PHI-CONGRUENCE AND CASE-AGREEMENT IN CLOSE APPOSITION IN RUSSIAN

Ora Matushansky

SFL (CNRS/Université Paris-8/UPL)/ILS (Utrecht University)

Abstract: I demonstrate that case-marking on the proper name in close apposition in Russian depends on two factors: the semantic sort of the proper name (where object-denoting proper names differ from place-denoting proper names, i.e., toponyms) and within the latter category on the lexical-semantic class of the toponym: major landmarks, such as cities and countries, special landmarks (rivers, streets, etc.) and the rest. While animate proper names necessarily agree in case with their sortals and inanimate ones obligatorily appear in the nominative case, case-agreement with toponyms is conditioned by phi-congruence: cities and countries require number congruence, special landmarks need gender congruence and for the residue only phi-congruent adjectival toponyms may agree in case. I suggest that the phi-congruence condition should be analyzed as semantic agreement and hypothesize that toponyms differ from object-denoting proper names in that the former may have interpretable phi-features despite being inanimate.

Keywords: case, semantic agreement, close apposition, Russian, phi-features

1. INTRODUCTION

Proper names in Russian are divided into three categories in function of their case-marking in close apposition: those that must agree in case with the sortal (animates), those that can agree (toponyms) and those that cannot agree (the rest). Within the second category the possibility of case-agreement is conditioned by *phi-congruence*: the values of certain phi-features of the toponym must match those of the sortal. The question arises how to model these facts and what they tell us about the nature of agreement.

I begin with the presentation of the phenomenon of close apposition in general (next section). In section 3 I will describe what is known about the empirical landscape of case-agreement in close apposition in Russian, focusing on toponyms and the impact of phi-congruence. Section 4 will deal with and dismiss several possible analyses of these facts. Section 5 is dedicated to a sketch of a proposal, linking case-agreement to semantic agreement. Section 6 concludes.

2. CLOSE APPOSITION

Apposition can be defined as a single constituent containing more than one NP yet only one referent. The obvious difference between close apposition in (1) and loose apposition in (2) is that in (1) there is no intervening pause and in (2) the proper name or kind name alone refers to the same individual as the NP combining with it:

- (1) a. the element engoopium
 - b. the material polyacrynilate
 - c. the actor John Gielgud

Jackendoff 1984

(2) a. This element, engoopium, was invented by Ray Jackendoff.b. The prima/Maria Callas, the best Carmen ever, outsings everyone in this role.

In the type of close apposition exemplified in $(1)^1$ the first noun (henceforth, *the sortal*) is the syntactic head (Jackendoff 1984, Lasersohn 1986, McCawley 1996, 1998; contra Haugen 1953, Burton-Roberts 1975, Noailly 1991, Keizer 2005), as shown by the fact that agreement is determined by the phi-features of the sortal rather than by those of the proper name (or the

¹ We set aside here several other types of close apposition, such as *Francis Bacon the philosopher* (restrictive, picking out one of the possible name bearers), *Karl Marx the Jew* (singling out a particular guise or aspect of an individual) or other marginal instances where NP_2 is headed by a common noun and contains an overt determiner, since those of them that can be reliably translated into Russian are all animate and exhibit obligatory case agreement.

second noun) and that the case assigned to the NP as a whole must surface on the sortal (and may, on the proper name):²

(3)	Krejser	"Avrora"	ne	strel ^j al/*strel ^j ala.	ag	greement
	cruiser M	Aurora _F	NEG	fired.MSG/FSG		
	The cruis	er Aurora	was n	ot firing.		

(4) na ulice/*ulica Jakimanke/Jakimanka in street.FSG.LOC/*NOM Yakimanka.FSG.LOC/NOM on the Yakimanka street

The fact that the sortal NP may contain a complement ((5), after McCawley 1998:473) shows that the proper name, which is clearly not a semantic argument of the sortal anyway, must be treated as a modifier (6).

(5) byvšij **prezident SŠA** i gollivudskaja kinozvezda Ronal^jd Rejgan former president USA.GEN and Hollywood.ADJ movie star Ronald Reagan *the former president of the US and Hollywood star Ronald Reagan*



Case-marking in close apposition (4) not only offers insight into its internal structure, but also suggests that agreement can occur between two noun phrases, as the choice of case can be conditioned by phi-congruence of the two nouns: having the same values for the gender and number features on the proper name as on the sortal may be a necessary condition for having an agreeing case on the proper name.

3. CASE-MARKING IN CLOSE APPOSITION WITH PROPER NAMES

As (4) shows, close apposition permits two options for the proper name: the proper name can bear either the same case as the sortal or the default nominative case. The availability of either option depends on the lexical-semantic class of the proper name. Three broad groups can be established:³

(i) uroven^j gormona %kortizol/%kortizola level hormone.GEN cortisol.NOM/GEN the level of the hormone cortisol

(ii) v marte mecⁱace in March.LOC month.LOC *in the month of March* case

² The first generalization seems to be contradicted by animate proper names, where the sortal may be masculine while the proper name (and the referent) is feminine, as in *doktor Liza*, which triggers feminine agreement. This contradiction is only apparent, as human-denoting nouns in Russian can agree semantically (Corbett 1979, see also fn.19).

³ Close apposition is also possible with kind names, as in (1b-c) and (i). The eight native speakers I asked split fifty-fifty as to which variant they accept and no one has accepted both, so kind names seem to pattern either as city/country names or as non-toponymic names.

Month names allow only the odd reversed construction in (ii) with obligatory agreement. Sortals are not used with days of the week or event names (like *WWII*), perhaps because these proper names refer unambiguously and so a sortal is pragmatically infelicitous. Finally, holidays names allow the appositive oblique, as in (iii), as do the names of galaxies, constellations, and certain others, see Logvinova 2018, [in press].

(7)	animate referents: obligatory case-agreement								
	a.	o russkom about Russian.MSG.LO about the Russian poet	poète C poet.MSG.LOC <i>Blok</i>	Bloke/*Blok Blok.MSG.LOC/*NOM	[+animate]				
	b.	o russkom about Russian.MSG.LO about the Russian poet	poète C poet.MSG.LOC <i>Tsvetaeva</i>	Cvetaevoj/*Cvetaeva Tsvetaeva.FSG.LOC/*NOM					
(8)	non-	toponymic proper names	: forbidden case-a	agreement					
	a.	s familiej Blok/*Blokom with surname.INS Blok.NOM/INS with the surname Blok							
	b.	o krejsere about cruiser.MSG.LOC about the cruiser Mosc	"Moskva/*Mos Moscow.MSG. ow.	kve". NOM/*LOC					
(9)	toponyms: case-agreement restricted by phi-feature congruence								
	a.	a. na ulice Jakimanka/Jakimanke in street.FSG.LOC Yakimanka.FSG.NOM/LOC on the Yakimanka street							
	b.	na ulice Ba in street.FSG.LOC Ba on the Balčug street	lčug/*Balčuge lčug.MSG.NOM/LC)C	≭ phi-congruent				

While with animate referents (7) non-agreeing case on the proper name is disallowed in close apposition, with non-toponymic proper names (8) nominative is required on the proper name. Finally, for the third category, which only contains toponyms, both options are possible and, as (9) shows, the availability of the agreeing option is conditioned by their phi-features.

