of the type classifier-noun for proper temporal adverbs. It was shown that the structure of proper (temporal) names contains a classifier that can be silent or overt. It seems natural to assume that the underlying representation of (43a) should be (43b):

\[(43)\]
\[a. \quad \text{marți} \quad \text{Tuesday} \]
\[b. \quad \text{ZIUA DE marți} \quad \text{DAY of Tuesday} \]

The same can be assumed about Italian, as shown by the contrast between (44a) and (44b), the difference being that di ‘of’ is overt:

\[(44)\]
\[a. \quad \text{martedì} \quad \text{Tuesday} \]
\[b. \quad \text{GIORNO DI martedì} \quad \text{DAY OF Tuesday} \]

Since one of the pre-conditions for the postulation of silent elements is their attestation in the overt form, (45a,b) show that the classifier DAY can also be overt:

\[(45)\]
\[a. \quad \text{De ce este ziua de marți atât de încârcată de superstiții}^{16} \quad \text{(Romanian)} \]
\[\quad \text{of what is day of Tuesday so loaded of superstitions} \]
\[\quad \text{‘why is the day of Tuesday so loaded with superstitions’} \]
\[b. \quad \text{Ma un giorno di lunedì capirai […]}^{17} \quad \text{(Italian)} \]
\[\quad \text{but a day of Monday understand. FUT.2SG} \]
\[\quad \text{‘One Monday you will understand’} \]

In order to articulate a syntactic structure for proper temporal names, the role of de/di ‘of’ needs to be determined. In Italian (see Franco and Lorusso 2022), the prepositional element di ‘of’ appears with proper temporal names of days and lends the example a habitual reading (46), a reading also available with the definite article (47):

\[\ldots\]

---

16 https://www.libertateapentrufemei.ro/superstitii/de-ce-este-ziua-de-marti-atat-de-incarcata-de-superstitii-212297

Manzini and Savoia (2011) and Franco and Lorusso (2020) analyze the *di* element as a genitive-assigning preposition, different from the partitive marker *dei*, but still involving an 'inclusion/sub-set' relation.

I claim that the same happens in Romanian. Whenever the classifier is overt, as in (48), the *de* element is a partitive-genitive preposition. Moreover, the syntactic structure of such constructions parallels the one present with pseudo-partitive constructions generally (49) (Tănase-Dogaru 2008, 2009, 2017).

Pseudo-partitive constructions are seen as single multi-headed extended projections, as shown in (50). N₁ in pseudo-partitives is a semi-lexical or functional element which behaves as a classifier, turning pseudo-partitives into Classifier Phrases (Tănase-Dogaru 2008, 2009). (50) gives the syntactic representation of pseudo-partitives, where *de* 'of' is a partitive marker, assigning N₃, i.e., the lexical head, abstract genitive case (Tănase-Dogaru 2008, following van Riemsdijk 1998, Vos 1999).

Classifiers project universally in the functional architecture of nominal phrases. The head of the ClasP may be filled with lexical material – as in the case of pseudo-partitive constructions – or with silent material (see Kayne 2005, van Riemsdijk 2005, Tănase-Dogaru 2008, 2009). For instance, in the pair (51a,b), (51b) contains the silent noun NUMBER acting as a classifier:
(51) a. Ce case au unii!
   what houses have some (people)
   ‘some have such big/beautiful houses!’

b. Ce de case au unii!
   what of houses have some (people)
   ‘some have so many houses!’

Tănase-Dogaru (2008: 317)

(51a) is an exclamation about some salient property of houses, for example their being large or beautiful; on the other hand, (51b) can only be an exclamation about the relatively large number of the houses in question.

The syntactic structure of proper temporal names also contains a classifier, which may be silent, i.e., DAY or overt, i.e., zi in Romanian, giorno in Italian. In what follows, I will exemplify the syntactic structures of the Italian and Romanian proper temporal name constructions. I will start with the Italian data, simplified for the current purposes as (52a-c).

