1. **INTRODUCTION**

Received wisdom: proper names differ syntactically from common nouns in that they lack the definite article, which would have been expected otherwise.

Actual facts are more complicated:

1. a. the Campbells, the Yorks  
   b. the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, the Monty Pythons  
   c. the Mets, the Mikes, the Tigers

2. a. the Alps, the Rockies  
   b. the Hebrides, the Orkneys  
   c. the Netherlands  
   d. the Pleiades, the Hyades

3. a. the Seine, the Erie, the Atlantic  
   b. the Milky Way, the Broadway  
   c. the Bronx, the Ukraine

Are proper names of *animate* entities special?

Counterexample: German proper names:

4. a. der Fujiyama, der Etna (but also: *die Zugspitze*)  
   b. der Mansarovar, der Lago Maggiore  
   c. der Parthenon, der Houriaji  
   d. der Atlantik (cf. *der Atlantische Ozean*), der Indik…

5. (der) Hans, (die) Maria…

6. München, Berlin, Frankfurt am Main…

In a number of German dialects it is city and country names that are anarthrous!

Furthermore, cross-linguistically, the presence of an article with a proper name may depend on its morphological case. Such is the case, e.g., in Romanian (Meyer-Lübke 1890, Hoffman 1989, Cojocaru 2003, Gönczöl-Davies 2008) and perhaps in Western Armenian:

7. a. Iulian – lui Iulian, Radu – lui Radu, Marcel – lui Marcel  
   b. Egipt – Egiptului, Bucureşti - Bucureştiului

It would seem unlikely that proper names denote different things with different case-marking

But it is not impossible that in other instances of language-internal variation the presence or absence of the definite article is semantically motivated.

---
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2. **Test case 1: German**

Well-known fact about German: "optional" definiteness with proper names:

(8) (der) Hans, (die) Maria…

Actually, diglossia: there are dialects (e.g., Swiss German) where the use of an article with a proper name is claimed to be obligatory in argument positions.

Even in these dialects names of countries, cities, villages, continents and some others appear bare (although names of some individual geographical entities require the definite article).

Moltmann 2013: inanimate proper names do not form a uniform class with respect to article omission and relativization (on the latter see below).

Parameters of variation:

- **animacy**: [+animate] proper names display dialectal variation
- **lexical-semantic category**: river names require the definite article, city and town names disallow it, country names vary

All proper names in lexical-semantic categories that do not give rise to a specific gender (e.g., planets or rivers) bear the definite article in German. To the best of my knowledge, they are also all masculine or feminine.

Furthermore, all syntactically simplex country names with an obligatory definite article have a gender/number specification that is distinct from neuter singular (in German and in Dutch).

In addition, there appears to be a tendency towards simultaneously dropping the article and switching the gender to neuter (van Langendonck 2007:208 discusses the article drop with the Ukraine, the Sudan, etc., in Dutch and German and the accompanying subtle change of attitude, but does not note the corresponding gender switch):

(9) a. der Irak, der Jemen... masculine
    b. die Schweiz, die Türkei... feminine
    c. die USA... plural

The only city name with a definite article in German that I'm aware of (der Haag 'the Hague', a variant of Den Haag) is masculine.

The empirical generalization seems pretty clear: an overt definite article is obligatory with formal gender specification.

On the assumption that (certain lexical-semantic categories of) toponyms may be inherently specified for gender, those toponyms will appear with an obligatory definite article. In fact, all the obligatorily non-bare place names that Moltmann 2013 discusses (mountains, temples and lakes) are masculine, which is a non-default value for inanimate entities:

(10) a. der Fujiyama, der Etna (but also: die Zugspitze) mountains
    b. der Mansarovar, der Lago Maggiore lakes
    c. der Parthenon, der Houriaji temples
    d. der Atlantik (cf. der Atlantische Ozean), der Indik... oceans

Now what about neuter toponyms with an obligatory definite article (names of sub-regions)?

(11) a. das Saarland 'Saarland', das Baskenland 'the Basque country'…
    b. Deutschland 'Germany', England

The German dialectal variation in the use of the definite article with proper names can be attributed to whether [animate] proper names are formally specified for gender. This kind of optionality is only possible with animates, both proper names and common nouns.

Is there a semantic alternative?
Moltmann 2013: non-bare proper names contain a **syntactically explicit null sortal** (i.e., a common noun) and a quotation.

