WHAT'S PROPER?
Workshop on binominal denominative NPs, June 2, 2012

Issue 1: close apposition: restrictive vs. non-restrictive

(1) close apposition: [PN] \[\subseteq\] [NP]
   a. le Président Mitterand
      the President Mitterand
      President Mitterand
   b. Jeanne la papesse
      Jeanne the pope-
      the Pope Joan

(2) restrictive modification
   a. le van Gogh peintre
      the van Gogh painter
      the painter van Gogh (as opposed to the art dealer van Gogh, his brother)
   b. Odile jeune fille
      Odile young girl
      Odile the young girl (i.e., Odile as a young girl)

Issue 2: appositive obliques:

(3) a. the city of New York
    b. the country of Russia

Some thoughts on the syntax and the semantics of names introduced by NPs:
  - close apposition vs. appositive obliques
  - restrictive vs. non-restrictive modification and part-whole coercion

Set aside for now: categorized mention (the verb "run", the question "Who is the culprit?")

1. THE SYNTAX OF CLOSE APPPOSITION

The **constituency** everyone agrees upon:

(4)
```
  DP
    D° NP
      AP
      other NP
        famous linguist
      NP1
      NP2 ← or DP
        Noam Chomsky
```
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The article cannot form a constituent with a common NP to the exclusion of the proper name:

(5)  The methods of the famous detective Sherlock Holmes differed from those of the famous detective Nero Wolfe.

Lasersohn 1986: in close apposition (unlike in loose apposition) an AP can take scope over both nouns:

(6)  a.  My one cousin Bill is rich, but my other cousin Bill hardly has a penny to his name.
    b.  ?My one cousin Bill is rich, but my other cousin John hardly has a penny to his name.

...or form a constituent with the common noun (McCawley 1998):

(7)  a.  the actor and political activist Vanessa Redgrave
    b.  the former president Ronald Reagan

Jackendoff 1984, Acuña Fariña 1996, McCawley 1998: the common noun can't be followed by a PP or a relative clause

(8)  a.  *the word you mentioned apple
    b.  *the author of this book Georgette Heyer

McCawley 1998:473 provides a (journalese) counterexample showing that the proper name is not the complement as the common noun may have one:

(9)  the former president of the United States and one-time Hollywood star Ronald Reagan

However, the common NP cannot be pronominalized by one (Jackendoff 1984):

(10)  a.  *the (lovely) song Entzweiflung (by Schubert) and the (trite) one Wiegenlied (by Brahms)
    b.  *the famous male detective Sherlock Holmes and the famous female one Miss Marple

Matters are more complicated with the joined NP-NP constituent (no Jackendoff 1984, sort of McCawley 1998):

(11)  a.  *the song Wer nur die Sehnsucht kennt by Schubert and the one by Tchaikovsky
    b.  the poem The Raven that E.A. Poe wrote and the one that my cousin Sam wrote

1.1.  Restrictive vs. non-restrictive modification

Jackendoff and McCawley presuppose the same underlying structure for restrictive and non-restrictive modification, but are they right?

(12)  a.  le  Président Mitterand
      the  President Mitterrand
      President Mitterand

    b.  le  van Gogh peintre
      the  van Gogh painter
      the painter van Gogh (as opposed to the art dealer van Gogh, his brother)

(13)  a.  l’ antique Pergame
      the ancient Pergamon
      Ancient Pergamon (the city has ceased to exist)

    b.  le  Babylone antique
      the Babylon ancient
      the ancient Babylon (as opposed to the modern Babylon in Illinois)
The obvious answer: linearization:

\[(14) \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{AP} \]

\[(15) \quad \text{le} \quad \text{Babylone} \quad \text{antique} \]

Problem: headedness

1.2. Headedness

Traditional view (Haugen 1953, Burton-Roberts 1975, Noailly 1991, Keizer 2005): as proper names may be non-restrictively modified by APs, PPs or relative clauses, the proper name must be the head in close apposition as well:

\[(15) \quad \text{a. No case was too hard for the famous detective Sherlock Holmes.} \quad \text{b. Bravely bold Sir Robin rode forth from Camelot.} \quad \text{c. Our next speaker is Noam Chomsky from MIT.} \quad \text{d. Samuel Clemens, (who was) better known as Mark Twain, was American.}\]


