WEAK DEFINITES:
BETWEEN INDEFINITENESS AND GENERICITY

Claire Beyssade
Institut Jean Nicod - June 2012

INTRODUCTION

Three types of definites

1. anaphoric
2. generic
3. weak (a.o. Poesio, Baker, Carlson)

(1) *a. Jean aime les animaux domestiques. Il a un chien et deux chats. Le chien, c'est un setter irlandais, qui s'appelle Flash.*
b. Le chien est l'animal domestique le plus commun en Europe.
c. Jean est venu par le train : il a dû changer deux fois, à Paris puis à Rennes.

Aims

1. Empirical data (decriptive perspective)
2. A unified analysis of definite NPs. What is weak: the determiner, the noun or the DP?
3. Weak definites, weak indefinites and incorporation

A double hypothesis

1. No uniqueness presupposition triggered by definite DPs

(2) *a. Prends une carte, n'importe laquelle.* (Free choice)
b. Tu vois les trois hommes là-bas. Approche-toi du grand. (Comparative)
b'. Tu vois les trois hommes là-bas. Approche-toi du plus grand.

Une analyse qui érige les définis faibles (et non plus les définis à génitif indéfini) « en instrument d'observation et de mise à l'épreuve privilégié pour les théories du défini ». (Corblin, 2001: 20)

2. Contrasts anchored in Lexicon (various types of nouns, various type of prepositions...)

(3) *a. appeler le docteur / */ parler au docteur* (verb variation)
*a'. aller à l'école / */ fréquenter l'école*
*b. lire le journal / */ lire le livre / lire un livre* (noun variation)
*b'. listen to the radio / */ listen to the record*
*b''. fumer le cigare / */ fumer la cigarette / fumer des cigarettes*
*c. être à l'hôpital / */ être dans l'hôpital* (prep variation)

Outline

1- One or many weak definites?
2- Analyses
3- Synthese and perspectives
Our proposal : a unique definite determiner but several types of nouns.

1. ONE OR MANY WEAK DEFINITES?

1.1. Quick history of the concept of weak definiteness

1.1.1. Poesio (1994)

(4) Def N of Indef-sg N

(5) *a. John got these data from <u>the student of a linguist</u>.*
b. The village is located on <u>the side of a mountain</u>.
c. I usually had breakfast at <u>the corner of a major intersection</u>.
d. On Friday, a bomb exploded outside <u>the offices of an American corporation.</u>

1.1.2. Barker (2005)

Definite descriptions whose use does not appear to require either familiarity or uniqueness.

(6) *a. I hope the cafe is located on the corner of a busy intersection.*
b. That's the one where Superman crashes spectacularly into the side of a Marlboro-emblazoned truck. (Google)
c. The baby's fully-developed hand wrapped itself around the finger of the surgeon.
d. In the center of the room is a large stone cube, about 10 feet on a side. Engraved on the side of the cube is some lettering. – Zork 2.
e. People were saying that a plane had hit the side of the other tower.
f. Remove all the objects to discover the really cool artifact that the archaeologists found buried in the corner of the Pharaoh's tomb!
g. Moon skinned him and threw the body in the corner of the smokehouse.
h. Look for the huge Whale on the side of the building.
i. Alexander the Great was crossing the desert on his donkey. Suddenly the leg of the donkey buckled and it fell.

j. Dry the slide by putting it between the pages of a book of Bibulous paper.
k. The term double crush describes a type of fracture or other injury resulting from being driven over by the two wheels of a car or other vehicle.

In (6a), neither the speaker nor the listener has any previous acquaintance with a specific intersection or corner, nor is there an implication that the intersection in question has only one corner.
More data: the possessor (genitive) NP may be definite, the head noun may be plural.