The gender-based approach is **preferable:**

- unification with plurals: the obligatory definite article in plural proper names has the same nature
- unification with non-bare proper names belonging to lexical-semantic categories lacking a default gender specification
- cross-linguistic coverage: the link between an obligatory article and a non-default gender in Romance [animate] proper names
- no need to specify the distribution or the meaning of the putative null sortal
- the correlation of gender with lexical-semantic categories is not limited to proper names (e.g., names of trees in Latin are all feminine, names of trees, flowers and fruit in German are mostly feminine, etc.)

Ede Zimmermann, p.c.: the presence of phi-features **forces the proper name to function as a predicate**, either as a result of coercion (IDENT) or due to its underlying ambiguity.

Problem: for this hypothesis to work it is necessary to assume that the relevant phi-features are uniformly interpretable. **Will it apply to the Netherlands?**

**NB:** I would agree (for independent reasons) with the premise that phi-features are all interpretable, but maybe not with the hypothesis that predicate denotation is necessary: formal phi-features do not impose restrictions on the extension of a predicate, but on the kind corresponding to it. Mine is very much the minority view, however.

I don’t see a clear reason here to prefer either the syntactic explanation or the semantic one.

3. **Test case 2:** locative prepositions with French proper names

Baseline: comparing to English, proper names of cities are unexceptional (like in German):

NB: The gender of French cities is a thorny issue, see Edwardsson 1968, Hasselrot 1943/1944, Lomholt 1983

(12) à Paris, à Nice, à Londres...

**Country names** (with two exceptions, Israel and Bahrain) introduce an additional quirk: the definite article:

(13) la France, le Canada, l’Egypte...

In locative/directional PPs the combination of à+DEF alternates with the portmanteau *en* in the function of phi-specification and phonology of the proper name:

(14) *en France vs. au Canada*

Cornulier 1972, Zwicky 1987, Miller et al. 1997: With **country names en** must be used if the proper name is **not a plural** and

- the proper name is **feminine** or
- the proper name **begins with a vowel**

Exactly the same pattern surfaces with some time expressions, cf. Cornulier 1972, *en hiver/au printemps*.

(15) a. en France, en Mauritanie… **feminine**
   b. au Canada, au Pérou… **masculine**
   c. en Israel, en Egypte... **feminine/vowel**
   d. en Afghanistan, en Angola, en Iran... **masculine/vowel**
   e. aux/*en Philippines/Indes **plural**
The preposition à cannot be replaced by en if it is not locative:

(16) lié à la France/*en France

Miller et al. 1997: The same is true for the locative and relational de:

(17) a. de France, de Mauritanie… feminine
    b. du Canada, du Pérou… masculine
    c. d’Israel, d’Egypte… feminine/vowel
    d. d’Afghanistan, d’Angola, d’Iran… feminine/vowel
    e. des/*de Philippines/Indes plural

The article cannot disappear if the preposition is not locative:

(18) discuter de *(la) France

In all these cases the masculine beginning in a vowel behaves like the feminine

Main contributing factors:

- the lexical-semantic class: city names (Paris) vs. country names (la France)
- the presence of a light locative preposition (à/de)
- the phonology of the toponym (vowel-initial stems)
- and individual items may behave differently (e.g., Bahrain appears without any article in argument positions, but combines with au and du)

It seems extremely unlikely that toponyms beginning with a vowel differ in their semantics from those beginning with a consonant

The explanation here has to be morphosyntactic. Strikingly, it is not the variation au/en and du/de that suggests a difference in the underlying semantics of some proper names vs. others -- it is the alternation between au/en and the prepositional variant dans+def.

With restrictive modification dans is used (cf. Lomholt 1983:126ff;145):

(19) a. dans l’Algérie/ la France contemporaine/ d’aujourd’hui in DEF+Algeria DEF France contemporary of+today in contemporary/today’s Algeria/France
    b. dans l’Iran/ le Canada contemporain/ d’aujourd’hui in DEF+Iran DEF Canada contemporary of+today in contemporary/today’s Iran/Canada

(20) a. *en√dans l’Alsace libérée
    b. *en√dans la Bretagne de mon enfance

So the full picture includes three possibilities, not two, and all three can be attested within the same lexical-semantic class of US states and Canadian provinces (as well as with other compositional administrative units of federal states, see Lomholt 1983):