The focus of this paper in on case-agreement for toponyms, which has been shown to depend on phi-congruence, i.e., on whether the sortal and the proper name match in phi-features. In addition to prescriptivist works like Rozental, Džandžakova and Kabanova 1998 (henceforth RDK), two corpus studies, Graudina, Ickovič and Katlinskaja 1976 (henceforth, GIK) and Logvinova 2018, show that within the broad category of toponyms different lexical-semantic classes can be distinguished in function of whether they require matching only in number or also in gender. After having examined the empirical picture provided by these works and discussed which deviations from these patterns are possible and why,⁴ I will argue (section 4) that the first hypotheses that come to mind cannot account for them and then advance an approach based on the assumption that phi-congruence enables semantic agreement (section 5).

3.1. Number congruence and optional case-agreement

The most permissive category of toponyms are proper names introduced by the sortals *gorod* 'city, town' (M), *stolica* 'capital' (F) and *strana* 'country' (F) (although not the coextensional

(iii) prazdnik Pasxi holiday Easter.GEN the Holiday of Easter

⁴ Most of the generalizations below come from GIK and RDK and are verified by Logvinova 2018, [in press]. Deviations from and extensions of the patterns described there have been cross-checked in the National Russian Language Corpus (RNC, https://ruscorpora.ru/new/index.html), on Google, and with some native speakers.

gosudarstvo 'state' (N)), where agreeing and non-agreeing cases can be in free variation with no obvious difference in interpretation. Yet the phi-feature specification of the proper name is relevant for case-agreement, as can be seen from morphologically plural proper names. While both masculine and feminine city and country names generally allow case-agreement (10), plural ones, as in (11), do not (GIK:141, RDK:281, confirmed by Logvinova 2018:25-28, [in press]; the same is true for Ukrainian (Gorpinič 1987)):⁵

(10)	a.	v gorode Moskva/ in city.MSG.LOC Moscow in the city of Moscow	Moskve singular sortal, feminine PN FSG.NOM/LOC
	b.	v gorode Tallinn/Tall in city.MSG.LOC Tallinn.MSC in the city of Tallinn	inne singular sortal, masculine PN .NOM/LOC
	c.	o strane Franc about country.FSG.LOC Franc about the great country France	ja/Francii feminine sortal, feminine PN e.FSG.NOM/LOC
	d.	o strane Kitaj/ about country.FSG.LOC China about the great country China	Kitaje feminine sortal, masculine PN .MSG.NOM/LOC
(11)	a.	v gorode Gagry/*Gag in city.MSG.LOC Gagra.PL.NG <i>in the city of Gagra</i>	rax singular sortal, plural PN DM/LOC
	b.	v gorode Velikie Lu in city.MSG.LOC Velikie Lu	ki/*Velikix Lukax singular sortal, complex plural PN ki.PL.NOM/LOC

in the city of Velikie Luki

A caveat should be introduced here. The non-agreeing pattern is an innovation in the history of Russian and is anecdotally taken to have arisen as a response to the logistical challenges of WWI, when the use of the nominative form before the sortal could distinguish one location from another. Prior to that time the preference was for case-agreement between the sortal and the proper name, and this pattern is still attested even for number-incongruent proper names. While (12a) can be taken to result from artificial archaization, (12b), forming a near-minimal pair with (11), is taken from a recent article about paragliding, indicating that the language change is still in progress.

- (12) a. V gorode Fivax pravili car^j Laj i carica Iokasta.⁶ in city.MSG.LOC Thebes.PL.LOC ruled king Laius and queen Jocasta *King Laius and Queen Jocasta ruled in the city of Thebes.*
 - b. V majskie prazdniki on paril nad pl^jažami v kurortnom gorode Gagrax.⁷ in May holidays he soared above beaches in resort town G.PL.LOC During May holidays he soared above the beaches in the resort town of Gagra.

Examples (12) were not ungrammatical for some of the native speakers I consulted, including those who, when asked earlier about (11), had rejected the agreeing variant.

⁵ For the sake of simplicity I avoid neuter toponyms, as these tend to behave as indeclinables, appearing in the nominative even without a sortal (GIK:138-140). The neuter sortals *selo* 'village' and *gosudarstvo* 'state' avoid case-agreement even with phi-congruent toponyms, though the former allows it with phi-congruent adjectival proper nouns (there exist no adjectival state names).

⁶ https://lit.wikireading.ru/hbGcTPBY34

⁷ http://www.paraplanerism.ru/kolomenskoe.php

There also exists a more restrictive group of speakers, who reject agreeing case on a country or city name that is not gender-congruent with the sortal (see also RDK:281). This is in fact the pattern described by RDK for sortals other than the masculine *gorod* 'city, town' and the feminine *strana* 'country'. In most of the current usage, however, as shown by the statistical data in Logvinova 2018:43, case-agreement with the masculine sortal *gorod* 'city, town' is not affected by gender. Interestingly, however, there is one context where the gender factor seems active for this category:

- (13) a. A vy znaete, čto v Rossii est^j dva goroda Pavlovska/*Pavlovsk? and you.PL know.2PL that in Russia is two city.GEN Pavlovsk.GEN/NOM Are you aware that there are two cities named Pavlovsk in Russia?
 - b. A vy znaete, čto v Štatax est^j dva goroda Moskva/*Moskvy? and you.PL know.2PL that in States is two city.GEN Moscow.NOM/*GEN *Are you aware that there are two cities named Moscow in the States?*

The fact that in exactly the same environment case-agreement is grammatical for a masculine toponym and ungrammatical, for a feminine one, strongly suggests that case-agreement is not correlated with a major difference in meaning.

3.2. Gender congruence as a condition on case-agreement

For the sortals *derevnia* 'village', *selo* 'village', *posiolok* 'village', *reka* 'river', *xutor* 'farm' and *ulica* 'street' (the exact list varies from source to source, and Logvinova 2018 claims that in contemporary Russian *reka* 'river' and *gora* 'mountain' reflect this tendency), the toponym in apposition does not agree in case unless congruent with the sortal both in number and in gender (RDK:281, GIK:140):

(14)	a.	na ulice in street.FSG.LOC on the Yakimanka s	Jakimanka/Jakimanke Yakimanka.FSG.NOM/LOC treet	✓ phi-congruent
	b.	na ulice in street.FSG.LOC on the Balčug stree	Balčug/*Balčuge Balčug.MSG.NOM/LOC t	×phi-congruent
	c.	na ulice in street.FSG.LOC on the Čistye Prudy	Čistye Prudy/*Čistyx Prudax Čistye Prudy.M.PL.NOM/LOC street	*phi-congruent

The lack of agreement in (14c), containing a masculine plural proper name with a feminine singular sortal, could be due to number incongruence, gender incongruence or both (the lack of familiar plural street names precludes the construction of a gender-congruent example). Moreover, the toponym in (14c) is also internally complex, which, oddly enough, introduces an additional factor to be discussed in section 3.5. Since gender is not syntactically active in the plural in Russian, the question arises if number congruence in this category of toponyms should be analyzed as a separate factor, which it is for the toponyms discussed in the previous section, or as merely reflecting the syntactic inactivity of gender in the plural.

