

A semantic-typological perspective on determination: ‘semantic’ vs. ‘pragmatic’ in uniqueness and possession

Albert Ortmann (HHU Düsseldorf)

Goal of the talk:

- to highlight the analogy of the two dimensions of nominal determination, namely definiteness and possession, and their cross-linguistic manifestation
- by exploiting the distinction of inherent vs. contextual meaning, a.k.a. semantic vs. pragmatic

1. Setting the stage: the theory of Concept Types and Determination (CTD)

Löbner (2011) elaborates on the (1985) distinction of sortal vs. relational vs. functional into the following cross-classification of nominal concept types:

(1)	non-unique reference	unique reference
monadic	sortal concepts (SN) <e,t> <i>dog, table, adjective, water</i>	individual concepts (IN) e <i>sun, weather, Mary, prime minister</i>
polyadic	relational concepts (RN) <e,et> <i>sister, leg, blood, modifier</i>	functional concepts (FN) <e,e> <i>father, head, age, subject; difference</i>

Fully along the lines of the opposition of semantic and pragmatic uniqueness (Löbner 1985, 2011; Ortmann submitted), the contrast of inalienable and alienable possession can be re-interpreted as **semantic and pragmatic possession**:

- For semantic possession some relation of affiliation is inherent in the lexical meaning of the possessum
- For pragmatic possession the POSS relation is established by the context rather than the word semantics.

In terms of concept types, I argue that the shift from sortal noun to relational concept (SN → RC) corresponds to alienable possession, much like the shift from sortal noun to an individual concept (SN → IC) corresponds to a strong definite article.

2. Typology of adnominal possession and semantic vs. pragmatic possession

2.1 Alienability splits

inalienable possession (to be argued to correspond to semantic possession):

inherent affiliation; unchangeable under normal conditions; relations that are not subject to choice or control: kinship, body parts, part-whole, location

alienable possession (to be argued to correspond to pragmatic possession):

temporary affiliation, where the p’or typically has control over the p’um. Accordingly, the purpose/the function of the p’um (eating, drinking, growing, tool) for the p’or is of relevance.

Modes of expressing an (in)alienability distinction in possession:

- Possessor agreement is directly attached to the noun vs. mediated by a connective or relator

- (2) Jamul Tiipay (Yuman < Hokan, Mexico; Miller 2001: 145ff)
- | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. <i>me-ntaly</i> | b. <i>me-ny-a'naak</i> |
| 2-mother | 2-POSS-chair |
| 'your mother' | 'your chair' |
- (3) Diegueño (Yuman < Hokan; Mexico; after Nichols 1992: 117)
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. \int - <i>ətal'</i> | b. \int - <i>ə''-ʔwa:</i> |
| 1SG-mother | 1SG-POSS-house |
| 'my mother' | 'my house' |

• Possessor agreement is directly attached to the noun vs. attached to possessive classifier:

- (4) Paamese (Oceanic < Austronesian, Vanuatu; Crowley 1996: 384ff)
- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. <i>vati-n ēhon</i> | b. <i>ani emo-n ēhon</i> |
| head-3SG child | coconut POSSCL.POTABLE-3SG child |
| 'the child's head' | 'child's drinking coconut' |

• The possessor is realised as a suffix vs. as a free (possessive or personal) pronoun:

- (5) Eastern Pomo (< Hokan; California), after Nichols (1992: 118)
- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| a. <i>wi-bayle</i> | b. <i>wáx ša?ri</i> |
| 1SG-husband | PRON1SG.GEN basket |
| 'my husband' | 'my basket' |

⇒ Less conceptual distance is mirrored by less morphosyntactic complexity

⇒ If the relation between p'or and p'um is a conceptually inherent one, let's speak of semantic possession.

If the relation between p'or and p'um is conceptualised as being circumstantial, or contextually instantiated, let's speak of pragmatic possession.