(21) a. en Californie, Caroline du Nord, Caroline du Sud… feminine states
    b. en/dans l’Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas… vowel-initial masculine states
    c. dans le/au Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware… masculine states
    d. à Hawaï island

Unlike the "functional" prepositions à and de, dans is a contentful lexical preposition, which never merges with the article

And the phenomenon distinguishes several lexical-semantic classes (see below)

3.1. The scope of the phenomenon

A global issue: how can the lexical-semantic class influence the syntax of a proper name?
3.1.1. Lexical-semantic class patterns

First impression: in function of the lexical-semantic class, the choice of the (light) locative preposition and the availability of other options change

**French province** names prohibit *au* altogether:
The variation between *en* and *dans* for masculine province names seems partly historical (*en* is the more archaic variant, dealing with the older feudal province rather than a modern region), partly pragmatic (*dans* also has the “somewhere in” interpretation)

(22) **French provinces**

a. *en* Picardie, *en* Normandie… feminine provinces
b. *%en/dans le/*au Béarn, Poitou… masculine provinces
c. *en/*dans l’Aquitaine, *en/*dans l’Alsace… feminine/vowel provinces
d. *en/dans l’Artois, en/dans l’Angoumois… masculine/vowel provinces

The more archaic obligatory *en* pattern with province names is replicated for **month names** (*en février*) and means of transportation (**en bus, en skis**)

**French department** names, irrespective of gender or initial segment, combine with *dans*, but *en* is possible for (Grevisse 2006:1507 and various sources):

- departments that have the same name as provinces (*Dordogne, Gironde, Vendée, Vaucluse, Savoie, Aveyron*)
- islands (*en Corse*)

This is a standard description, but all of these cases are feminine or begin with a vowel

Non-French European provinces and regions appear to vacillate between the French province pattern and the French department pattern (see Lomholt 1983:160-162 claiming that it makes a difference whether the region or province in question is Francophone)

**Oceans, seas, lakes, bays**, etc., take *dans*. As do **mountain chains**.

**Continents** are all feminine and begin with a vowel, so *en*.

Table 1: Directional/locative summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine V</th>
<th>Masculine C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country, continent</td>
<td><em>en</em></td>
<td><em>au</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US state, Canadian province</td>
<td><em>en</em></td>
<td><em>en/dans l’</em></td>
<td><em>au/dans le</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French province</td>
<td><em>en/dans la</em></td>
<td><em>en/dans l’</em></td>
<td><em>dans le</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>département</td>
<td><em>en/dans la</em></td>
<td><em>en/dans l’</em></td>
<td><em>dans le</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cities</td>
<td><em>à</em></td>
<td><em>à</em></td>
<td><em>à</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oceans, seas, lakes, etc.</td>
<td><em>dans la</em></td>
<td><em>dans l’</em></td>
<td><em>dans le</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lexical-semantic class seems to be decisive: department names, names of US states and Canadian provinces, country names and city names all pattern differently

3.1.2. Within-class variation

Two types of variation: individual and systematic exceptions

**Rivers**, irrespective of gender and phonology, prefer *sur* (but feminine ones may accept *en*, and *dans* is also possible):
   I go on DEF.FSG Loire/ DEF+Oise/ DEF+Ognon/ DEF.MSG Rhône
   I am going to the Loire/the Oise/the Ognon/the Rhône.

b. Celle-ci évita d’être […] jetée en Loire.
   this.FSG-PROX avoided of+be-INF thrown in Loire
   This one avoided being thrown into the Loire.

c. le corps d’un inconnu repêché dans la Seine.
   Lomholt 1983:285
   an unidentified body fished out in the Seine

Cities on rivers take *sur*; but if you jump into them, it’s *dans*. This is, of course, semantic.