3.3. Case-agreement with number-congruent pluralia tantum toponyms

While GIK, RDK and other prescriptive sources agree that morphologically plural toponyms disallow agreement, such is not the case when the sortal itself is plural, as with archipelagos (15a) or mountain chains (15b):

- (15) a. Kak žit^j na rajskix ostrovax Mal^jdivax za suščie groši?⁸ how live.INF on Paradise _{ADJ} islands.LOC Maldives.LOC for real pennies *How to live in the island paradise of the Maldives for peanuts?*
 - b. gorami Alⁱpami⁹ mountains.PL.INS Alps.PL.INS *with the Alps*

Confirming this observation, Logvinova 2018 also points out that case-agreement is possible when a plural sortal is followed by a conjunction of singular toponyms:

(16) v gorodax Balakove i Saratove in city.M.PL.LOC Balakov.M.LOC and Saratov.M.LOC *in the cities of Balakov and Saratov*

Logvinova 2018

As the proper name here is a conjunction of two singular toponyms and is therefore plural only by virtue of its semantics, it cannot be argued that number congruence as a precondition for case-agreement is ensured by the proper name agreeing with the sortal.

3.4. Case agreement with phi-congruent adjectival proper names only

For the remaining categories of toponyms case-agreement in close apposition is possible only with morphologically adjectival toponyms on the condition of both gender and number congruence with their sortals:

(17)	a.	do stancii until station.FSG.GEN until the station Bologo	Bologoe/*Bologogo Bologoe.NSG.NOM/GEN oe	×phi-congruent, ✓adjective
	b.	do stancii until station.FSG.GEN until the station Mosco	Moskva/*Moskvy Moscow.FSG.NOM/GEN w	✓phi-congruent, ×adjective
	c.	do stancii until station.FSG.GEN until the station Tixore	Tixoreckaja/Tixoreckoj Tixoreckaja.FSG.NOM/GEN eckaja	✓ phi-congruent, ✓ adjective

An incomplete list of such sortals includes ports, lakes, bays, volcanoes, hills (especially the Far Eastern *sopka*), mountains, planets, and railway stations. Prescriptive grammars may insist that case-agreement is impossible with such proper names or include in this list islands, republics, etc., but this is because adjectival toponyms are rarely considered. Thus, toponyms preceded by the sortals *aúl* 'a village in the Caucasus and Central Asia' and *kišlák* 'a village in Central Asia' are often claimed to never agree for case, but this is because the names of such villages are extremely unlikely to be morphologically adjectival: when an adjectival toponym is used, case-agreement becomes possible:

(18) v kišlake/aule Severnom/Severnyj in kishlak/aul.MSG.LOC Northern.MSG.LOC/NOM in the kishlak/aul Severnyj

The observation (GIK:143, confirmed by Logvinova) that foreign toponyms do not agree in case when combining with such sortals as *štat* 'state', *respublika* 'republic', etc., is explained by the non-existence of morphologically adjectival foreign proper names.

⁸ https://arissston.livejournal.com/140512.html

⁹ https://limon.kg/ru/news:67260

As far as I could ascertain, adjectival toponyms can always agree in case with their sortal if they are phi-congruent. In this they differ from proper names of other entities, which do not allow this option:

(19)	a.	na minonosce on torpedo boat.MSG.LC <i>on the torpedo boat</i> The	"Blest ^j aščij"/*"Blest ^j aščem" Shining.MSG.NOM/LOC hining	
	b.	o romane about novel.MSG.LOC <i>about the novel</i> The Invi	"Nepobedimyj/*Nepobedimom" Invincible.MSG.NOM/LOC ncible	

The contrast between adjectival and nominal toponyms strongly suggests that the latter do not contain an implicit sortal (which would have made them nominal).

3.5. Complex toponyms

One more important characterization of close apposition in Russian is that complex toponyms appear to be more restrictive than simplex toponyms. As noted in GIK:142, syntactically complex city and country names differ from syntactically simple ones in that the former agree in case only on the condition of gender congruence, just like street names, (20):¹⁰

(20)	a.	v goro	de	Belaya Cerkov ^j /*Beloj Cerkvi	×phi-congruent
		in city.	MSG.LOC	White Church.FSG.NOM/LOC	
		in the ci	ity of Beld	aya Cerkov (lit. White Church)	

b. v gorode Petropavlovsk-Kamčatskij/Petropavlovske-Kamčatskom in city.MSG.LOC Petropavlovsk-Kamčatka.ADJ.MSG.NOM/LOC in the city of Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij (lit. Petropavlovsk of Kamchatka)

As before, Internet searches locate some instances of case-agreement for (20a) that probably reflects an earlier stage of the linguistic change in progress, whereas the native speakers that I consulted conform to the generalization in GIK: only phi-congruent complex city names can agree in case, exhibiting the more restricted pattern associated with street names (section 3.3). Logvinova 2018 supports this generalization showing that complex masculine city names (the word *gorod* 'city, town' is masculine) are less likely to agree than simplex masculine city names of comparable frequency.¹¹

A similar effect is reported for internally complex street names, such as *Novaja Zarja* 'the New Dawn'. While street names are generally asserted to require gender congruence (as in (14) in section 3.2), some prescriptivists claim¹² that complex feminine street names behave like masculine street names and disallow case-agreement (recall that the sortal *ulica* 'street' is feminine), resulting in the pattern in (21a). Others¹³ only draw a distinction between feminine street names (which agree in case) and masculine ones (which do not). Importantly, complex adjectival street names allow case-agreement (21b).

(21)	a.	na ulicu	Novaja Zar ^j a/*Novuju Zar ^j u
		on street.ACC	New Dawn.NOM/ACC
		on(to) the stree	t New Dawn

¹⁰ Gorpinič 1987 asserts that in Ukrainian complex toponyms in close apposition do not agree in case, but a quick informal check has shown that such is not the case for at least some native speakers.

¹¹ GIK:149 also claims that while agreeing adjectival modifiers have this effect, PP modifiers do not. Logvinova does not examine such cases and I have not been able to verify this claim or disprove it.

¹² E.g., https://newslab.ru/article/465957

¹³ E.g., http://new.gramota.ru/spravka/buro/search-answer?s=295848

b. na ulicu Malaja Bronnaja/Maluju Bronnuju on street.ACC Small Hauberk _{ADJ}.NOM/ACC on(to) the Lesser Hauberk street

Even though adjectives do not modify adjectives and *malaja* 'small' in (21b) is originally a restrictive modifier (the Small Hauberk street, as opposed to the bigger one), it seems unlikely that (21b) contains a null head noun, or it would behave the same as (21a). One more possibility is that (21b) is derived by inversion from (21c), where the sortal forms part of the toponym, yet inversion is generally impossible with toponyms (22)-(23), except in poetry:

(21)	c.	na Maluju Bronnuju	ulicu
		on Small Hauberk ADJ.ACC	street.ACC
	on(on(to) the Lesser Hauberk st	reet

- (22) a. na Sennoj ploščadi on hay.ADJ.FSG.LOC Square.F.LOC on Hay Square
 - b. *na ploščadi Sennoj on Square.F.LOC hay.ADJ.FSG.LOC
- (23) a. na Nevskom (prospekte) on Nevsky.MSG.LOC avenue.M on the Nevsky (Prospekt)
 - b. *na prospekte Nevskij/Nevskom on avenue.M.LOC Nevsky.MSG.NOM/LOC

The fact that complex adjectival toponyms do not behave as nominal ones provides additional support for the lack of an implicit sortal in adjectival toponyms, which the contrast between adjectival and nominal toponyms has already suggested.

