

## Review of “A short note on honorifics and personal articles in Spanish and Catalan and its consequences for the theory of proper names”

1. **Novelty of the contribution.** Potentially, this could be a significant contribution, but in the form of a short note, the arguments are not developed enough to be able to judge.
2. **Empirical evidence.** The note does not focus on empirical evidence, but on pointing to possible theoretical explanations of data and generalizations from Bernstein et al. (2009).
3. **Line of argumentation.** The argument is coherent, but relies on several unexplained assumptions whose import is not overtly explained. Some of the conclusions are grounded on implicit arguments.
4. **References.** The note has a limited set of reference, those essential for attempting to derive a theoretical point.
5. **Recommendation.** I do not think the import of the theoretical argument can be adequately developed in two pages, my recommendation would be to try to develop it as a full-fledged article.

### Detailed comments

The squib proposes two seemingly unrelated consequences of the analysis of *en/na* in Catalan and *don/doña* in Spanish, based on Bernstein et al (2019), who show that these personal articles must be singular and propose that they head a Classifier phrase located between DP and NP.

Specifically, the author makes two independent and seemingly unrelated claims: first, that *en/na/don/doña* are pure expressives in Potts' (2005) sense, whose main contribution is a conventional implicature. Second, assuming Saab and Lo Guercio's (2020) proposal that proper names project a numberless DP, it follows that they these DPs should only be singular.

The arguments in the squib raise several questions that seem hard to answer in two pages, suggesting perhaps that the squib modality is not the best vehicle for this developing this proposal. Below, I detail a few of these questions:

1) On the conventional implicature analysis. The author's lexical entries for items proposes that *don/doña* contributes a CI related to “respect” (see the squib's (7)) and *en/na* a CI related to “Familiar”. In Potts' framework, CIs are generally assume to be speaker oriented, but it is not completely obvious that this is the case at least for *don/doña*. For example, in *Marta cree que Pedro trae a Doña María*, *doña* can be speaker-oriented, but it seems like it can also be subject oriented. Likewise, it would be useful to explore examples like *vimos a la maldita doña María*, where the CI contribution by *maldita* seems to contradict that of *doña* a somewhat unexpected possibility if both are speaker-oriented.

2) Implications for the predicative analysis of proper names. The author states that this view constitutes “another important piece of evidence against the predicative analysis of proper names” when coupled with Saaba and Lo Guercio's (2020) proposal that “proper names project a numberless DP denoting in *e*”, and that “if proper names were predicates, the pattern briefly discussed here would remain mysterious”.

There are too many assumptions for this argument to go through without further explanations. For one, it is not obvious how the proposed view constitutes evidence against the predicative analysis of proper names. In other words, the reader is left wondering how exactly the analysis is an argument against the

predicative view. On the notion of proper names as a numberless DP, which presumably would derive the lack of plural instances of *en/na/don/doña*, it is not completely obvious why the mechanism that derives *los Alfredos* is not available for deriving *\*dones Alfredos*.

None of these objections are a priori insurmountable, but they do require stronger footing than what is possible in a squib.