**Islands** are divided into country-like and city-like (Vikner 1970, Lomholt 1983:235-245)

**Country-like islands**: overt definite article, *en* in the feminine and perhaps with vowel-initial names:

(24) a. la Corse, la Sicile, la Tasmanie…
    feminine
b. le Groenland, le Spitzberg
    masculine
c. l’Irlande, l’Islande…
    feminine/vowel

(25) a. en Corse, en Sicile, en Tasmanie
    feminine
b. au Groenland, au Spitzberg
   masculine
c. en Irlande, en Islande
   feminine/vowel

When modified, they appear with the locative preposition *dans* (Vikner 1970:240)

**City-like islands**: no definite article, the locative preposition is *à*; the article is absent in the ablative:

(26) a. à/de Terre-Neuve, à/de Belle-Ile, à/de Bornholm
    feminine
b. à/de Madagascar, à/de Malte, à/de Bornéo, à/de Mayotte
   masculine
c. à/de Haïti
   masculine/vowel

The latter, like city names, may contain a definite article as part of the proper name itself:

(27) a. (à/de) la Réunion, (à/de) la Nouvelle-Amsterdam, (à/de) la Grenade
    island
b. (à/de) La Rochelle, (à/de) La Nouvelle-Orléans
   city

Question: to which of the two classes do the two masculine examples (25b) belong?
Answer: like country names, they retain the article with the ablative *de*.

(28) a. du Groenland, du Spitzberg
    country-like
b. de Madagascar, de Malte, de Bornéo, de Mayotte
   city-like

**Feminine island names can be definite or bare** (which contradicts the earlier generalization about the role of gender in the overtness of the definite article). The same picture appears to arise in Italian

And finally, some islands allow both: *en/à la Martinique, en/à la Gouadeloupe*, sometimes for the same author within the same text (Vikner 1970:238); with the ablative *de* the article cannot be omitted (ibid.)

3.1.3. **Summary**

First impression: locative encoding in function of the lexical-semantic class

Issue: systematic variability with some lexical-semantic classes (islands)

Conclusion: item-specific encoding. How?
Proposal: place denotation
Simplification: **productive spatial and temporal localization only**. For the broader picture see Waugh 1976, Guimier 1978, Katz 2002, Amiot and De Mulder 2011, among others

### 3.2. The portmanteau variant as case

What is the mechanism responsible for the availability of the portmanteau variant?
I will concentrate on the toponyms that alternate with the three-dimensional preposition *dans* ‘in, into’: names of cities and various territories (excluding islands)
Proposal: Unlike *dans*, which is a true preposition, the portmanteau morphemes realize case, locative/directional (*au/en*) and ablative (*du/de*). It is not clear whether the portmanteau is the case-marked form of the proper definite article or a case prefix of the proper name itself:

- cross-linguistically, proper names are known to follow pronouns in their ability to decline (although I have been unable to find the proper reference for this claim), and French has locative pronouns (clitics), demonstratives and wh-words.

- if French case affixes are prefixes, the fact that declension interacts not only with gender but also with the initial segment is less surprising

- in other words, the *en/au* alternation is a **liaison phenomenon**

Morphosyntactic availability of certain cases for a subset of nouns and/or proper names is not unheard-of

Latin: the **locative case** is available only for names of towns, cities, small islands and several nouns including *domus/domī* ‘home’, *rus/ruri* ‘countryside’ and *humus/humi* ‘ground’ (Lane 2013 [1899]:216-218)

Exactly the same set of lexical items uses **accusative** case-marking for **allative** and **ablative** case-marking without a preposition for the source.

Modification does not seem to remove the ability function as a locative, but perhaps yes, to receive locative case (modifying adjectives (*meae domī* (Plautus, *Aulularia* 432 via Calabrese 2008) ‘at my home’; *proximae viciniae habitat* ’s/he lives nearby’ (Plautus, *Bacchidae* 2, 2, 27)) are genitive, nouns in apposition (Lane's *appellatives*) are ablative). However, Donaldson 1860:314 claims that real modification generally blocks the bare locative. The difference between French and Latin with respect to modification may be due to the fact that Latin has case elsewhere, which French doesn’t

Core intuition: a locative preposition is necessary to construct a certain interpretation, that of a space/location/region, which entity-denoting NPs do not have, as a rule. But if they do, the preposition is not necessary

It is also possible to hypothesize that the locative/directional/ablative cases are assigned by the corresponding null prepositions, but this approach has no explanatory power: the puzzle remains of why these particular lexical items can while others cannot combine with the relevant null prepositions and get the appropriate case-marking. To say nothing of inelegance.