(7) *Summary of the data.*
Possessive definite descriptions allow weak interpretations with a wide range of lexical items, **both singular and plural,** as long as the nominal predicate is relational and the preposition involved is the true genitive *of*. They **take modification** without giving up their ability to give rise to weak readings, suggesting a high degree of productivity. They often but **not always occur with an indefinite** possessor (object of the genitive *of*), and they often but not always have a generic flavor. (Baker, 2005: 15)

1.1.3. Carlson et Sussman (2005), Carlson, Sussman, Klein et Tanenhaus (2006), Klein et al. (2009)

Why weak indefinites only? A comparison between weak definites, weak indefinites and bare singulars.
(8) « Weak » definites should in fact not be subsumed under a more general semantic treatment, but **form a distinguished class** of (apparent) definite descriptions on their own that shares a semantics with (at least) bare count singulars, and probably not with definites. [...]
We will be discussing instances that usually differ from the examples examined by Poesio and Barker, and will leave unresolved the question of whether their examples should be subsumed under our analysis. (Carlson et al., 2006: 179)

(9) *a. Mary went to the store.*
b. I'll read the newspaper when I get home.
c. Open the window, will you please?
d. Fred listened to the Red Sox on the radio.

No genitive DPs.
Important lexical restrictions but a productive construction, not idioms.

1.1.4 Beyssade et Simatos (2009)

Three types of contexts legitimize weak definites
a) Copula sentences
(10) *a. Marie est la fille de Pierre.*
b. Marie est la fille au chapeau rouge.
c. Marie est la fille de Pierre et pourtant elle ne ressemble pas du tout à ses soeurs.
d. # Marie est la fille au chapeau rouge et elle ne ressemble pas du tout à l'autre fille au chapeau rouge.

b) DPs of type "le N1 de SN2", where N1 is either a relational noun or an event noun.
Relational noun
(11) *a. Pierre s'est arrêté sur le bord de la route.*
b. La boulangerie se trouve au coin de la rue Broca et du boulevard Arago.
c. Le bébé tient le doigt de l'infirmière.
d. Jean s'est cassé la jambe / a mal au bras.

Event noun (a subtype of relational nouns ?)
(12) *a. L'attaque du camp par les rebelles doit être envisagée.*
b. L'attaque répétée du camp a fini par affaiblir les forces françaises.

Constraints:
- preposition « de »,
- relational nouns (mereology (*roue/voiture; doigt/main*), kindship (*frère, fils*), topology (*coin, bord, côté*),
- Typical relation and only a small quantity/number of possible referents.

(13) *a. */ La boulangerie se trouve au coin près de la rue Broca et du boulevard Arago.*
*b. */ Jean a attrapé la branche de l'arbre.*
*c. */ Pierre a garé sa voiture après le virage de la route.*

c) Verbal phrases, in which the DD refers, not to an entity-token, but to entity-type involved in an activity.
(14) *a. Pierre écoute la radio / */ le disque.*
*b. Pierre lit le journal / */ le livre*
*c. Pierre va au supermarché / */ à la boutique.*
d. Pierre prend l'ascenseur.

1.1.5. Corblin (2011, to appear) and Aurnague (2012)
a) Focus on "routine sociale" (Vandeloise 1987) : when a place is associated with an activity.
(15) *a. Pierre va à l'école.*
b. Pierre est à la plage.

b) Extension from places to objects : when an object is associated with an activity.
(16) *a. Marie est au piano.*
b. Le plat est au four.

Observations
Anaphora :
(17) *a. Marie est à l'hôpital, elle va y rester longtemps.*
b. ?? Marie est hospitalisée. Elle va y rester longtemps.

No pluralizations :
(18) *a. Tous les blessés sont à l'hôpital (*aux hôpitaux).*
b. Les deux concertistes sont au piano (?? aux pianos).
c. La classe entière est au téléphone (?? aux téléphones).
d. Tous les poulets sont au four (?? aux fours).

Number neutrality :
(19) *a. Jean écoute la radio tous les matins, soit France-Inter, soit France-culture.*
b. Vous pouvez venir par le train, en changeant à Rennes.