Jackendoff 1984: the proper name/sound may be followed by a further restrictive modifier:

\[(16) \quad \text{a. the song cycle I Hate Music by Leonard Bernstein} \quad \text{b. the banal phrase in the house that begins the poem}\]

McCawley 1998: N₁ can be plural:

\[(17) \quad \text{a. the well-known operas Norma and Tosca} \quad \text{b. the Japanese postpositions yori and kara}\]

N. B: What he might have meant is that N₂ cannot be, except that in Russian, surnames can be plural

Predicate agreement in Russian is with the common noun:

NB: With [+ human] proper names both options are available for independent reasons.

\[(18) \quad \text{Kreiser “Avrora” plyl(*a).} \quad \text{cruiser Aurora swam-M/F} \quad \text{The cruiser Aurora was moving.}\]

Case-marking in Russian is obligatory for the common noun, but depends on the toponym for the proper name:

\[(19) \quad \text{a. My govorili o velikom gorode Moskva/Moskve.} \quad \text{we spoke about great-MSG-LOC city-MSG-LOC Moscow.FSG-NOM/LOC} \quad \text{We spoke about the great city of Moscow.}\]
\[\text{b. My doexali do stancii Popovka/*Popovki.} \quad \text{we reached until station.FSG-GEN Popovka.FSG-NOM/GEN} \quad \text{We have reached the station Popovka.}\]

Article agreement is with the common noun:

\[(20) \quad \text{a. le/*/la brigadier-chef Marie Poumart} \quad \text{the-M/F lance sergeant.M Marie Poumart} \quad \text{the lance sergeant Marie Poumart}\]
\[\text{b. le chanteur de Maroon 5 Adam Levine et le/*/la mannequin Anne Vyalitsyna} \quad \text{the-M/F singer of Maroon 5 Adam Levine and the-M/F model.M Anne Vyalitsyna}\]
(21) a. *ilan medico Ciara
the-M/F physician.M Ciara
Italian (Giuseppe Longobardi, p.c.)

b. il/?la judische Ciara
the-M/F judge.M Ciara

How does this extend to restrictive modification?

(22) a. *le/la Susanne médecin
the-M/F Susanne physician.M

b. le/*la Pierre victime
the-M/F Pierre victim.F

But also:

(23) a. Susanne le/*la médecin
Susanne the-M/F physician.M

b. Pierre *le/la victime
Pierre the-M/F victim.F

Is determiner agreement determined by proximity?

2. CONTRASTIVE CLOSE APPosition

English: two options:

(24) a. the SCIENCE-FICTION WRITER Norton (not the programmer Norton)

b. Norton the science-fiction writer

Both are generally subsumed under close apposition

2.1. Interpretation (Noailly 1991)

The NP need not be contrastive or visibly restrictive:

(25) a. Satie l’ermite
Satie the hermit

b. Felix the Cat

... but it may be:

(26) a. Jeanne la pucelle
Jeanne the maid

b. Jeanne la papesse
Jeanne the pope-F

The NP must denote a singleton set (Noailly 1991): only the bearer of the proper name may aspire to the description provided by the NP.
NB Official names of royalty (Henry III, Richard III) appear to contradict this generalization, but the ordinal is usually taken to imply of that name, sometimes made explicit. More difficult is the simultaneous occurrence of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great in Russian history, though interpretable gender marking would make them unique.

Prediction: profession names and office titles are not very felicitous in this construction: they don't naturally define singleton sets.

(27) a. le procureur Molinier
   the public prosecutor Molinier
   Noailly 1991

   b. Molinier le procureur
   Molinier the public prosecutor

The fact that at an earlier stage of the language office titles and profession names gave rise to such surnames as Levebvre, Lemaréchal, etc., is due to social rather than linguistic factors: the smaller size of a community made them to naturally denote singleton sets.