(52) a. di lunedì (habitual reading) = DAY di lunedì
b. il lunedì (habitual reading) = il DAY OF lunedì
c. lunedì (punctual interpretation) = DAY OF lunedì

The corresponding syntactic structures are given in (53a-c).
The Romanian data are shown again in (54a,b), with their corresponding syntactic structures in (55a,b):

(54)

a. *lunea* (habitual reading) = DAY OF lunea
b. *luni* (punctual reading) = DAY OF luni

(55)

a. 

b. 

\[DP\]

\[D^0\]

\([+\text{def}]\]

\[\text{ClasP}\]

\[\text{Clas}'\]

\[\text{Clas}^0\]

\[\text{PP}\]

\[\text{DAY}\]

\[P^0\]

\[\text{NP}\]

\[\text{OF}\]

\[\text{lunea}\]

\[\text{luni}\]
In (55a), lunea ‘Monday.DEF’ is generated in N, a position it does not leave, it is the lack of movement which accounts for the habitual reading. (55b) illustrates N-raising of the proper temporal name to D.

This type of movement is visible in examples (56a,b), with the corresponding syntactic structures in (57a,b). In (56a), the emergence of the adjective triggers the overt realization of the classifier DAY, while in (56b), there is N-movement to D, and the classifier remains silent. The adjective in (56a) modifies the classifier, a relation which triggers the overt realization of the classifier.

(56)
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ viitoarea zi de luni} \\
& \text{next.DEF day of Monday}
\end{align*}
\]

b. \text{lunea viitoare}

Monday.DEF next

(57)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{DP} \\
& \text{D'} \\
& \text{D''} \\
& \text{[+def]} \\
& \text{AP viitoarea} \\
& \text{Clas'} \\
& \text{Clas'' zi} \\
& \text{PP} \\
& \text{P'} \\
& \text{P'' de} \\
& \text{NP of luni}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{DP} \\
& \text{D'} \\
& \text{D''} \\
& \text{[+def]} \\
& \text{AP viitoarea} \\
& \text{Clas'} \\
& \text{Clas'' DAY} \\
& \text{PP} \\
& \text{P'} \\
& \text{P'' OF lunea}
\end{align*}
\]

---

I follow Nicolae (2013) and Corniles cu (2016) in arguing that Romanian has a suffixal definite article. In a simple structure where the DP consists only of a definite noun, the uninterpretable definite feature of the noun values the interpretable definite feature of the D Probe by means of the operation Agree (Corniles cu 2016: 14). This means that a DP like \text{lunea ‘Monday.the’} in (55a) remains in N and undergoes Agree with the definite feature in D.
In (57a), \textit{luni} ‘Monday’ is generated in the N layer, in a typical classifier-noun sequence of the type discussed in section 4. In (57b), \textit{lunea} ‘Monday.the’ undergoes movement to SpecDP, crossing over the adjective \textit{viitoare} ‘next’, in a manner similar to proper names in Italian (see section 3.1)

This section has shown that the syntactic structure of proper temporal names is complex, in the sense that it contains a classifier, which may be silent or overt. The overt realization of the classifier is triggered by the presence of adjectives, while the prepositional element \textit{de/di} ‘of’ is a partitive-genitive marker.

5. Conclusions and further research

The paper has started from the empirical observation that proper temporal names in Romanian may have punctual or a habitual interpretation. These interpretations are associated with the absence or presence, respectively, of the definite article. With bare proper temporal names, N-to-D movement triggers individual-like reference, which, in turn, explains why the event is interpreted as punctual. An important finding of the paper is related to the complex syntactic structure of proper temporal names. This syntactic structure contains classifiers, which may be silent or overt. The silence of the classifiers is related to the phenomenon of N-raising. I leave for further research a finer-grained parameterization of Italian and Romanian with respect to the silence of the prepositional element \textit{di/de} ‘of’.
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