The domains of locative case seem to be exactly reversed for Latin and French

### 3.3. The role of conceptualization for the prepositional variant

Toponyms that do not denote locations clearly denote entities, which may be conceptualized as three-dimensional objects (containers) more or less readily

Cf. the choice of the spatial preposition in Russian, juxtaposing cities, countries and plural mountain chains (perceived as three-dimensional objects requiring *v* ’in’) to mountain ranges, seashores, islands and peninsulas (perceived as two-dimensional objects requiring *na* ’on’; for corpus analysis see Graudina et al. 1976:51-52):
(29) a. exat’ v/*na Moskvu/Angliju/Al’py
    go-INF in/on Moscow/England/the Alps

b. exat’ *v/na Pamir/Adriatiku/Kubu/Taimyr
    go-INF in/on Pamir mountain range/the Adriatic shore/Cuba/Taimyr Peninsula

This distinction in conceptualization is necessary to account for the choice between *dans* and *à*

### 3.4. Accounting for optionality and variation

Variation (for masculine US states and with department names) is due to variant specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Variation summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French province (old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US state (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US state (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>département (loc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French province (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French province (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 [?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantic factor: only proper names that denote locations rather than entities can bear the locative case

The morphological factor: the presence of phi-features, number, gender and animacy
- For all lexical-semantic classes: locative + plural → aux
- For all lexical-semantic classes: locative + feminine → *en* (39)

Vowel-initial toponyms fit into the standard liaison pattern, where the appropriate allomorph is the consonant-final one.

In one of French region patterns (new-2) liaison fails, why?

Innovations: to account for the unexpected cases we need to modify the Vocabulary Insertion rules stated informally above:
- The *en* allomorph is used if gender is specified
- The *au* allomorph is used if animacy is specified
- In the absence of both ineffability results and a locative case is unavailable

Department names are ambiguous between two possibilities in Modern French:
- place-denotation: only feminine toponyms are marked for phi-features
- entity-denotation: not in competition with the place-denotation because inherently available rather than a derived option

Importantly, for all these toponyms the alternative entity-denotation can be constructed (the entity corresponding to the appropriate region in space)
- For provinces, states, regions and departments it can be treated as a container, which makes the use of the three-dimensional preposition *dans* possible
- The constructed entity-denotation is obligatorily specified for gender (forcing the presence of the definite article)
- It *is this entity-denotation that is used in non-locative contexts*, but also when the realization of the locative case is impossible (the *dans*-variant)
Masculine names of US states and Canadian provinces may either be formally [inanimate] with no gender specification (yielding surface masculine agreement and the au allomorph for consonant-initial names, en, for vowel-initial ones) or unspecified for phi-features altogether:
- The en allomorph is used with gender-specified (i.e., [feminine]) toponyms
- The au allomorph is used with [inanimate] toponyms
- In the absence of both ineffability results and a locative case is unavailable

The behavior of vowel-initial toponyms follows the feminine pattern here, but not because of exceptional feature specification

Names of French provinces follow three patterns:
- The older pattern with the obligatory en: are all specified for gender
- The newer pattern with en for feminine and vowel-initial names only (the same as the country pattern): the feminine names are specified for gender, the masculine ones have no gender. Without phi-features ineffability results and locative case is unavailable (unless made possible by liaison)
- The unexpected pattern where vowel-initial names allow dans l’. This one could be a confound, since dans is also possible with feminine province names (with a subtly different interpretation)

In other words, formally masculine toponyms in this category can either bear the [masculine] value of the gender feature or not be specified for gender at all

Cities are not specified for gender and therefore do not have the definite article, but I further assume that they denote not locations but entities. The sort of entities that they denote are not normally conceptualized as containers, which makes the spatial preposition dans impossible

Rivers do not denote locations and therefore do not appear in the locative case. They are also not naturally conceptualized as containers

Islands may be location-denoting (with en/au alternation) or entity-denoting (yielding à/à la)

3.5. A note on liaison

The shared pattern for vowel-initial and feminine NPs is observed for liaison with prenominal adjectives and demonstratives (but not, as noted by MPZ, for possessives and the definite article), for all nouns:

(30) a. ce bébé this-MSG baby
b. cet enfant this-MSG child
c. cet adorable bébé this-MSG adorable baby
d. cette créature this-FSG creature.F

(31) a. mon bébé POSS.1SG-MSG baby
b. mon enfant POSS.1SG-MSG child
c. mon adorable bébé POSS.1SG-MSG adorable baby
d. ma créature POSS.1SG-FSG creature.F

