LOCATIVE CASE IN FRENCH?
Séminaire de LaGraM, Paris VIII, June 8, 2015

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 familial or political clan
    b. the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, the Monty Pythons band, company
    c. the Mets, the Mikes, the Tigers baseball or football team, Army regiment

(2) a. the Alps, the Rockies mountain chains
    b. the Hebrides, the Orkneys archipelagoes
    c. the Netherlands conglomerate countries
    d. the Pleiades, the Hyades constellations

(3) a. the Seine, the Erie, the Atlantic water bodies
    b. the Milky Way, the Broadway former definite descriptions
    c. the Bronx, the Ukraine idiosyncratic cases

Is there no system?

In German, proper names are bare iff they are not specified for number or gender features (Matushansky [to appear])

(4) 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

(5) (der) Hans, (die) Maria…

(6) München, Berlin, Frankfurt am Main…

Furthermore, cross-linguistically, the presence of an article on 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:

    b. Egipt – Egiptului, București - Bucureștiului

One may hope that there is always a formal system behind language-internal variability.

2. LOCATIVE PREPOSITIONS WITH FRENCH PROPER NAMES

Baseline: comparing to English, proper names of cities are unexceptional:

NB: The gender of French cities is a thorny issue, see Edwardsson 1968, Hasselrot 1943/1944, Lomholt 1983
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(8)  à Paris, à Nice, à Londres…

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

(9)  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:

(10)  *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*).

(11)  a.  en France, en Mauritanie…
    b.  au Canada, au Pérou…
    c.  en Irlande, en Egypte…
    d.  en Afghanistan, en Angola, en Iran…
    e.  aux/*en Philippines/Indes

The combination of à+DEF cannot be replaced by en if à is not locative:

(12)  lié à la France/*en France

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

(13)  a.  de France, de Mauritanie…
    b.  du Canada, du Pérou…
    c.  d’Irlande, d’Egypte…
    d.  d’Afghanistan, d’Angola, d’Iran…
    e.  des/*de Philippines/Indes

The article cannot disappear if the preposition is not locative:

(14)  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 dhu)

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

**2.1. Prior treatments of these 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)

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

Miller et al. 1997: “Grevisse (1980:627ff.) notes that Danemark, Portugal and Luxembourg (consonant-initial masculines) take either en or au, and de or du (Il est alle en/au Danemark ‘He went to Denmark’; Il revient de/du Danemark ‘He came back from Denmark’). […] Similarly, names of old provinces can be preceded by en, even when they are consonant-initial masculines: en Limousin, en Berry, etc.” (cf. Grevisse 2006:1506-1507)

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 1983:126-135;145):

(15) 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

(16) 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):

(17) 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)

2.2. The scope of the phenomenon

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

2.2.1. 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)
(18) 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, Vauchuse, Savoie, Aveyron)

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></th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>masculine V</th>
<th>masculine C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country, continent</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US state, Canadian province</td>
<td>en/*/dans la</td>
<td>en/*/dans l’</td>
<td>au/dans le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French province</td>
<td>en/dans la</td>
<td>en/dans l’</td>
<td>*en/dans le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>départements</td>
<td>en/dans la</td>
<td>en/dans l’</td>
<td>dans le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cities</td>
<td>à</td>
<td>à</td>
<td>à</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oceans, seas, lakes, etc.</td>
<td>dans la</td>
<td>dans l’</td>
<td>dans le</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rivers generally take the lexical prepositions dans and sur, as well as à; feminine ones may accept en. No information on vowel-initial river names in Lomholt:

    this.FSG-PROX avoided of+be.INF thrown in Loire
    This one avoided being thrown into the Loire.

    b. le corps d’un inconnu repêché dans la Seine. Lomholt 1983:285
    the body of+INDEF unknown fished.out in the.FSG Seine
    an unidentified body fished out in the Seine

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

2.2.2. Within-class variation

Two types of variation: individual (for a particular lexical item) and systematic exceptions

Islands are divided into country-like and city-like (Vikner 1970, Lomholt 1983:235-245): en Corse vs. à Bornholm

Actually, topographic containers vs. points, more on this below
Country-like islands: overt definite article, *en* in the feminine and perhaps with vowel-initial names:

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

(21) 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 *à*; the article is absent in the ablative:

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

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

(23) 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 (21b) belong?

Answer: like country names, they retain the article with the ablative *de*.

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

Feminine island names can be definite or bare (which means that French does not fit into the generalization about the role of gender in the overtness of the definite article for German). The same picture appears to arise in Italian

Further counterexamples from names of planets: for instance, *Jupiter* is feminine (because a planet?)

Masculine island names are generally bare (I have found only three exceptions: two in (21b) and *l’Etac de Sercq* ‘Little Sark’, which combines with the locative preposition *dans*)

Lexical exceptions: some islands allow both: *en/à la Martinique, en/à la Gouadeloupe*, but also *en/à Haïti*, sometimes for the same author within the same text (Vikner 1970:238); with the ablative *de* the article cannot be omitted (ibid.), but Lomholt 1983:244 is more cautious, claiming simply that the drop of the definite article is not as frequent as the use of *en*

Singular archipelagoes are all masculine, but divide up along the same lines:

(25) a. le Svalbard (au/du), le Vanuatu (au/du)
b. Madère (à/de), Zanzibar (à/de)
c. le Dodécanèse (dans le/du)

To the best of my knowledge, no one treats archipelagoes as a separate lexical-semantic class, even though empirically they are very different from islands

In fact, Lomholt discusses *Svalbard* and *Mayotte* in the island section, and for a number of archipelagoes their name is identical to that of the main island (e.g., *Chausey, Malte, Madère*; this used to be the case for Zanzibar and Spitsbergen (now the archipelago is called Svalbard))

2.2.3. **Summary**

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

**Issue 1**: what is the **syntactic (and ontological) status of the lexical-semantic class**?

**Issue 2**: **variability** within lexical-semantic classes (systematic: islands and archipelagoes)
Conclusion: **item-specific encoding.** How?