⇒ Morphological markers of 'alienability' (connectives, classifiers) are interpreted as establishing a non-inherent, contextual, hence pragmatic POSS relation

2.2 Type shifts in possession

Claim and roadmap: Pragmatic possession should be represented as instantiating a shift from SN to RC:

- | | | | |
|--------|---|--|---------|
| (6) a. | sortal noun, e.g., <i>house</i> : | λx HOUSE(x) | |
| b. | type shift template for SC p'um: | $\lambda N \lambda y \lambda x$ [N(x) & POSS(y,x)] | SC → RC |
| c. | (6b) applied to (6a) | $\lambda y \lambda x$ [HOUSE(x) & POSS(y,x)] | |
| d. | (6c) applied to an NP (p'or), e.g., <i>John</i> : | λx [HOUSE(x) & POSS(John',x)] | |

A case study from Mayan:

2.3 'Alienable' morphology indicates pragmatic possession (SC → RC)

Claim: Mayan languages are particularly explicit in the sense of shifts: Absolute nouns (= SNs) are transformed into RCs by means of suffixation of *-il*, and by vowel lengthening, respectively.

2.3.1 Yucatec

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| (7) a. <i>le nah=o'</i> | b. <i>in=nah-il</i> | (data from Lehmann 1998) |
| DET house=DISTAL | 1.SG.E=house-POSS | |
| 'the house' | 'my house' | |
-
- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| (8) a. <i>ba'y</i> | b. <i>tu'x yàan u=x-ba'y-il in=nòok'</i> |
| bag | where exist 3.SG.E=FEM-bag-POSS 1.SG.E=dress |
| 'bag' | 'Where is the bag for my clothes?' |

2.3.2 Mam

- (9) a. *xaq*
rock
'rock'
- a'. *n-xaaq=a*
1.SG.E-rock.POSS=NON3RD
'my rock'
- b. *ne'l*
sheep
'sheep'
- b'. *n-nee'l=a*
1.SG.E-sheep.POSS=NON3RD
'my sheep'
- c. *kyixh*
fish
'fish'
- c'. *t-kyiixh*
3.SG.E-fish.POSS
'its fish'
- (data from England 1983)

Alternation sometimes blurred by irregularity: lexicalised possessed stems

- (10) a. *tz'lom*
plank
'plank'
- a'. *n-tz'áalm-a=ya*
1.SG.E-plank(POSS).EP=NON3RD
'my plank'
- b. *chekoxh*
fine_thread
'fine thread'
- b'. *n-chóokaxh=a*
1.SG.E-fine_thread(POSS)=NON3RD
'my fine thread'

Alternation sometimes blurred by prosody: stems with underlying long vowel can no longer be lengthened

- (11) a. *k'ooj*
'mask'
- a'. *n-k'ooj=a*
1.SG.E-mask=NON3RD
'my mask'
- b. *xkoo'ya*
'tomato'
- b'. *n-xkoo'y=ya*
1.SG.E-tomato=NON3RD
'my tomato'

⇒ Generalisation: in possessive use, 'alienable' nouns in Mam are subject to vowel lengthening unless they contain an underlying long vowel

2.3.3 Representations

Compositional analysis (drawing on Ortmann 2002, Ortmann & Handschuh 2004) that pairs the involved semantic operations (type shifts) with the involved morphological exponents.

In particular, the relator morpheme is analysed as the morphological exponent of establishing the relation POSS for alienable nouns as in (6b), thus, as establishing pragmatic possession.

For Yucatec:

- (12) a. sortal noun: *nah:* λx HOUSE(x)
- b. POSS type shift: *-il:* $\lambda N \lambda y \lambda x$ [N(x) & POSS(y,x)] SC → RC
- c. result of POSS type shift: *nah-il:* $\lambda y \lambda x$ [HOUSE(x) & POSS(y,x)]
- d. saturation of the possessor argument: *in=nah-il:* λx [HOUSE(x) & POSS (SPEAKER, x)]

For Mam: assume that the exponent of the POSS-operation is a prosodic property

- (13) a. sortal noun: *kyixh:* λx FISH(x)
- b. POSS type shift: $\mu:$ $\lambda N \lambda y \lambda x$ [N(x) & POSS(y,x)] SC→RC
- c. result of POSS type shift: *kyiixh:* $\lambda y \lambda x$ [FISH(x) & POSS(y,x)]
- d. saturation of the possessor argument: *t-kyiixh:* λx [HOUSE(x) & POSS (z,x)]

Analysis: type shift RC → SC

- (20) ‘derelative’ affixes: *-baj, -j, -tsil, k’e-*: $\lambda R \quad \lambda x \exists y R(x,y)$
RC → SC

In some languages, such a shift can be followed by the reverse (RC → SC → RC), with the result of providing the possessum with a general contextual relation of possession, as opposed to inherent possession.