**No determiner other than the definite article** is possible here:

(28) a. *Molinier ce procureur
   Molinier this public prosecutor

   b. ce procureur Molinier
   this public prosecutor Molinier

The definite article is therefore likely to form a constituent with the NP -- to the exclusion of the proper name.

2.2. Is (24b) denominative and/or binominal (though obviously an NP)?

The French of Noailly 1991: four grammatically distinguished binominal NPs:

(29) a. l’ orateur Cicéron
   the orator Cicero
   nonrestrictive (ix : Cicero(x) . orator (x))

   b. Cicéron l’ orateur
   Cicero the orator
   nonrestrictive (ix : orator (x) . Cicero (x))

   c. le Cicéron orateur
   Cicero the orator
   intersective restrictive only
   (as opposed to another Cicero, e.g., a philosopher)

   d. Cicéron orateur et Cicéron philosophe
   Cicero orator and Cicero philosopher
   coercive only
   Cicero the orator and Cicero the philosopher

For my speaker pool (29d) is only available for temporal stages; the coercive interpretation is obtained via (29b) or (29c), perceived as contrastive and interchangeable for both individual and aspect. (29c) fully qualifies for being a binominal denominative NP.

**Coercion** (Paul 1994, Gärtner 2004) or **fractioning** (Jonasson 2005) is not restricted to NPs and appears to distinguish between proper and common nouns:

(30) a. The upper Rhine is polluted.
   material part

   b. The upper river is polluted.

   temporal stage

   b. The young composer visited Paris.
(32) a. I will show you the secret Paris.  aspect/guise
   b. I will show you the secret city.

(33) The Somerset Maugham that his nephew describes is a lot more disagreeable than the Somerset Maugham described by Somerset Maugham. proxy?

The common core seems to be the notion of a part.
The lexical category of the modifier constrains the available interpretations.

2.3. The role of the lexical category

NP modifiers yield aspects (cf. Landman 1989), a.k.a. facets (Kleiber 1981, 2005; see also Jonasson 2005) or manifestations (von Heusinger and Wespel 2007), or guises:

(34) a. Chomsky the linguist
   b. Lolita the adolescent

The lack of temporal parts can be made to follow from the fact that NPs are individual-level (Carlson 1977)
Aspects can also result from non-NP modifiers (cf. Paul 1994):

(35) a. the short Mark Smith (not the tall one) individual
   b. the Davy Jones from The Monkees (not the pirate)
   c. the Lewis that wrote about Narnia

(36) a. the #young/#nervous/?Spanish Picasso aspect
   b. the Picasso ?of Guernica/*in the United States
   c. the Picasso that painted Guernica

... which may allow an additional option:

AP modifiers yield temporal stages or spatial parts (cf. Carlson 1977). I have been unable to construct a definite example involving a guise:

(37) a. the young Mozart (= Mozart when he was young)
   b. the upper Rhine (= the upper part of the Rhine)
   c. the Spanish Pyrenees (= the Spanish part of the Pyrenees)

PP modifiers appear to allow temporal stages (Paul 1994), but definitely not spatial parts:

(38) a. Paris at night is absolutely charming.
   b. The Paris of the 80s was a fun place to be.
   c. The Picasso of the Blue Period is clearly a genius.

(39) a. *the Rhine in Germany
   b. *the Pyrenees in Spain

I'm unsure if examples (38) involve stages (rather than aspects); they are characterizing, and a short-duration temporal modifier is infelicitous:

(40) a. *(the) Ora at 1 PM September 3, 2011
   b. *(the) Jesus Christ on December 25, one A.D. (cf. the newborn Jesus)

RC modifiers yield guises only:

(41) a. the Picasso that painted Guernica
   b. the France that we know

(42) a. *the Pyrenees that are in Spain
   b. *the Mozart who was 16/young

Reminder: NP, AP, DP and RC modifiers can all distinguish between individuals
2.4. **Common nouns**

Aspect/guise interpretation is not available with common nouns:

(43)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>the secret city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>#the linguist of his parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the painter that painted Guernica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*the professor the teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spatiotemporal slices of kinds are individuals (Carlson 1977).