Factors of variation:
- denotation (location rather than entity)
- topological properties (container vs. point)
- gender and number

Simplification: **productive spatial and temporal localization only.** For the broader picture of *en* see Waugh 1976, Guimier 1978, Katz 2002, Amiot and De Mulder 2011, among others

### 2.3. 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 more likely that the portmanteau is the case-marked form of the proprial definite article rather than 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

### 2.3.1. Accounting for optionality and variation

Variation (for masculine US states and with department names) is due to variant specification
Evidence for the three categories: lexical-semantic classes that fit into only one of them (i.e., consonant-initial department names are only compatible with dans; no optionality for months or seasons)

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

All lexical-semantic classes in the last row of the table can also take dans; for la Manche 'La Mancha' it is obligatory (Lomholt 1983:125)

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

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

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: pre-specified gender for all toponyms

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; unidirectional -- yet)
- 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, replaced by en for vowel-initial ones (the second row in the table above)
- In the absence of phi-features locative case cannot be realized and ineffability results, except for vowel-initial proper names (the third row in the table above)
The behavior of vowel-initial toponyms follows the feminine pattern here, but not because of exceptional feature specification.

Names of **French provinces** follow two 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** locative case is unavailable, yielding ineffability (except for vowel-initial locations).

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).

### 2.3.2. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(26)</th>
<th>a. ce bébé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this-MSG baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>cet enfant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this-MSG child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>cet adorable bébé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this-MSG adorable baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>cette créature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this-FSG creature.F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(27)</th>
<th>a. mon bébé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSS.1SG-MSG baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>mon enfant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSS.1SG-MSG child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>mon adorable bébé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSS.1SG-MSG adorable baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>ma créature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSS.1SG-FSG creature.F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demonstrative pattern in (26) suggests that the allomorphy in (27) is not achieved by the deletion of or a change in a gender feature, because in (26b, 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><em>ma, ta, sa</em></td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td><em>cette</em></td>
<td><em>belle, nouvelle, vieille, etc.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td><em>mon, ton, son</em></td>
<td><em>l’</em></td>
<td><em>cet</em></td>
<td><em>bel, nouvel, vieil, etc.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine C</td>
<td><em>mon, ton, son</em></td>
<td><em>le</em></td>
<td><em>ce</em></td>
<td><em>beau, nouveau, vieux, etc.</em></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.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(28)</th>
<th>a. une grande [ɡʁɑ̃d] amie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a.FSG big.FSG friend.FSG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tseng 2003
Locative case in French?, Séminaire de LaGraM, Paris VIII (June 8, 2015)

b. un grand [grǎ]/[grā]t ami
   a.MSG big.MSG friend.MSG

(29) a. une grosse [grās] amie
    a.FSG fat.FSG friend.FSG

Moreover, ineffability is attested (Morin 1992):

(30) 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:

   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

2.4. 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 '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):

(32) 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

Locations translate into containers in French, but not vice versa

3. The definite article for entity-denotation

Starting hypothesis: it's about phi-features again
Problem for this hypothesis: names of islands:

(33) **Country-like islands: all requires the definite article**

a. la Corse, la Sicile, la Tasmanie…

b. le Groenland, le Spitzberg

(34) **City-like islands: overt definite article not attested for masculine ones**

a. â/de Terre-Neuve, â/de Belle-Ile, â/de Bornholm feminine/no article

b. â/de la Réunion, â/de la Nouvelle-Amsterdam, â/de la Grenade feminine/article

c. â/de Madagascar, â/de Malte, â/de Bornéo masculine

The existence of **bare feminine island names** argues against the hypothesis that specification of formal gender results in an overt definite article

Likewise, **city names**, while mostly bare, **prefer feminine agreement** (traditional grammars are all over the place; see Hasselrot 1943/1944, Edwardsson 1968, Lomholt 1983)

Curious fact: I found no feminine archipelago names

Hypothesis: the feminine agreement with bare city and island names is **semantic agreement** triggered by the corresponding sortals (*ville, île*, respectively)

Problem then: where does **masculine agreement** come from?

Hypothesis: these proper names are specified as [inanimate] (the feature already invoked for location-denoting proper names). By more general redundancy rules the formal specification of [inanimate] should yield the default gender, which is identical to masculine in French

For this system to function it is necessary to adopt a **dynamic approach** to NP-internal phi-feature specification (which is arguably necessary anyway)

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): "phrasal inflection" given a concrete realization
- 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:

(35) 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:

(36) a. gde 'where', kudá 'whereto', ot.kúda 'wherefrom'

b. zdes'/tut 'here', sjúda 'to here', ot.sjúda 'from here'

c. tam 'there', tudá 'to there', ot.túda 'from there'

d. vezde 'everywhere', vsjúdu 'to every where', 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. one- or 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:

(37) 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:

(38) 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)

(39) 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:

(40) 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:

(41) 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:

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

(43) 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:

(44) 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):

(45) a. Fresno g-abri-nk.
    Fresno INDIC-live-1PL
    We live in Fresno.

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):

(46) a. Tun Hayastan e-ir.
    you Armenia be-PAST.2SG
    You were in Armenia.

    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:

(47) 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)
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