- (21) Koyukon (Athapaskan < Na-Dene; Thompson 1996: 666f)
- | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| a. <i>nelaane</i> | b. <i>be-nelaane</i> | c. <i>se-k’e-nelaane</i> |
| meat | 3SG-meat | 1SG-DEREL-meat |
| ‘meat, flesh’ | ‘his/her (own) flesh’ | ‘my (animal’s) meat’ |

- (22) Movima (isolate, Bolivia; Haude 2006: 236)
- | | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| a. <i>di:noj</i> | b. <i>dinoj-kwa</i> |
| upper_leg | upper_leg-DEREL |
| ‘my upper leg’ | ‘detached leg’ |

⇒ Further overt type shifts may interact with alienability distinctions.

2.5 Temporary (in)alienability assignments

For many languages nouns are not invariably assigned to one of the classes:

- (23) Patpatar (Oceanic < East Malayo-Polynesian; New Guinea; Chappell & McGregor 1996):
- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. <i>a kat-igu</i> | b. <i>agu kat</i> |
| ART liver-1SG | 1SG liver |
| ‘my liver’ | ‘my liver (that I am going to eat)’ |

- (24) Maltese (Semitic < Afro-Asiatic; Fabri 1993: 161f)
- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| a. <i>ras Basilju</i> | b. <i>ir-ras ta’ l-istatwa</i> |
| head Basil | DEF-head of DEF-statute |
| ‘Basil’s head’ | ‘the head of the statute’ |

⇒ Emphasis may be put either to the inherent (semantic) or to an established (pragmatic) relation

⇒ type shift from inherently possessed RC to RC with contextual relation to p’ or (RC → SC → RC):

$$\lambda RC \lambda z \lambda x \exists y [RC(x,y) \& POSS_{context}(z,x)]$$

applied to *kat* ‘liver’: $\lambda z \lambda x \exists y [LIVER'(x) \& PART-OF(x,y) \& POSS_{context}(z,x)]$

- The semantic vs. pragmatic distinction accounts for what is known as the alienability contrast:
- ‘Alienable’ morphology (esp. connectives, classifiers) denote a type shift from SC to RC
- ‘Inalienable’ is morphologically unmarked because the relation of affiliation is inherent
- The inalienable construction therefore corresponds to either weak or absent definite articles

3. Typology of definite article splits and semantic vs. pragmatic uniqueness

Uniqueness approach to definiteness (Löbner 1985, 1998): Any definite noun phrase indicates unique reference; thus, it is used as an IC or FC.

Unique reference may come about in two different ways:

- uniqueness results from the meaning of the noun: FCs such as *the sun, the temperature in Oslo at noon, John’s mother* ⇒ semantic uniqueness
- uniqueness results from the (linguistic or non-linguistic) context: anaphoric uses of SCs, or situational definiteness: *the man at the corner* ⇒ pragmatic uniqueness (shift SC/RC → IC/FC)

Scale established according to the invariance of reference of nominal expressions:

(25) **Scale of uniqueness** (to be completed):

deictic SN < anaphoric SN < SN with establishing relative clause < definite associate anaphors < IN/FN < proper names < 3rd person personal pronouns < 2nd and 1st person personal pronouns

Expectations:

Prediction 1: A decrease of obligatoriness in the use of articles as one moves from the left end to the right. This decrease correlates with a decrease of functional load.

Prediction 2: Diachronically, the use of the article spreads from left to right along the scale, thus eventually covering also those areas where it is functionally redundant.