3.6. Intermediate summary

The behavior of toponyms clearly shows that case-agreement depends on phi-congruence and that the strictness of this condition is determined by the lexical-semantic class of the proper name: while animate proper names require case-agreement and non-toponymic inanimate ones disallow it, toponyms permit case-agreement on variable conditions of phi-congruence: while for cities and countries number congruence is a sufficient condition for case-agreement, street names require gender congruence in addition, and other toponyms can agree in case only if they are adjectival.

	no case	+adjectival	gender	number	no congruence
animates	×	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark
cities, countries, rivers	✓	✓	✓	✓	×
streets, villages	✓	✓	✓	×	×
other toponyms	✓	✓	×	×	×
non-toponymic inanimates	✓	×	×	×	×

Table 1: Case-agreement with proper names

For some speakers certain lexical-semantic classes seem to be more restrictive than described by the existing sources and "shifted downwards" in the table, and the same appears to be the case for internally complex toponyms, though the facts are yet far from clear. Several facts should be accounted for, which excludes some analyses that appear plausible at a first glance:

- > animate sortals require a case-agreeing proper name
- > case-agreement is impossible with inanimate non-toponymic proper names
- without an overt sortal all proper names are appropriately case-marked
- \blacktriangleright it is the sortal that determines how the entire NP agrees
- the same proper noun (e.g., Moskva 'Moscow' in (8b) and in (10a)) may behave differently with different sortals
- it does not seem that agreeing toponyms permit some interpretation or usage that non-agreeing ones do not
- internally complex toponyms may yield different congruence restrictions, though the entire empirical picture is yet unclear
- at a prior stage of the language toponyms did not require phi-congruence for caseagreement
- ▶ with cardinals, sorted city names require gender congruence (13)

The distinction between toponyms and other proper names suggests that the lexical-semantic class of a proper name is reflected in its syntax in a principled way.

4. EXCLUDED HYPOTHESES

The empirical generalizations established above provide the desiderata for an explanation that exclude several immediately obvious and not-so-obvious hypotheses.

4.1. Semantic type distinction

A question that needs to be addressed by any theory of close apposition is the semantic type of the proper name (or kind name, for that matter). Two options are available: a predicate and an individual.

The standard approach to proper names is to regard them as individual constants: in argument positions the name *Alice* denotes the individual *a*. However, since, as first pointed out in this context by Sloat 1969, proper nouns can also appear in positions where such a denotation is impossible (24), an additional denotation for them is needed, where they denote predicates.

(24) a. *Some/ \checkmark sóme Smith/man stopped by.

Sloat 1969

- b. Some/sóme Smiths/men stopped by.
- c. Smiths/men must breathe.
- d. The clever Smith/man stopped by.
- e. The Smith/man who is clever stopped by.
- f. A clever Smith/man stopped by.
- g. The Smiths/men stopped by.
- h. The *Smith/ \checkmark man stopped by.
- i. Smith/*man stopped by.

The predicative approach to proper names (see Matushansky 2008, Gray 2015, and Fara 2015 for recent takes and references) argues that the denotation in (25a) can and must be derived as a referential definite description built on the basis of the predicative denotation presented in a simplified form in (25b). Yet for our purposes it is sufficient that the toponym in close apposition can in principle be referential or predicative.¹⁴ Can case-agreement be taken as an

¹⁴ It is tempting to appeal to the lack of the article in *the river Rhine* as an argument for treating the toponym as non-referential. However, in the next language over, Dutch, the article is present:

argument for the simultaneous availability of both options and used to differentiate between the two?

(25) a. [Alice] = ab. $[Alice] = \lambda x \in D_e$. x is called /ælis/

Several reasons can be provided why this approach should not be taken. Firstly, the fact that animate proper names require case-agreement, while inanimate non-toponymic proper names disallow it is hard to square with different denotations: we do not expect animacy to interact in this way with the semantic type. Secondly, if case-agreeing toponyms are referential and non-agreeing ones are predicative (or *vice versa*), we expect that there is some context of use that the non-agreeing close apposition in (17a-b) lacks and the agreeing close apposition in (17c) has, which does not seem to be the case. While a more detailed survey might reveal such a difference, no research so far has indicated that there is some meaning or use that (26a) might have while (26b) would lack, nor is there any obvious interpretational distinction for the agreeing vs. non-agreeing options for one and the same toponym in (17c) or for the gender-distinct toponyms in exactly the same environment in (13).

(26)	a.	v	gorode	Moskve
		in	city.MSG.LOC	Moscow.FSG.LOC
		in the	e city of Mosco	W

b. v gorode Gagry in city.MSG.LOC Gagra.PL.NOM in the city of Gagra

It can be argued that a predicative proper noun, as in (25b), can be combined with the definite article (or the corresponding type-shift, the iota-operator) to give rise to a definite NP with an interpretation that is virtually indistinguishable from (25a), as in (25c). While the predicative approach to proper names argues that this is in fact how their referential use is derived, the referential approach may rely on the ambiguity in (25a-b) to derive the two syntactic options: the proper name (25a) and the definite DP (25c):

(25) c. $\iota x \in D_e$. x is called /ælıs/

While at first blush such an analysis could be taken as an argument in favor of the referential approach to proper names, two problems arise as a result. Firstly, in general, if both options are available in principle, how do we know which one we are dealing with in *Alice is here?* Secondly, specifically to the empirical issue at hand, why should one of the two options be unavailable for animate proper names (which require case-agreement in close apposition) and the other, for inanimate non-toponymic proper names (which require nominative) and why should gender features, as in (13), be relevant? The same two issues arise for any view that derives the variation in case-agreement from a difference in the interpretation, and the theory to be discussed now is no exception.

4.2. Quotation

The semantic distinction between mention and use looks like a plausible explanation for the two different syntactic options. It is an immediately obvious hypothesis that case invariability involves quotation, and even the objection raised at the end of the previous section might be overcome: maybe quotations are obligatorily inanimate and cannot function as anthroponyms or zoonyms, thus explaining why animate proper names require case-agreement.

(i) **de** rivier **de** Rijn the river the Rhine *the river Rhine* singular sortal, feminine PN

singular sortal, plural PN

Two issues remain, however. Firstly, it is still an open question why inanimate non-toponyms disallow case-agreement. Secondly, if the interpretation of the proper name is not the same in agreeing vs. non-agreeing cases, some difference in use is expected. There are, however, no cases where a phi-congruent and hence agreeing toponym is possible and another toponym, which does not permit agreement due to phi-incongruence, is excluded. In other words, the fact that a certain toponym cannot agree with a given sortal does not preclude its appearance in any context where an agreeing toponym with the same sortal can appear, which strongly suggests no difference in semantics for case-agreeing and invariant toponyms.

4.3. The sortal as the locus of variation

Although case-agreement variation for toponyms is usually described in the terms of lexicalsemantic classes, it is tempting to hypothesize that it is not the toponyms that are responsible for it, but their sortals, e.g., that some nouns can enter the derivation underspecified for some phi-features. The advantage of this approach is that it can explain why the same proper nouns (e.g., *Moskva* 'Moscow' in (8b) and in (10a)) behave differently by suggesting that it is not in the proper noun but in the sortal where the difference lies.¹⁵ The flip side is the prediction that different sortals applying to the same set of proper names are not expected to behave the same. Testing this prediction is difficult: the same behavior for different sortals can easily be attributed to coincidence. In fact, the feminine *stolica* 'capital', which combines with a subset of the toponyms that the masculine *gorod* 'city, town' can combine with, also requires only number congruence, whereas the difference between the coextensional *strana* 'country' and *gosudarstvo* 'state' (see fn. 15) can be due to the difference in their gender, so confirming or disproving this prediction is impossible.