1.2 Characterizing properties
A) No uniqueness presupposition
(20) *a. Prendre le train* (maybe several trains).
b. Lire le journal (not necessary the same)
c. Se casser le bras (only one of both)
d. Jean a l'œil vitreux, la fesse basse et le cheveu gras. (both eyes, the hair...)

Consequences
- Narrow scope only

(*21*) *a. Tous les motards vont au pub.* (not necessarily the same pub)
b. Every man was reading the newspaper. (not necessarily the same newspaper)
b'. Every man was reading the book. (necessarily the same book)

- VP ellipsis, allowing sloppy interpretations

(22) *a) Anna read the newspaper and John did, too.* (different newspapers)
b) Anna read the book and John did, too. (* different books)

B) Lexical restrictions, disallowing synonyms, hyponyms, hyperonyms... (not always)

(23) *a. être au lit / * être au canapé*
b. Aller au pub/ au café / au bistrot....

C) Semantic enrichment (not always)
- Stereotypical interpretations, routines

(24) *Bob is in the pub (to drink / # to do some plumbing)*

But not with Poesio's or Baker's examples, nor with *se casser la jambe, la fille d'un fermier...*

A referential expression, but not a specific reference. A dependent reference. The issue of the strict or exact reference of NP is not relevant.

(25) *A : Jean s'est cassé la jambe.*
B : Laquelle ?
A : Ca n'a aucune importance.

2. ANALYSES

2.1 Poesio

Two essential features :

- the preposition *« of »,* to select a relational interpretation of N1
- followed by a weak DP.

Poesio claims that N1 in « the N1 of a N2 » is interpreted as the noun of a relation, the preposition « of » selects the relational meaning of the noun and the indefiniteness of the whole DP is inherited from the genitive.

(26) *a N2* refers to x, which has a weak reference
the N1 of a N2 refers to y such as f(y,x), where f is the relation associated with N1

2.2 Barker

Use the technique of function composition (independently motivated in various combinatory categorial grammars). Two distinct ways of composing the meaning of the definite description (27), with f = [[*the*]], g = [[*corner*]] and h = [[*of the intersection*]]

(27) The corner of the intersection

(27') a. $f(g(h))$ = the(corner(of-the-intersection)) NORMAL UNIQUENESS
b. $(f \bullet g)(h)$ = (the • corner)(of-the-intersection) WEAK DEFINITE

On the second analysis, the determiner combines first with the relational noun *corner*, and then with the prepositional phrase.

« What could it mean for a relation to satisfy uniqueness?

- In the case of a non-relational definite description, e.g., *the man*, a successful use is one that guides the attention of the listener to reliably pick out the intended individual: it's the man I'm talking about, not the woman, not the dog.
- Analogously, in the relational case, e.g., *the corner of a busy intersection*, the relational predicate *corner* describes the connection between the referent of the NP as

a whole (the corner) and the object it stands in relation to (the busy intersection). Now, there are many different kinds of relations that could connect an object with its possessor: ownership, part-whole, familial relations, physical proximity, etc. A successful use of a possessive definite description, then, is one that provides enough information for the listener to reliably pick out the intended kind of object: it's the side of the box I'm talking about, not the bottom, not the top. In other words, what the speaker has in mind is a unique, specific relation, and that specificity is what the definite determiner is marking. » (Baker, 2005: 110)

No change in the semantics of the definite determiner : Baker suggests that there is still uniqueness, but not uniqueness of reference. Rather, what is unique is the contrastive selection of one relation over another: the corner of a busy intersection, not the middle; the side of a truck, not the top.

Neither Poesio, nor Baker gives up the idea of a uniqueness presupposition associated with « the ».

2.3 Carlson et al.

Weak definites are characterized:

- by the lack of a uniqueness presupposition and
- by enriched meaning.