In Old High German, definite articles are only obligatory with anaphoric NPs, and often missing with FCs; see the following excerpt from a translation (8th cent.) of the gospel of Luke, 2, 4–6:

(26) a ... *her uuas fon huse inti fon hiuuiske Dauides.* b. ... *vvurðun taga gifulte thaz siu bari.*
 he was from house and from line David's were days fulfilled that she gave birth

Similarly, Old Norse (Faarlund 2009):

(27) a. *sat konnugr ok dróttning i hásæti*
 sat king.NOM and queen.NOM in high-seat
 'The King and the Queen were sitting in the high-seat.'

b. *Þeir sjá nú skip-in fyrir sér*
 they see now ship.DET.ACC before themselves
 'They now see the ships in front of them.'

⇒ Semantic uniqueness is unmarked, in harmony with the uniqueness scale

Claim: Language-specific asymmetries fall into two kinds:

Split I: A topmost segment of the scale is marked by the definite article, the rest remains unmarked

Split II: Two segments of the scale (normally pragmatic and semantic uniqueness) are morphosyntactically distinguished in terms of different article forms, each of which will be subject to the above Predictions 1 and 2.

4. Type shifts in definiteness

Analogously to the analysis of possession, the **Claim / road map** necessarily is:

- 'strong' articles indicate pragmatic uniqueness: SN → IN
- 'weak' articles indicate semantic uniqueness (and for Split I no article, respectively)
- 'de-functionalisation': IN → SN (analogous to de-relativisation)

The indefinite uses of ICs and FCs (*a sun, a mother*) involve a shift in the opposite direction, that is, IC/FC → SC (<e,<et>> and <<e,e>>,<et>>, respectively).

4.1 Instances of Split II: strong and weak definite articles in West Germanic

Definite articles in Fering (i.e., the Northern Frisian dialect of Föhr), Ebert (1971a: 159f)

(28)

	masc	fem	neuter	plural
'D-form' (strong)	<i>di</i>	<i>det (jü)</i>	<i>det</i>	<i>don (dö)</i>
'A-form' (weak)	<i>a</i>	<i>at</i>	<i>at</i>	<i>a</i>

- (29) *Oki hee an hingst keeft. Di / *A hingst haaltet.* ANAPHORIC
 ‘Oki bought a horse. The horse founders.’

- (30) *a / *di san* (UNIQUE) *b. Keike hee a / *di meesel* (NON-PARTICULAR REFERENCE)
 ‘the sun’ ‘Keike has the measles.’

Definite articles of the Central Franconian and Low Franconian dialects of the **Rhineland**:

(31)

		masc	fem	neuter	plural
strong	NOM/ACC:	<i>dä</i>	<i>die</i>	<i>dat</i>	<i>die</i>
	DAT:	<i>däm</i>	<i>dä</i>	<i>däm</i>	<i>dänne</i>
weak	NOM/ACC:	<i>dr</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>de</i>
	DAT:	<i>däm, ‘em</i>	<i>dr</i>	<i>däm, ‘em</i>	<i>de</i>

Definite articles in Alemannic: forms and examples of Swiss German according to Studler (2004, 2007):

(32)

		masc	fem	neuter	plural
strong (= ‘full’)	NOM/ACC:	<i>dä</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>das</i>	<i>di</i>
	DAT:	<i>däm</i>	<i>dere</i>	<i>däm</i>	<i>dene</i>
weak (= ‘reduced’)	NOM/ACC:	<i>de</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>d</i>
	DAT:	<i>em</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>em</i>	<i>de</i>

- (33) a. *de Sepp* b. *de Bräutigam* c. *de sterchscht Maa vo de Wäut* d. *de Löi*
 ‘Sepp’ ‘the bridesman’ ‘the strongest man of the world’ ‘the lion’(GENERIC)

⇒ contexts for weak forms: semantically unique, i.e., IC/FC

- (34) a. *De Paul het es Ross ghouft. ... Das Ross laamt.* ANAPHORIC
 ‘Paul bought a horse. ... The horse founders.’