Modification of singular kinds yields the taxonomic interpretation (Krifka et al. 1995):

(44)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*The house of the forties housed Bill’s aunt and her extended family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The human of that era was not yet fully bipedal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(45)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>#My young sister is much happier than my middle-aged sister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The giant panda is smaller than the Himalayan brown bear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural kinds can also yield aspects and proxies:

(46)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>fake diamonds and plastic ducks (cf. Partee 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The Japanese described by Clavel are not very realistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis: **aspects of proper names correspond to sub-kinds** (cf. Kripke 1980).

The correspondence between spatiotemporal slices of individuals (proper names) and kinds (common nouns) is well-established.

2.5. **The "name DP" constituent**

What are the origins of *Sherlock Holmes the detective*?

Two possible routes: "when I got it, it was already broken" & "it's not a bug, it's a feature":

(47) base-generation

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\mid \hline
\text{Norton} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{sci-fi writer}
\end{array}
\]

(48) movement, cf. Burton-Roberts 1975

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\mid \hline
\text{[NP Norton]} \\
\mid \hline
\text{DP} \\
\mid \hline
\text{the} \quad \text{sci-fi writer} \quad \text{Norton}
\end{array}
\]

Possible arguments **against the derivation approach**:

- determiner restriction: only the definite article is possible (cf. Noailly 1991)
- non-complementary distribution (restrictive interpretation is available for both in English, the head noun doesn't have to be "noteworthy" in the inverted structure)
- the coercive interpretation not available for the "base" option
- multiple determiners (e.g., the Emperor Charles V, the young King Richard the Lionheart)
Besides, English (I don't know about Germanic in general) allows definite NPs as apparently non-definite predicates (Berman 1973:118):

(49) a. "So. You're not the complete optician after all.

b. His brother-in-law, Mr. Hurst, merely looked the gentleman...
Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, p. 11

c. You're quite the philosopher, aren't you?

d. "So I'm left the great monster to plague their dreams..."
Samuel Delany, *Neworthy*, p. 240

e. "Oh, Mr. Holmes, always the comedian, you were."
Laurie R. King, *The Beekeeper's Apprentice*, p. 243

Possible arguments for the derivation approach:

- one structure instead of two
- "headless" DPs (e.g., *Henry the Eighth*, *Catherine the Great*)
- semantics: Predicate Modification below the determiner

For now, I feel more inclined towards the base-generation approach

### 2.6. The underlying DP-DP

DP-DP adjunction must be possible to account for:

(50) a. those bastards the Lancasters  
    b. my friends the Miss Boyds  

The expressive *that* is equally compatible with common nouns:

(51) a. that difficult instrument the tongue (George Eliot, *Silas Marner*)
    b. that famous politician our president

NP₂ is an appositive cataphoric on the demonstrative; the presupposition is accommodated

**Kinship terms** (taken broadly) are also compatible with a common noun N₂:

(52) a. my brother the poet
    b. my friends the Russians

This is why kinship terms are also the only common nouns that allow close apposition to be stacked (though only once):

(53) my friend the famous detective Sherlock Holmes

Inversion is impossible here.

Outside these contexts, the proper name may not be preceded by either an AP or a determiner (Molitor 1979 as cited in Heringa 2011):

(54) a. *the famous river the (mighty) Nile
    b. *the brilliant singer the (incomparable) Maria Callas

...which suggests that non-restrictive close apposition does not involve DP-DP adjunction.

### 3. The appositive oblique

The appositive oblique is distinguished from close apposition by the preposition *of*.
NB The term *appositive oblique* (a.k.a. *pseudo-possessive*, McCawley 1998) is preferable to the term *binominal denominative NP* (Van de Velde 2001), since the latter also includes the classic close apposition.