The behavior of the demonstrative in (30) suggests that the allomorphy in (31) is not achieved by the deletion of or a change in a gender feature, because in (30b, c) we would have had to do the opposite.
Table 3: Prenominal allomorphy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possessive</th>
<th>article</th>
<th>demonstrative</th>
<th>adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feminine C</td>
<td>ma, ta, sa</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>cette</td>
<td>belle, nouvelle, vieille, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>mon, ton, son</td>
<td>l'</td>
<td>cet</td>
<td>bel, nouvel, vieil, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine C</td>
<td>mon, ton, son</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>ce</td>
<td>beau, nouveau, vieux, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, it can be shown that even with prenominal adjectives liaison does not always give rise to a form that is identical to the feminine (Tranel 1990 et seq., etc.):

(32) a. une grande [grâd] amie
     a.FSG big.FSG friend.FSG
     b. un grand [grâd]/[grât] ami
     a.MSG big.MSG friend.MSG

(33) a. une grosse [grâs] amie
     a.FSG fat.FSG friend.FSG
     b. un gros [grâz] ami
     a.MSG fat.MSG friend.MSG

Moreover, ineffability is attested (Morin 1992):

(34) a. une franche discussion
     a.FSG honest.FSG discussion.FSG
     b. un franc dialogue
     a.MSG honest.MSG dialogue.MSG
     c. *un franc/franche entretien
     a.MSG honest.MSG/FSG interview.MSG

The interplay of syntactic and phonological factors in liaison is also taken to be a challenge to modularity (see Tranel 1990 and Schlenker 2010 on discontinuous contexts for liaison).

Now for a crazy idea: How about giving a more syntactic treatment to liaison?

Mulder 1994, Stebbins 2003, Ball 2011: Coast Tsimshian case affixes morphologically attach to the preceding word:

(35) Yagwat huumda duusa hoon.
     Yagwa-t huum-[da duus]-[a hoon]
     CONT-3.ERG smell-[ERG.CN cat]-[ABS.CN fish]
     The cat is sniffing the fish.

Hypothesis: French has three declension classes, and case-markers (syncretic, except for wh-words, pronouns and toponyms) are word-initial auto-segmental affixes that cliticize onto the preceding word

4. SUMMARY AND QUESTIONS

The realization of the definite article with French toponyms depends on the presence of phi-features (gender, number, animacy) and case
Advantages of postulating locative cases in French:

- resolution of a long-standing problem in the modular generativist approach (cf. Miller et al. 1997)
- translation of the vague appeal to lexical-semantic classes into concrete morpho-semantic features

Independent evidence for place denotation of noun phrases: bare temporal and locative NPs, the status of corresponding pronouns:

(36) a. I'm leaving next week/next Monday/then.
    b. Don't go that place/there.

In Russian, the true locative case is only available for demonstratives, simplex wh-words and their existential derivatives, and the universal quantifier:

(37) a. gde 'where', kudá 'where to', ot.kúda 'where from'
    b. zdes'/tut 'here', sjudá 'to here', ot.sjúda 'from here'
    c. tam 'there', tudá 'to there', ot.túda 'from there'
    d. vezde 'everywhere', vsjúdu 'to everywhere', oto.vsjúdu 'from everywhere'

The type-based approach is independently motivated by all the work on spatial prepositions, but non-explanatory in the sense that no reason is provided for why prominence hierarchies should (seem to) be relevant for the realization of case.

The difference in conceptualization as a three-dimensional vs. two-dimensional entity is also cross-linguistically motivated and required for common nouns

5. **APPENDIX I: ITALIAN TOPONYMS**

The realization of definite articles and spatial prepositions with Italian toponyms is subject to a different set of constraints

The definite article is obligatorily absent for (bare) city names and obligatorily present for all other toponyms (Proudfoot and Cardo 2002:15-16) in argument positions:

(38) a. Firenze 'Florence', Londra 'London'
    b. le Alpi 'the PL Alps', il Tamigi 'the MSG Thames', la Italia 'the FSG Italy'

As in other languages, restrictive modification triggers the presence of the definite article:

(39) la Firenze del Settecento
    the.F Florence of the eighteenth century

As in French, the definite article may fail to appear on the surface in locative uses, although in Italian the effect is limited to the locative/directional prepositions *a* and *in* 'in'

The difference between cities and regions translates into the choice of a preposition: *a* vs. *in* (both translating into the same prepositional variant with modification)

(40) a. a Roma 'in Rome' vs. nella Roma imperiale 'in Imperial Rome'
    b. in Italia 'in Italy' vs. nell'Italia meridionale 'in southern Italy'