- b. *di Frou, wo früener näbe üüs gwoont het* AUTOPHORIC
 ‘the woman who used to live next to us’

⇒ contexts for strong forms: pragmatically unique, i.e., SC → IC

(Essentially the same holds for Bavarian; see Schwager 2007)

⇒ Like in Föhr Frisian and Rhinelandic the contrast of forms clearly reflects the conceptual difference of semantic and pragmatic uniqueness. The choice of the strong article indicates a type shift.

4.2 Strong and weak in Dutch

(35)

	utrum/plural	neuter
strong (‘demonstratives’)	<i>die</i>	<i>dat</i>
weak (‘articles’)	<i>de</i>	<i>het</i>

Claim: The function of non-stressed *die*, *dat* goes beyond that of demonstrative pronouns and towards articles, comparable with strong forms of other West Germanic languages.

– passage from *De Aanslaag* (English: “The Assault”) by Harry Mulisch:

- (36) In **dat** gedicht wilde ik **de** liefde vergelijken met **het** soort licht, dat je vlak na zonsondergang soms tegen **de** bomen ziet hangen.

in the poem (*anaphoric* → *strong*), I wanted to compare love (*unique* → *weak*) to the sort of light (*autophoric*, *independent of speech context* → *weak*) which you sometimes see against the trees right after sunset.

– passage from *Het leven is verrukkulluk* by Remco Campert:

- (37) Langzaam stroomt **de** middag verder. Wat een rust, en ook wat een opwinding in **die** rust.
 slowly streams the noon (IC) further. What a quiet, and also what an excitement in the quiet (SC → FC)

– passage from *Figuranten* by Arnon Grunberg:

(38) Niet dat er iemand op mij lette, want er denderen van 's ochtends zes tot 's avonds acht vrachtwagens door mijn straat en die overstemmen elk geluid. Zelfs als je met een megafoon uit het raam zou gaan hangen kom je er nog niet bovenuit.

Door **die** vrachtwagens komt er een zwart poeder in mijn woning, ook al sluit je het raam.

'Not that anybody took notice of me, because there are lorries rumbling through my street from six in the morning to eight in the evening, and they drown out any noise. [...]

Due to the lorries a sort of powder comes into my flat, even if you close the window.'

The unstressed strong form *die* occurs in a context of plain anaphoricity in which no deictic force is involved. It indicates a topic shift. Thus, its use goes beyond that of demonstratives, and towards that of a strong article in just the same way as the Frisian 'D-article' marks a topic shift, but not topic continuity.

⇒ Generalisation for the various instances of Split II:

Strong forms indicate that uniqueness comes about by reference to the context or discourse, thus involving a shift SN/RN → IC/FC.

⇒ The generalisation for West Germanic can be represented along the following lines:

- Weak articles are semantically vacuous, thus denoting an identical mapping of the type <e,e>
- Strong articles denote a type shift from SC/RC to IC/FC (type <<e,t>,e>)

4.3 Definiteness suffixes in (Mainland) Scandinavian

The upshot for modern Mainland Scandinavian is that both articles show a split that is in line with the Scale of uniqueness:

1. **Suffixed articles** indicate uniqueness in general. Compared with Old Norse their range is extended along the scale down to FN, thus excluding proper names and pronouns.
2. The additional occurrence of **free articles** is syntactically conditioned by a prenominal modifier. (This seems to be true of Swiss German as well; cf. Frans Plank's talk.) To the extent that their occurrence is also conditioned by semantic factors (that is, irrespective of the presence of a prenominal modifier, with deictic and autophoric reference) they also signal pragmatic uniqueness, thus, the shift SN/RN → IC/FC in case of deictic and autophoric reference.

5. The threshold of semantic and pragmatic uniqueness as a source of variation

5.1 Split I systems in West Slavic

– Colloquial Upper Sorbian (Breu 2004 and Scholze 2007):

The article is not realised with lexical INs/FNs:

(39) *Tame jo dwórnišćo.* *Tame jo cyrkej.* *stónco* *Bundeskancler*
'There's the station.' 'There's the church.' 'the sun' 'the federal chancellor'

The article is however realised with all steps 'further up' the Scale:

(40) a. *Měrko jo s ćaom šijoŕ. **Tón** ća jo džewěcich Kamencu bót.* ANAPHORIC
'Mirko came by train. The train arrived in Kamenz at twelve o'clock.'

b. *Kóždy dóstane **tón** žonu, kiž sej wón zasluži.* AUTOPHORIC
'Every man gets the wife he deserves.'