Another problem with this hypothesis is that it cannot explain why phi-congruent adjectival toponyms can always agree in case with their sortal and why non-toponymic proper names never do: if the source of the relevant phi-features is the proper name, adjectival and nominal proper names should not differ, and the same is true for toponyms vs. non-toponyms. One more problem is motivation: these sortals do not exhibit any obvious semantic or syntactic peculiarities in any other contexts (which, however, is also true for the toponyms themselves). Finally, the very mechanism of "agreement as valuation" is ill-suited for dealing with phi-congruence, as we will now see.

4.4. Phi-congruence as valuation

Two mechanisms are provided by the current syntactic theory for comparing the phi-features of two constituents: agreement and semantic matching. As it is generally assumed that gender features of inanimate nouns are not interpretable, the feminine of *Jakimanka* and that of *ulica* 'street' in (14a) cannot be matched by ensuring that their presuppositions match: they do not introduce any.¹⁶ Syntactic agreement remains then the only option.

While number can reasonably be argued to not be inherent to a noun, gender arguably is. It is possible, however, that the gender feature is introduced on a special functional head (e.g., n, see Kihm 2005, Lowenstamm 2007, Acquaviva 2009, Percus 2011, and Kramer 2015, among others) and some additional (and independently needed) mechanism ensures that it correlates

¹⁵ Logvinova 2018 documents a difference in the behavior of the same toponyms with the feminine *strana* 'country' (case-agreement conditioned by number congruence) as opposed to the neuter *gosudarstvo* 'state' (no case-agreement). While the question is open whether the (sorted) toponyms denote the same entity, the syntax could still be the same, as the observed difference would also follow from the gender of the sortal: there were no neuter country names in the data set. Furthermore, as discussed in fn. 5, neuter toponyms resist case-marking even without a sortal.

¹⁶ This assessment will be reexamined in section 5.

properly with the semantics of the noun (for animates) and its declension class. How can we then implement the fact that some sortals, e.g., *ulica* 'street', can agree with the toponym?

Suppose that *ulica* 'street' can combine directly with the toponym and the gender-introducing functional head n (be it categorizing or not) enters the derivation afterwards:



Setting aside many technical details, consider (27b), where the gender values of the sortal and of the proper name do not match. The proper name is masculine (a valued feature), so *ulica* 'street' should also be assigned masculine, contrary to its declension class, which assigns it to feminine (and the gender feature of the resulting complex NP (nP₂) should also be feminine). Nouns whose gender does not match its declension class, such as semantically feminine nouns ending in a consonant (28), do not decline in Russian.

(28)	a.	k	ètoj	madam/*madame/*madamu	
		towards	this.DAT	madam.DAT _{INDECL/a-DECL/C-DECL}	
		towards	this mada	um l	

b. s Karmen/*Karmenoj/*Karmenom Ivanovnoj with Carmen.DAT_{INDECL/C-DECL} Ivanovna.DAT_{a-DECL} with Carmen Ivanovna

At the nP₁ level the prediction is that *ulica* 'street' would not agree. This is a wrong result, so let us suppose that the feminine feature of n_2 somehow overrides the masculine obtained from nP_{1-name}, both on the sortal and on the proper name. Feminine gender specification contradicts the morphological properties of the toponym, so the structure in (27b) would result in a non-agreeing form, as desired.¹⁷

This approach, however, cannot be extended to toponyms agreeing in case on the condition of number congruence. Firstly, number is generally associated with the presence of plural semantics, i.e., a *-operator or a cardinal (or both, this depends on the adopted approach to cardinals). In the case of number-congruent *pluralia tantum* toponyms, like in (15), where both the sortal and the toponym bear plural morphology, there seems to be no reasonable way in which one of them could be unvalued.¹⁸ To see this, consider the following structures:



The toponym Alipy 'the Alps' in (29) corresponding to (15b) is plural, on both morphological and semantic grounds, so its number feature is valued. Consider first (29a), where the number feature of the sortal is unvalued and so can in principle agree with the valued number feature of the toponym. However, the semantics of (29a) is incorrect: if Alipy 'the Alps' is referential

¹⁷ The fact that phi-congruent toponyms may still not agree in case requires an additional richer structure, where the sortal is specified for gender and the toponym, not having agreed with it, does not count as part of the same NP for the purposes of case-assignment (or more likely, concord).

¹⁸ I note here that in the singular the feminine noun *gora* 'mountain' allows case-agreement on the condition of gender congruence, though to a lesser degree than *strana* 'country' or *reka* 'river' (Logvinova 2018:22).

here, then the higher nP_1 node denotes the set of singular mountains that is the Alps, i.e., the empty set. If Alpy is predicative, then the higher nP_1 node denotes a set of mountains each of which either is called (the) Alps or is a plurality called (the) Alps, which is equally incorrect.

Consider now (29b) as the structure for (15b), assuming that Num^0 of the sortal is the source of the plural semantics (if it isn't, the same problem arises as in (29a)). The semantics is now correct, but the number feature of the sortal cannot be unvalued.

Two more options are available in principle. One (29c) is to assume that the unvalued number feature is on the toponym, contrary to what has been assumed before (and despite the fact that it is a *plurale tantum*). The second (29d) is to treat number features as unvalued on both the sortal and the toponym.



Even setting aside their syntactic plausibility, both options fail with the conjoined singulars in (16), repeated below, where the toponym cannot be reasonably regarded as having unvalued number: a non-intersective conjunction of two singulars (be it a sum of two individuals or a set-product of two predicates) can under no assumptions be non-plural semantically.

(16)	V	gorodax	Balakove	i	Saratove
	in	city.M.PL.LOC	Balakov.M.LOC	and	Saratov.M.LOC
	in	the cities of Bo			

We conclude that case-agreement with a phi-congruent plural sortal poses an unsurmountable obstacle to treating the phi-congruence condition in toponymic close apposition as valuation.

4.5. Intermediate summary

We have examined four theories that can be advanced to explain the phenomenon of varying case-agreement in close apposition in Russian. Two of them suggest a semantic difference between agreeing proper names (assumed to be referential) and non-agreeing proper names (which are attributed predicative semantics (or maybe indirectly referential semantics) or the semantics of quotation). The other two address the syntactic side of the problem: the locus of the unvalued features that should drive case-agreement and the applicability of the theory of agreement as feature valuation to close apposition.

The failure of syntactic theories is due to the fact that phi-congruence is established between interpretable features that can be simultaneously valued on the sortal and on the proper name. On the semantic side one problem is that the immediately obvious potential solutions do not take into consideration the difference between lexical-semantic classes of proper names, and another, that there is no independent evidence for a semantic distinction.

What follows is a sketch of a solution based on two assumptions: (a) that agreement in closeapposition is semantic and as such, based on feature-value matching rather than valuation and (b) that the semantic sort of toponyms is different from that of other proper names, so they can be singled out on semantic grounds.

5. TOPONYMS AS A SEMANTIC SORT

One of the main facts to be accounted for is the distinction between animate proper names (which obligatorily agree in case), toponyms (which may do so) and inanimate non-toponyms (which cannot do so).

As case-agreement is clearly dependent on phi-congruence, it is natural to hypothesize that a proper name "counts as part of the same NP as the sortal" if it agrees with it in some feature. Case-agreement then becomes something of a free-rider in the sense that case-assignment to the proper name forming part of the same NP as the sortal (which is what agreement enables) can be viewed as concord: multiple realizations of the case assigned to the entire NP. Without further elaboration of this hypothesis, I further suggest that different lexical-semantic classes of proper names underlyingly have different semantic phi-feature specifications and attempt to motivate these distinctions by independent factors.