(28) In weak definite NPs, the definite article does not act as a morpheme. Weak definite NPs function exactly like bare singulars. They show all the earmarks of semantic incorporation (Carlson, 2006 : 8)
- They are non-specific, rather than specific in import.
- They are interpreted as narrow-scope indefinites, showing no scoping interactions with other logical operators in the same sentence.
- As incorporated nominals, they convey an existential interpretation and never a generic one.
- As incorporated nominals, they convey a number-neutral interpretation

Weak definites are not indefinites in some kind of disguise. The lack of scoping is unlike what we find with indefinites, and the number neutrality is much more **reminiscent of incorporated nominals** than of indefinites. And the semantic enrichment is a very typical feature of incorporated structures, as well.

This suggests a possible explanation for the absence of presuppositions requiring unique reference for weak definite NPs: rather than referring to a uniquely identifiable discourse entity as regular definites, or establishing a new discourse entity as indefinites, weak definites potentially **evoke a conventional activity or event type.**

« The » is an expletif in weak definite NPs. Weak definites are incorporated arguments.

Open questions :

- Why weak definites are used at all, as opposed to simply using a bare singular?
- How account for lexical restriction associated with weak definites?
  - « ...it is a much more difficult challenge then to go back and outline the precise role that 'restriction' plays in the semantics of the constructions that would count as incorporated, semantically »(Carlson, 2006: 12).
  - weak definites and concepts. A linguistic issue or a cognitive one ?

(29) We can make sense of newspaper reading situations in which the identity of the newspaper is irrelevant, while we find it apparently harder to make sense of book reading situations where the identity of the book is irrelevant. The question is, I believe, one of the availability of concepts. (Bosch, 2010)
New research based on experiments.

- How account for incorporation of Weak Definites ?

Incorporating verbs *à la* van Geenhoven

(30) a. $\lambda P \lambda x \exists y[Verb(x,y) \wedge P(y)]$
b. Jean a mangé du saumon.
b'. $\lambda P\ P(j) \bullet \lambda Q \lambda x \exists y[manger(x,y) \wedge Q(y)] \bullet \lambda z\ saumon\ (z)$
c. Jean lit le journal.
c'. $\lambda P\ P(j) \bullet \lambda Q \lambda x \exists y[lire(x,y) \wedge Q(y)] \bullet \lambda z\ journal\ (z)$

Restriction *vs* saturation (Chang et Ladusaw)

(31) Restrict $(\lambda y \lambda x \lambda e\ [Pred\ (y,x,e)], N)$
$= \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e\ [Pred\ (y,x,e) \wedge N(y)]$

2.4. Aguilar-Guevara & Zwarts (2010)

Aguilar-Guevara & Zwarts argue that weak definites:

1. do not denote specific objects but **instantiations of specific kinds** and that uniqueness is given on the kind-level. They use the **R-predicate**.
2. They capture the idea of **stereotypical enrichmen**t with **a two-place predicate U**. The first argument of this usage predicate is an event and the second a kind. The predicate is true if and only if the event is a stereotypical usage of the kind (see (37)).

Following Parsons (1990), they assume that propositions describe events

(32) a. Anna is reading a book.
b. $\exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=anna \wedge \exists x[book(x) \wedge Theme(e)=x]]$

They use the two-place relation **R**

(33) a. Anna is reading the book.
$\exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=anna \wedge \exists! x[book(x) \wedge Theme(e)=x]]$
b. Anna is reading the newspaper.
$\exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=anna \wedge \exists x_i[R(x_i,newspaper_k) \wedge Theme(e)=x_i]]$

The instantiation is not always a single object but can also be a **sum of objects**

(34) John took the train from Munich to Hamburg.
$\exists e[take(e) \wedge Agent(e)=john \wedge \exists x_i[R(x_i,train_k) \wedge Theme(e)=x_i] \wedge$
$Source(e)=munich \wedge Goal(e)=hamburg]$