– Upper Silesian Polish (for examples and full story see Adrian Czardybon's talk):

The demonstrative *tyń, ta, te* has obtained the function of a definite article: obligatory in anaphoric and autophoric contexts, and excluded with lexical ICs/FCs.

- ⇒ Where Split I articles occur they indicate pragmatic uniqueness, hence a type shift from SN to IC.
 ⇒ Variation is found especially at the edge of semantic and pragmatic uniqueness.

5.2 Three steps at the borderline between pragmatic and semantic uniqueness

looked at in order to approach the exact language-specific cut-off points

5.2.1 Non-lexical (or complex) functional concepts

- Upper Sorbian: articles occur when the non-lexical FCs is comment rather than topic (Breu 2004; see also Scholze 2008).

- (41) a. *tón najwetš šuft,*
 DEF.M.SG superl-bigger rascal
 ‘the biggest rascal’
 b. *tón prejni wesnanosta*
 DEF.M.SG first mayor
 ‘the first mayor’

- Upper Silesian: articles are usually missing with ordinal numbers and with superlatives

- (42) a. *(ta) noj-lepsz-o zoz-a*
 DEF.F.SG SUPERL-better-F sauce-NOM
 ‘the best sauce’
 b. *w (ty) drug-ij szuflodzie*
 in DEF.F.SG.LOC second-LOC.SG drawer.LOC
 ‘the second drawer’

5.2.2 Definite associative anaphora (DAAs; ‘bridging’)

In Upper Sorbian DAAs usually take the article as in (43), except (for older speakers) in cases such as (44).

- (43) *Noš wučor jo nam jenu kniu pokazał. Tón to awtora wosobinsce znaje.* (Breu 2004: 20, 41)
 ‘Our teacher showed us a book. He knows the author personally.’

- (44) *Moje nowo awto jo dórbjało do reperatury, (tón) motor be kaput.*
 ‘My new car needed repairing, the motor was broken.’

Analogous asymmetry in German: In general, fusion of article and preposition also occurs with DAAs, but Schwarz (2009: 34) observes the following contrast:

- (45) *Das Theaterstück missfiel dem Kritiker so sehr, dass er in seiner Besprechung kein gutes Haar #am /an dem Autor ließ.* (*am < an dem: at_the.DAT*)
 ‘The play displeased the critic so much that he tore the author to pieces in his review.’

- (46) *Der Kühlschrank war so groß, dass der Kürbis problemlos im /#in dem Gemüsefach untergebracht werden konnte.* (*im < in dem: in_the.DAT*)
 ‘The fridge was so big that the pumpkin could easily be stowed in the crisper.’

Schwarz’s proposal: (45) involves anaphoricity by virtue of a contextually supplied relation, whereas (46) involves uniqueness in terms of an inherent part-whole relation:

Upper Silesian: ‘relational anaphora’ tend to require the article, part-whole DAAs do not (Czardybon 2010):

- (47) *Wczoraj bołach w kin-ie. Ale tyn film boł nudny.*
 yesterday was.F in cinema-LOC but DEF.M.SG.NOM film was boring
 ‘Yesterday I went to the cinema, but the movie was boring.’

- (48) *Mo-m fajno szklonka. Ale ucho jest ułomane.*
 have-1SG nice cup but handle COP.3SG broken_off
 ‘I’ve got a beautiful cup, but the handle broke off.’

⇒ Schwarz’s generalisation with respect to language-internal variation is independently corroborated by the findings of Slavic (Standard Polish, Upper Silesian, and Upper Sorbian).

⇒ Both the variation and the semantics provide reasons for supplementing the Uniqueness Scale with another step regarding DAAs:

... < SN with establishing rel. clause < **relational DAAs** < **part-whole DAAs** < IN/FN ...