5.1. The role of animacy

Being a subtype of nouns, proper names have valued formal phi-features determined by their semantics and their declension class. Since formal gender (for inanimate nouns) and formal number (for *pluralia tantum*) can be inherently valued and fail to agree, the only remaining option for agreement in close apposition are semantic phi-features. The first such feature is obviously animacy.

I will not decide here how this feature value is set. Three possibilities can be envisaged: from the sortal, from the denotation of the proper name itself (if it is referential) or from the denotation of the entire appositive noun phrase. What is crucial is that semantically, animacy is a privative feature, so inanimate nouns lack it. This means that a proper name can semantically agree for animacy only with animate sortals, which would explain why only animate proper names agree in close apposition.¹⁹

The question is now why toponyms do not behave as other inanimate proper names.

5.2. Locative nominals as a lexical-semantic class

There is mounting evidence that the syntax of nouns denoting places is different from that of nouns denoting other entities. Thus Haspelmath 2019 shows that cross-linguistically nouns denoting places are less marked in locative environments than regular object-denoting nouns, and Matushansky 2019 argues that crosslinguistic use of toponyms and a few common nouns as locative adverbials with zero or special marking indicates denotation in the special locative domain (variants of which have been independently postulated to account for the semantics of spatial prepositions (Bierwisch 1988, Wunderlich 1991, Zwarts and Winter 2000, Kracht 2002, Bateman et al. 2010, etc.)). Evidence for a special status of locative placenames in Martinican Creole can also be found in Zribi-Hertz and Jean-Louis 2013, 2017, 2018. In Russian itself, support for this view comes from the so-called *locative-II*: the special form of the Russian locative case that certain nouns take when appearing with the prepositions v 'in' or *na* 'on' denoting the default locative relations with these nouns (30).²⁰ Other nouns (including other location nouns) do not show this distinction:

¹⁹ One might object that animate proper names also have semantic gender, which they need not share with the sortal (fn. 2). A counterargument to this objection is that a human-denoting NP in Russian may acquire semantic gender that overrides its formal gender (Crockett 1976, Corbett 1979, Rothstein 1980, Nikunlassi 2000, Asarina 2008, Pesetsky 2013, etc.):

 ⁽i) U nas byla ocen^j xorošaja zubnoj vrač. Crockett 1976 with us was.FSG very good.FSG dental.MSG doctor.M We had a very good dentist.

In other words, sortals whose gender is different from that of the anthroponym can also agree on the basis of the gender of the referent outside close apposition, so arguably either do not possess underlying semantic gender or can acquire the gender of their referent by an independently motivated mechanism and then presumably agree with the proper name.

²⁰ The distribution of the "second prepositional case" (locative II) is very complicated, as discussed in Plungjan 2002, Brown 2007 and Itkin 2016 (see Nesset 2004 for its use in temporal expressions).

- (30) a. voda v taz- \mathbf{u} water in hand-basin-LOC II water in the hand-basin
 - b. nadpis^j na taz-**e** writing on hand-basin-LOC writing on the hand-basin

default locative meaning

non-default locative meaning

Plungjan 2002

The fact that adjectival modification of nouns in locative II is allowed shows that they cannot denote in the loci domain (since loci, be they regions, sets of points, or sets of vectors, do not have the same domain structure as objects and cannot be modified by the same modifiers). Yet locative II provides evidence for a crucial underlying distinction between object nouns and place nouns, and I propose that toponyms can be distinguished from other proper names on precisely these grounds (even though toponyms are never marked with locative II in Russian). Moreover, since locative-II nouns denote not only places, but also objects (i.e., any such noun can enter the derivation with either sort), we expect that the non-agreeing option will be possible in the latter denotation.

The question is how this distinction translates into optional case-agreement on the condition of phi-congruence.

5.3. Number features of toponyms

Importantly, Russian toponyms are not syntactically uniform. Their behavior with respect to case-agreement separates them into three classes (cf. Table 1):

- > countries and cities: number congruence is required for case-agreement
- > rivers, villages, etc.: number and gender congruence is required
- > others: only agreeing adjectival toponyms agree

I stipulate that, unlike other proper names, toponyms by virtue of their semantic sort cannot be mass. This generates the semantic feature of number, which is denotation-based. For most toponyms this would mean singular, but it is overridden by the formal plural with a *plurale tantum* toponym. It is only when the sortal is plural as well that no conflict arises.

The question is then what to do with gender.

5.4. Semantic agreement and referentiality

The appeal to semantic agreement raises the question of whether case-agreeing proper names are referential since semantic agreement is known to rely on the properties of the denotatum. Importantly, case-agreement is known to be facilitated if the toponym is familiar (GIK, RDK and Logvinova 2018, [in press]).²¹ While it seems plausible therefore than case-agreement in close apposition correlates with the referentiality of the toponym, testing this hypothesis with native speakers does not support this conclusion:

goroda Ekaterinburga (31) a. obsledovanie domašnix xozjajstv žitelej examination home economy.GEN residents.GEN city.GEN Ekaterinburg.GEN takže naxodjaščixsja na territorii Sverdlovskoj a oblasti gorodov located.PL.GEN on territory Sverdlovsk.ADJ region and also cities.GEN Kamensk-Ural^jskogo Pervouraliska i Pervouralsk.GEN and Kamensk-Ural'sky.GEN

²¹ Logvinova [in press] provides (p. 56) evidence from city names that higher frequency of a toponym increases the frequency of case-agreement. As previously described (GIK, RDK), plural and two-word toponyms are less likely to agree in case. She also observes that unexpectedly, adjectival city names are less likely to agree in case.

an examination of the housekeeping of the residents of the city of Ekaterinburg, as well as of the towns of Pervouralsk and Kamensk-Ural'sky, located in the Sverdlovsk region (RNC)

b. Krome **goroda Pavlovska** pod Piterom, est^j eščë odin – pod Voronežem. besides city.GEN Pavlovsk.GEN under Piter is also one under Voronezh Besides the town of Pavlovsk near St. Petersburg, there is one more near Voronezh.

The RNC example (31a) strongly implies that the hearer is not familiar with the two towns in question, yet case-agreement is grammatical there. More convincingly, perhaps, the toponym *Pavlovsk* cannot be referential in example (31b) because two places with such a name exist in the context, and the same is true in (13).

Nonetheless as the presupposition of countability applies to all toponyms it seems reasonable to view semantic features here as derived from the denotation. The situation is more complex where it comes to gender.

5.5. Inanimate gender as a formal feature

To account for case-agreement on the condition of gender congruence (section 3.2)) I propose that, contrary to what happens to inanimates in general, gender features of toponyms may be interpretable. Independent evidence for this comes from indeclinable toponyms and common nouns. While inanimate nouns in Russian are generally assigned gender on the basis of their declension class, the gender of indeclinable toponyms is often the same as the gender of their hypernym (RDK, Doleschal 1996, Murphy 2000, Matushansky 2022, a.o.), which strongly suggests that inanimate gender can also be interpretable at LF.²² If, as corpus searches reveal, along with the neuter expected for inanimates the indeclinable *Zimbabve* 'Zimbabwe' can be feminine (because *strana* 'country' is feminine) and *Bolišhoj Zimbabve* 'Great Zimbabwe' can be masculine (because *gorod* 'city' is), nothing excludes that morphologically declinable toponyms can also have semantic gender. If their gender is systematically determined by their declension class (as can be seen from their agreement outside close apposition), then for case-agreement this semantic/formal gender of a toponym would have to match the gender of the sortal along the same lines as discussed for animacy and number.