McCawley 1998: the distribution of the appositive oblique is idiosyncratic:

(55) the city of?@ Toledo the country (of) Canada
    the country *of?f@ the United States
    the planet (?of) Mars
    the poet (*of) Robert Frost
    the role of?f@ Hamlet
    the amount of?f@ $10
    the year (of) 1971
    the sin of?f@ gluttony
    the vowel (*of) /æ/
    the key of?f@ E♭ major

    McCawley 1998

*Appositive obliques are impossible with categorized mentions:*

(56) a. the concept of truth/*truth
    b. the word/noun/monosyllable (*of) pear

...or with nouns that are either not abstract or not mass (cf. Van de Velde 2001):

(57) a. the virtue of patience
    b. *the animal of dog
    c. *the liquid of water

My intuition: the preposition *of* in appositive obliques is not vacuous and the relation between $N_1$ and the proper name is restrictive: $N_1$ specifies one *aspect* of the complex entity denoted by the proper name (e.g., *the city of New York* vs. *the municipality of New York*) -- or the kind name (*the feature of stridency* vs. *the property of stridency*):

(58) a. The concept of love and the sentiment of love are not the same thing.
    b. The concept "love" and the sentiment "love" are not the same thing.

The final denotation is the same, but the routes taken to achieve it are different.

Names and titles (in both senses): both are entities:

(59) a. He became famous under the *pseudonym of David Bowie*.
    b. In the States, *The Chrysalids* was published under the *title of Re-Birth*.

Proper names may appear in the genitive in Russian as well:

(60) Ivan Vasil'evič Groznyj *carstvoval pod imenem Ivana IV.*
    Ivan Vasiljevič Terrible reigned under name-INST Ivan-GEN Fourth-GEN

*Ivan the Terrible reigned under the name of Ivan the Fourth.*

The apparent counterexample from French, *le nom de mère* ‘the word *mother*’ (Van de Velde 2001), does not involve mention.

Is my intuition is correct, then we are observing a syntactic distinction between proper names and common nouns in the gray area where the distinction between a kind and an individual is blurred: abstract mass nouns (cf. Van de Velde 2001)

(61) a. the city of New York vs. the municipality of New York
    b. the state of New York
And it is highly suggestive that city names and country names, both denoting (actually rather abstract) entities, share the same syntax as abstract mass nouns.

Though the cross-linguistic variation in appositive obliques requires more work.

4. **Reified Quotation/Categorized Mention**

Jackendoff 1984: the *N-E* construction can also contain a quotation (henceforth, categorized mention):

(62) a. the phrase *the phrase*
    b. the word/verb *run*
    c. the pattern *da-dum da-dum da-dum*
    d. the symbol *

In Japanese, these are clearly syntactically distinguished (Sode 2004):

(63) a. 'the phrase' -to -iu fureezu/hyoogen
    b. *fureezu/hyoogen (-no) 'the phrase' phrase/expression -COPN the phrase

(64) a. 'da-dum da-dum da-dum'-to -iu pataan

*-to* is the general complementizer, used for both direct and indirect speech (Coulmas 1985):

(65) a. asita made-ni kono sigoto-o yatte kudasai -to kare-wa iimasita.
    b. asita made-ni kono sigoto-o yaru yôni -to kare-wa iimasita.

Of the three options available, categorized mentions allow only direct quotation.

In Russian, categorized mentions are grouped with less prototypical (non-anthropomorphic -- cf. Turkel 2000) proper names, such as book titles, in resisting case-marking.

5. **Summary**

On the syntactic side:
- close apposition: an NP categorizing a proper name in apparent adjunction, or an NP categorizing a quotation. Both find parallels in modified proper names, but there, the head is not the NP.
- appositive obliques: the categorizing NP combines with the concept-denoting NP or proper name introduced by *of*.

On the semantic side:
- Predicate Modification: assuming that proper names can be *bona fide* predicates (cf. Matushansky 2008), no special assumptions needed.
- coercion: the proper name denotes an entity, which is then converted into a set of its parts; common nouns are incompatible with categorizing NPs.
Ora Matushansky

What's proper?, Workshop on binominal denominative NPs (June 2, 2012)

(Some of) outstanding questions:

- In examining the cross-linguistic syntax of binominal denominative NPs, are we dealing with an arbitrarily partitioned scale from people names to quotations, or are there, say, three clear discrete categories (e.g., names, quasi-referential terms (Moltmann 2012a) and quotations)?
- Whence the impossibility of iterating close apposition?
- How does this all link to close apposition with names of types (the number 16, the letter S, but also perhaps the novel Death in Venice)?

To be continued...
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