5.2.3 Autophoric noun uses ('establishing relative clauses')

From a semantic point of view one may think of a distinction of autophorics into semantic and pragmatic: The former would involve context-independent and the latter context-dependent uniqueness.

This way, DAAs would be sandwiched between context-dependent and context-independent autophorics; thus, ... *anaphoric SN* < *SN with context-dependent establishing relative clause* < *definite associative anaphora* < *SN with context-independent establishing relative clause* < *IN/FN* ...

(A very similar point is made by Patricia Cabredo Hofherr). Autophoricity essentially gives rise to variation within individual languages:

Alemannic usually features the strong article in autophoric contexts (see 34b), but as Studler (2007) points out the weak article occurs in certain cases:

- (49) a. *d Lüüt, wo für äin de münd schaffe*
 DET.PL people REL for one then must work
 'the people who've got to work for (some) one then'
- b. *vo de Materie, wo mer bearbäitet*
 of DET.DAT.F material REL one manipulate
 'the material that one works'
- c. *i de Phönkt, wos drof a chont*
 in DET.DAT.PL point.PL REL-it thereon depend
 'in the points that are essential'

Fering (Föhr Frisian) also by and large employs the 'D-article' (that is, the one that is responsible of pragmatic uniqueness) in autophoric contexts (Ebert 1971a, 1971b):

- (50) a. *Di hingst, wat Oki keeft hee, haaltet.*
 DEF.STRONG horse REL Oki bought has lames
 'The horse that Oki bought is lame.'
- b. *Det as det / *at buk, wat hi tuiast skrewen hee.*
 DEM COP DEF.STRONG/WEAK book REL PRON3SG first write.PART has
 'This is the book which he wrote first.'
- c. *Dön / A foomnen, wat ei mülki kön, fu neen maan.*
 DEF.STRONG/WEAK girls REL NEG milk can find no man
 'Those girls that can't milk a cow won't find a husband.'

A further autophoric context with the 'A-article' (discussed in Keenan & Ebert 1973):

- (51) *John wonnert ham, dat a maan wat woon bisöopen wiar.*
 John wonder REFL COMP DEF.WEAK man REL won drunk was
 'John wonders that the man who won was drunk.'

Example (51) only allows for an opaque (or *de dicto*) reading, not for a transparent (or *de re*) interpretation.

⇒ The 'A-article' indicates that the uniqueness comes about independently of the situation.

5.2.3 Proposal: refinements of the scale

Two amendments necessitated by phenomena on the borderline between pragmatic and semantic uniqueness:

(52) **Scale of uniqueness** (refined version):

deictic SN < anaphoric SN < SN with establishing relative clause < relational DAAs < part-whole DAAs < non-lexical FNs < lexical IN/FN < proper names < personal pronouns

6. Conclusion

The distinction of semantic vs. pragmatic is successful in explaining morphosyntactic splits w.r.t. the two dimensions of nominal determination:

1. Definiteness:

- Semantic uniqueness implies that the reference of a noun is unambiguous because of its lexical semantics. Pragmatic uniqueness refers to those uses of nouns whose unambiguous reference only comes about by the context of utterance.
- This distinction is reflected by two different sorts of splits:
 - Split I: Pragmatic uniqueness is marked by the definite article, whereas semantic uniqueness is unmarked (e.g., in West Slavic).
 - Split II: Pragmatic and semantic uniqueness is morphosyntactically distinguished by either lexically or phonologically different article forms (e.g., in Germanic).
- ‘Weak’ articles are semantically redundant, they merely signal the presence of an IC/FC
- ‘Strong’ articles, as well as the articles of split (i) languages, denote a <<et>,e> type shift:
 - semantic function of dialectal German *die* (as opposed to *de*): SC/RC → IC/FC
- Variation both within and across languages is highest with those noun uses that are at the borderline of pragmatic uniqueness and semantic uniqueness, or combine properties of both