The hypothesis that formal gender features can be semantically interpretable (as is needed to explain toponyms requiring gender congruence for case-agreement (section 3.2)) entails that gender features of toponyms requiring number congruence only (section 3.1) should also be interpretable. Where does the difference come from?

By our prior reasoning toponyms are non-mass, so semantic agreement in number is possible for all toponyms and seems to be required for case-agreement. To explain the role of gender it is necessary to assume that when gender is semantically interpretable, semantic agreement just for number is insufficient. The question then arises why gender is interpretable for some toponyms (section 3.2) but not for others (section 3.1) and how come it suddenly becomes so for the latter in cases like (13).

The crucial property of (13) is obviously the paucal cardinal. The cardinal assigns a formal plural (or paucal) value to the number features of the sortal and the toponym, which both are morphologically singular and, following Ionin and Matushansky 2006, 2018, semantically atomic, even though the denotatum is semantically plural. Furthermore, the toponym, being in the scope of the cardinal, is not referential. Which of these factors (number mismatches or

²² Indeclinable common nouns can also be assigned semantic gender on the basis of their hypernym (see Wang 2014, Baranova 2016, a.o.), both in online computation and prescriptively.

non-referentiality) can explain the more restricted character of toponyms discussed in section 3.2 remains an open question.

5.6. Adjectival toponyms

To conclude the proposed sketch of a solution, it is necessary to explain why case-agreement with a phi-congruent adjectival toponym is possible for any sortal. The core intuition should rely on the fact that adjectives normally do not have any underlying phi-features as all. As metalinguistic as it sounds, it seems reasonable that adjectival toponyms come with a strong intuition of what the sources of their valued phi-features are, i.e., with some presupposition about their sortals. While it is unlikely that the hypernym is syntactically represented, it can function as the source of semantic phi-features, enabling the toponym to establish semantic agreement with its sortal.

6. CONCLUSION

We have seen that Russian proper names fall into three categories in function of how they behave with respect to case-agreement in close apposition. Proper names of human and other animate entities necessarily agree in case with the sortal. Names of inanimate entities that are not locations conversely never agree in case with the sortal. Finally, toponyms fall into the intermediate category: they may fail to agree in case with the sortal or allow case agreement on the condition of congruence in number (section 3.1) or in number and gender (section 3.2). While we have not looked at kind names in detail, they seem to pattern either as city/country names or as non-toponymic names (fn. 3).

I propose that the crucial distinction between toponyms and other inanimate proper names is that toponyms may introduce interpretable phi-features in close apposition. The advantages of this hypothesis are that, on the one hand, it does not need to assume that any semantic factors distinguish between toponyms agreeing and not agreeing in case, and on the other, that the introduction of interpretable phi-features can be naturally linked to frequency: more frequent toponyms would be more clearly identified with some presuppositions.

Many questions remain. For the time being we have no principled explanation for why there are these three classes of toponyms, or why internal syntactic complexity of proper names influences case-agreement.²³ We have not explored adjectival proper names in sufficient detail and only sketched a possible solution for the apparently obligatory gender congruence with cardinals. Likewise, we have not addressed the fact that close apposition may involve restrictive or non-restrictive interpretation of the sortal and did not make clear how agreement (or congruence) in phi-features can enable agreement in case (which is, after all, a purely syntactic operation).

The entire phenomenon of phi-congruence in case-agreement in toponymic close apposition, which we have encoded by hypothesizing that inanimate proper names may acquire semantic gender features, might instead be regarded as an argument in favor of treating agreement as matching rather than valuation. Irrespective of the eventual implementation, the issue of phi-congruence in case-agreement raises a number of problems for standard approaches to both proper names and agreement.

ABBREVIATIONS

2 second person

²³ One possible answer might be that internally complex toponyms are simply less frequent, but this hypothesis requires independent confirmation.

ACC	accusative
ADJ	adjective
DAT	dative
F	feminine
GEN	genitive
INF	infinitive
INS	instrumental
LOC	locative
LOC-II	locative-II
М	masculine
N	neuter
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative
PL	plural
SG	singular

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Precursors, parts, and pieces of this work have been presented and fruitfully discussed at many venues, including MIT (2011), Groningen University (2012), Radboud University of Nijmegen (2012), Moscow State Humanitarian University & Academy of Sciences Linguistic Institute (2013), UMR 7023 in Paris (2013) and several others. I am also very grateful to the three FDSL-14 reviewers, whose detailed and insightful comments have led me to completely restructure the paper, casting it as a challenge to a far greater extent than before.

REFERENCES

The Russian National Corpus (ruscorpora.ru). 2003–2022.

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 2009. Roots and lexicality in Distributed Morphology. In *York-Essex Morphology Meeting 2*, ed. by Alexandra Galani, Daniel Redinger and Norman Yeo, 1-21. York: University of York, https://researchrepository.ucd.ie/handle/10197/4148.
- Asarina, Alya. 2008. Gender and adjectives in numeral constructions in Russian. Ms., MIT. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.207.7432.
- Вагапоva, Anna S. 2016. Отражение вариативности родовой характеристики несклоняемых существительных в современных словарях [Variation in gender characteristics of indeclinable nouns in contemporary dictionaries]. Вестник Санкт-Петербургского Университета. Язык и литература [Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Language and Literature] 13(1), 45-57. doi:10.21638/11701/spbu09.2016.105.
- Bateman, John A., Joana Hois, Robert Ross, and Thora Tenbrink. 2010. A linguistic ontology of space for natural language processing. *Artificial Intelligence* 174(14), 1027-1071. doi:10.1016/j.artint.2010.05.008.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1988. On the grammar of local prepositions. In *Syntax, Semantik und Lexikon*, ed. by Manfred Bierwisch, Wolfgang Motsch and Ilse Zimmermann. *Studia Grammatica XXIX*, 1-65. Berlin: Akademie.
- Brown, Dunstan. 2007. Peripheral functions and overdifferentiation: the Russian second locative. *Russian Linguistics* 31(1), 61-76, http://www.jstor.org.proxy.library.uu.nl/stable/40160837.
- Burton-Roberts, N. 1975. Nominal apposition. *Foundations of Language* 13(3), 391-419, http://www.jstor.org/stable/25000923.
- Corbett, Greville G. 1979. The agreement hierarchy. *Journal of Linguistics* 15, 203-224. doi:10.1017/S0022226700016352.