The locative + definite combination is realized as *in* with feminine toponyms, unless they are restrictively modified:

(41) a. in/*nella Italia 'in Italy'
    b. nell'Italia meridionale 'in southern Italy'

With bare masculine toponyms both variants are allowed, with plurals only the composite:

(42) a. in/nel Veneto/Lazio
    b. nei/*in Paesi Bassi, nelle Marche
Again, restrictive modification makes *in* impossible

Syntactically complex toponyms pattern with restrictively modified toponyms in allowing the preposition-determiner combination *nel/nella*, but *in* is also sometimes possible:

(43)  
   a.  *in/nella Nuova Guinea, in/nella Unione Sovietica, in/nella Corea del sud  feminine*  
   b.  *in/nella Guinea Equatoriale, *in/nella Guyana Francese*  

(44)  *nel/*in Timor Oriental, nel/*in Regno Unito, nel/*in Dakota del sud  masculine*  

Islands may be feminine and bare (Rodì, Miconos, Cipro), feminine and definite (la Corsica, la Sardegna) or masculine and definite (one example: il Madagascar). I don't know whether there is a correlation with the realization of the locative preposition, but my impression is that it is the same city/country (= two-dimensional vs. three-dimensional object) distinction again.

6. **APPENDIX II: WESTERN ARMENIAN**

Natural background assumption: addition of functional structure entails addition of meaning

Frequent example: proper names denote entities. When they don't, it can be detected in their syntax by the presence of an overt article:

(45)  
   a.  *London: a unique and specific entity*  
   b.  *a London, the London, the London that I know: things called London*  

Western Armenian: obligatory definite article with proper names (Gulian 1902:23: only in the accusative and oblique cases, Sakayan 2012:13: in all positions)  

But not if they denote places (Guekguezian 2011):

(46)  
   a.  Fresno  g-abri-nk.  
   Fresno  INDIC-live-1PL  
   *We live in Fresno.*  
   Peter Guekguezian, p.c.  
   b.  *Fresno-n  gabrink.*  
   Fresno-DEF  INDIC-live-1PL  
   c.  Fresno-n  keghetsig  e.  
   Fresno-DEF beautiful  is  Fresno is beautiful.  
   d.  *Fresno  keghetsig  e.  
   Fresno beautiful  is  

Some common nouns can also function as locations without a postposition (not necessarily as weak definites, although they cannot be modified, pluralized or indefinite):

(47)  
   a.  Tun  Hayastan  e-ir.  
   you Armenia  be-PAST.2SG  
   You were in Armenia.  
   Guékguézian 2011  
   b.  Anahid-ə  təbrots-ə  tashnag  gə-nəvake.  
   Anahid-DEF school-DEF piano  IND-play.3SG  
   Anahid plays the piano at school.  

Intuition: toponyms and some common nouns naturally denote **locations** (rather than entities)

The same logic suggests that only toponyms are really proper names in Western Armenian and their use in argument positions involves addition of meaning

Overt case-marking requires an overt article:
(48) a. Fresno-ye-n gu-ka-m.  
Fresno-ABL-DEF INDIC-come-1SG
I come from Fresno.

b. *Fresno-ye  gu-ka-m.  
Fresno-ABL  INDIC-come-1SG

The semantic argument doesn't seem to go through: in ablative uses the proper names should mean the same thing (a place)

7. **APPENDIX III: PRIOR TREATMENTS OF THE FRENCH FACTS**

Cornulier 1972: **the definite article remains iff it is phonologically incorporated into the preposition**: This is counter-cyclic and non-explanatory

Zwicky 1987: *en*, like *au* and *aux*, a portmanteau morpheme realizing two syntactic positions, $P_{LOC}+FSG$; a special rule of referral, replacing the masculine form with the feminine one, is activated for proper names beginning with a vowel

- elsewhere, elision has priority over contraction (*à l’* > *au*); with possessive and demonstrative determiners feminine is replaced with masculine (*mon amie*)
- lexical exceptions (Grevisse: *Danemark/Portugal/Luxembourg; en Limousin*)

Miller 1992, Miller et al. 1997: French determiners and the prepositions *à, de* and *en* must not be analyzed as syntactic words but as phrasal inflections which are lexically realized on the first word of the NP

Multiple problems with this view, but crucial is the empirical one: provinces
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