2. Possession:

- Semantic possession implies that the relation between the noun’s referential argument (the ‘possessum’) and the possessor is inherent to the noun’s lexical semantics. Pragmatic possession implies that the POSS relation is contextually established, and often depends on the utterance situation.
- The semantic vs. pragmatic distinction is reflected by (and largely accounts for) what is known as alienability contrast
- ‘Inalienable’ morphology merely signals the inherence of a relation of affiliation
- ‘Alienable’ morphology (e.g., connectives, classifiers) denote a <<et>,<e<et>>> shift from SC to RC:

type shift template for sortal noun p’um:	$\lambda N \lambda y \lambda x [N(x) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(y,x)]$
applied to sortal noun, e.g., <i>house</i> :	$\lambda y \lambda x [\text{HOUSE}(x) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(y,x)]$
result applied to an NP, e.g., <i>John</i> :	$\lambda x [\text{HOUSE}(x) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(\text{John},x)]$

The two dimensions of nominal determination, definiteness and possession, are thus largely parallel w.r.t.

- the distinction of semantic vs. pragmatic
- the type shifts from underlying concept type to actual use
- the close correlation of semantic and morpho-syntactic markedness

References

- Chappell, Hilary & William McGregor (eds.; 1996) *The Grammar of Inalienability: a typological perspective on body part terms and the part whole relation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Czardybon, Adrian (2010). *Die Verwendung des definiten Artikels im Oberschlesischen im Sprachvergleich*. Master Thesis, University of Düsseldorf.
- Ebert, Karen H. (1971a) Zwei Formen des bestimmten Artikels. In: Dieter Wunderlich (ed.) *Probleme und Fortschritte der Transformationsgrammatik*, 159-174. München: Hueber.
- Ebert, Karen H. (1971b) Referenz, Sprechsituation und die bestimmten Artikel in einem nordfriesischen Dialekt (Fering). Bredstedt: Nordfriisk Instituut.
- England, Nora C. (1983) *A grammar of Mam, a Mayan language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. & Karen H. Ebert (1973). A note on marking transparency and opacity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 412-424.
- Lehmann, Christian (1998) *Possession in Yucatec Maya*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Löbner, Sebastian (1985) Definites. *Journal of Semantics* 4, 279-326.
- Löbner, Sebastian (2011) Types of nouns, NPs, and determination. *Journal of Semantics* 28, 279-333.
- Lyons, Christopher (1999) *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nichols, Johanna (1992) *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ortmann, Albert (2002) The Morphological Licensing of Modifiers. In: Vida Samiian (ed.) *Proceedings of the Western Conference On Linguistics: Volume Twelve, WECOL 2000*, 403-414. California State University, Fresno.
- Ortmann, Albert (submitted) Definite article asymmetries and concept types: semantic and pragmatic uniqueness. To be published in: Thomas Gamerschlag, Doris Gerland, Rainer Oswald & Wiebke Peterson (eds.) *Concept types and frames*.
- Ortmann, Albert & Corinna Handschuh (2004) Semantic factors of valence-changing processes with nouns: possession in the Mayan languages. DGfS-Jahrestagung Mainz, 25.2.2004/Ms., Universität Tübingen & HHU Düsseldorf.
- Partee, Barbara H. (1986) Noun Phrase Interpretation and Type-shifting Principles. In: J. Groenendijk, D. de Jongh & M. Stokhof (eds.) *Foundations of Pragmatics and Lexical Semantics*. Dordrecht: Foris, 115-143
- Scholze, Lenka (2007) Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Sprachkontakts. Dissertation, Universität Konstanz.
- Schwarz, Florian (2009) *Two Types of Definites in Natural Language*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Seiler, Hansjakob (1983) *Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language*. Tübingen: Narr (= Language Universals Series Vol. 2).
- Studler, Rebekka (2004) Voller und reduzierter Artikel in der schweizerdeutschen DP. In: Bračić, S., Čuden, D., Podgoršek, S. & Pogačnik, V. (eds.) *Linguistische Studien im Europäischen Jahr der Sprachen. Akten des 36. Linguistischen Koll. in Ljubljana*, 625-635. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Thompson, Chad (1996) On the grammar of body parts in Koyukon Athabaskan. In: H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.) 551-676.