- Crockett, Dina B. 1976. Agreement in Contemporary Standard Russian. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Doleschal, Ursula. 1996. Gender assignment revisited. In *Gender in Grammar and Cognition: I: Approaches to Gender*, ed. by Unterbeck Barbara, Rissanen Matti, Nevalainen Terttu and Saari Mirja, 117-166: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:10.1515/9783110802603.117.
- Fara, Delia Graff. 2015. Names are predicates. *Philosophical Review* 124(1), 59-117. doi:10.1215/00318108-2812660.
- Gorpinič, V. O. 1987. Складні випадки відмінювання топонімів [Difficult cases of declension of toponyms]. *Kul'tura slova [The culture of the word]* 3, http://kulturamovy.univ.kiev.ua/KM/pdfs/Magazine32-22.pdf.
- Graudina, Ljudmila Karlovna, Viktor Aleksandrovič Ickovič, and Lia Pavlovna Katlinskaja. 1976. Грамматическая правильность русской речи. Стилистический словарь вариантов [Grammatical correctness of the Russian speech. A stylistic dictionary of variants]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gray, Aidan. 2015. Lexical individuation and predicativism about names. *Thought: A Journal* of Philosophy 4(2), 113-123. doi:10.1002/tht3.164.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2019. Differential place marking and differential object marking. *STUF Language Typology and Universals* 72(3), 313-334. doi:10.1515/stuf-2019-0013.
- Haugen, Einar. 1953. On resolving the close apposition. American Speech 28(165-170). doi:10.2307/454129.
- Ionin, Tania, and Ora Matushansky. 2006. The composition of complex cardinals. *Journal of Semantics* 23(4), 315-360. doi:10.1093/jos/ff1006.
- Ionin, Tania, and Ora Matushansky. 2018. Cardinals: The Syntax and Semantics of Cardinalcontaining Expressions. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Itkin, I. B. 2016. Удивительная история второго предложного падежа [The amazing history of the second prepositional case]. Paper presented at «Публичные лекции "Полит.py"», May 19, 2016. https://m.polit.ru/article/2016/08/20/itkin_lecture/.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1984. On the phrase the phrase 'the phrase'. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 2(1), 25-37. doi:10.1007/BF00233712.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2005. The discourse function of close appositions. *Neophilologus* 89(3), 447-467. doi:10.1007/s11061-004-0963-9.
- Kihm, Alain. 2005. Noun class, gender, and the lexicon-syntax-morphology interfaces: a comparative study of Niger-Congo and Romance languages. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque and Richard S. Kayne, 459-512. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195136517.013.0011.
- Kracht, Marcus. 2002. On the semantics of locatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25(2), 157-232. doi:10.1023/A:1014646826099.
- Kramer, Ruth. 2015. The Morphosyntax of Gender. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasersohn, Peter. 1986. The semantics of appositive and pseudo-appositive NPs. In *Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics 3* ed. by Fred Marshall, Ann Miller and Zheng-sheng Zhang, 311-322. Columbus, Ohio: Dept. of Linguistics, the Ohio State University, https://www.academia.edu/417853/The_Semantics_of_Appositive_and_Pseudo_App ositive NPs.
- Logvinova, N.N. 2018. Аппозитивные конструкции с именами собственными в русском языке (Close appositional constructions with proper names in Russian). Ms., High School of Economics (St. Petersburg).
- Logvinova, N.N. [in press]. Именные аппозитивные конструкции в русском языке. In Материалы к корпусной грамматике русского языка [Materials for the corpus grammar of Russian], http://rusgram.ru/pdf/appositive_logvinova_181020_final.pdf.
- Lowenstamm, Jean. 2007. On little n, $\sqrt{}$, and types of nouns. In *The Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and Phonology*, ed. by Jutta Hartmann, Veronika Hegedüs and Henk Van Riemsdjik. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

- Matushansky, Ora. 2008. On the linguistic complexity of proper names. Linguistics and Philosophy 31(5), 573-627. doi:10.1007/s10988-008-9050-1.
- Matushansky, Ora. 2019. The case of restricted locatives. In Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 23, ed. by M. Teresa Espinal, Elena Castroviejo, Manuel Leonetti, Louise McNally and Cristina Real-Puigdollers, 161-178: Open Journal Systems, https://ojs.ub.uni-konstanz.de/sub/index.php/sub/article/view/604.
- Matushansky, Öra. 2022. On the semantics of inanimate gender. In QMUL Occasional Papers in Linguistics, ed. by Linnaea Stockall, Luisa Martí, David Adger, Isabelle Roy and Sarah Ouwayda, https://www.qmul.ac.uk/sllf/media/sllf-new/department-oflinguistics/hagit-borer-celebration/Matushansky.pdf.
- McCawley, James D. 1996. An overview of 'appositive' constructions in English. In Proceedings of Eastern States Conference in Linguistics '95, ed. by Marek Przezdziecki and Lindsay J. Whaley, 195-211. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
- McCawley, James D. 1998. The Syntactic Phenomena of English. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murphy, Dianna L. 2000. The gender of inanimate indeclinable common nouns in Modern Russian. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1488194825666262. Nesset, Tore. 2004. Case assignment and image schemas: Russian temporal adverbials:
- Studies in Language. *Studies in Language* 28(2), 285-319. doi:10.1075/sl.28.2.02nes.
- Nikunlassi, Ahti. 2000. On gender assignment in Russian. In Gender in Grammar and Cognition, ed. by Barbara Unterbeck and Matti Rissanen, 771-791. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110802603.771.
- Noailly, Michèle. 1991. "L'énigmatique Tombouctou": Nom propre et la position de l'épithète. Langue Française 92, 104-113. doi:10.3406/lfr.1991.6214.
- Percus, Orin. 2011. Gender features and interpretation: a case study. Morphology 21(2), 167-196. doi:10.1007/s11525-010-9157-2.
- Pesetsky, David. 2013. Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Plungjan, V.A. 2002. К семантике русского локатива («второго предложного» падежа) [On the semantics of the Russian locative ("the second prepositional" case]. Семиотика и информатика [Semiotics and informatics] 37, 229-254.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1998. Categorial feature magnetism: The endocentricity and distribution of projections. Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 2(1), 1-48. doi:10.1023/A:1009763305416.
- Rothstein, Robert A. 1980. Gender and reference in Polish and Russian. In Morphosyntax in Slavic, ed. by Catherine V. Chvany and Richard D. Brecht, 79-97. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Rozental, D. E., E. V. Džandžakova, and N. P. Kabanova. 1998. Справочник по правописанию, произношению, литературному редактированию [A Handbook of Orthography, Orthophony, Literary Editing]. Moscow: CeRo.
- Sloat, Clarence. 1969. Proper nouns in English. Language 45, 26-30. doi:10.2307/411749.
- Wang, Qiang. 2014. Gender assignment of Russian indeclinable nouns, MA thesis, University of Oregon. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/36692535.pdf.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1991. How do prepositional phrases fit into compositional syntax and semantics? Linguistics 29(4), 591-622. doi:10.1515/ling.1991.29.4.591.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne, and Loic Jean-Louis. 2013. From noun to name: on definiteness marking in modern Martinikè. In Crosslinguistic Studies on Noun Phrase Structure and Reference, ed. by Patricia Cabredo Hofherr, Anne Zribi-Hertz and Loic Jean-Louis, 269-315. Leiden: Brill. doi:10.1163/9789004261440_011.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne, and Loïc Jean-Louis. 2017. Les grammaires des noms de pays en martiniquais et en haïtien et la question du "prototype créole". Etudes créoles XXXV(1/2),64-91, https://www.lpl-aix.fr/wpcontent/uploads/Etudes cr%C3%A9oles/zribi-hertz.pdf.

- Zribi-Hertz, Anne, and Loïc Jean-Louis. 2018. General locative marking in Martinican Creole (Matinitjè): a case study in grammatical economy. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* 4, 151-176. doi:10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-23843.
- Studi Orientali 4, 151-176. doi:10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-23843.
 Zwarts, Joost, and Yoad Winter. 2000. Vector space semantics: a model-theoretic analysis of locative prepositions. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 9, 169-211, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40180207.