The formalization also works for the **VP ellipsis** test

(35) Anna read the newspaper and John did, too.
$\exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=anna \wedge R(Theme(e),newspaper_k)] \wedge$
$\exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=john \wedge R(Theme(e),newspaper_k)]$

The narrowest scope of Weak DPs

(36) Every couple goes to the cinema.
$\forall x[couple(x) \rightarrow \exists\ e[go_to(e) \wedge Agent(e)=x \wedge R(Goal(e),cinema_k)]$

Stereotypical enrichment

(37) a. John went to the hospital.
b. $\exists e[go_to(e) \wedge Agent(e)=john \wedge R(Goal(e), hospital_k) \wedge U(e,hospital_k)$

(38) The Kind Lifting Rule

(KLR) Kind Lifting Rule:
If V is a transitive verb (or verb-preposition combination) with interpretation
$\lambda x_i \lambda e[V(e) \wedge Theme(e)=x_i]$ then V also has the meaning
$\lambda x_k \lambda e[V(e) \wedge R(Theme(e),x_k) \wedge U(e,x_k)]$.

The application of KLR results in **ambiguous verb meanings**.

(39) a. John is reading the book.
$\exists! x_i \exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=john \wedge book(x_i) \wedge Theme(e)=x_i]$
b. John is reading the newspaper.
$\exists e[read(e) \wedge Agent(e)=john \wedge R(Theme(e),newspaper_k) \wedge U(e,newspaper_k)]$
c. John is reading the book.

$\exists$e[read(e) ^ Agent(e)=john ^ R(Theme(e),$book_k$) ^ U(e,$book_k$)]

Weak definites are **truth-conditionally similar to indefinites**. Both formalizations for the indefinite, (40'a) and (40'b), are truth-conditionally equivalent and the only difference to the weak definite in (41') is the truth value of **U**.

(40) John is reading a newspaper.
(40') a. $\exists$e[read(e) ^ Agent(e)=john ^ R(Theme(e),$newspaper_k$)]
b. $\exists$e[read(e) ^ Agent(e)=john ^ $\exists$x[newspaper(x) ^ Theme(e)=x]]
(41) John is reading the newspaper.
(41') $\exists$e[read(e) ^ Agent(e)=john ^ R(Theme(e),$newspaper_k$) ^ U(e,$newspaper_k$)]

Problems
• No weak interpretation in a context including an anaphora.
(42) We have a nurse and even a doctor in our small village. When she needed medical advice, Anna called the doctor.

• The class of body parts is an example where the formalization does not work. It is not reasonable to assume a kind such as *John's arm*, consisting only of both his arms.

• Routines *vs.* Stereotypes
(43) Le week-end, Marie va au supermarché pour faire la manche. Elle ne va pas toujours au même endroit, ça dépend de son humeur.

• Bare nouns and kind reference
(44) a. Jean a vu un chien.
b. Jean a vu une instanciation de l'espèce chien.
(45) a. Jean a une fourmi rouge sur le bras. (Elle va le piquer / Ça peut piquer, non ?)

2.5. Corblin (2011, to appear) and Aurnague (2012)

(46) a. aller à l'école. Noun describing a location or an institution.
b. Ítre au four, au lit, au telephone. Noun describing an object

Corblin: « des définis fonctionnels auto-légitimés » **(a subtype of associative anaphora)**
(47) La préposition *à* admet deux constructions :
- Une construction locative : son complément doit être un lieu, non un objet. (*Le taxi est à la plage, *La mouche est au fauteuil).*
- Une construction télique : son complément doit dénoter une institution sociale, ou une activité. (*Marie est à la gym*).

A la différence des institutions-lieux, il est requis pour les objets que le contexte joue un rôle, en rendant saillante cette interprétation fonctionnelle, qui seule leur permet d'être interprétés comme activité.

Analyse qui permet de prédire les suites possibles en « lequel » ou avec reprise anaphorique (Ce N, ou pronom)

Aurnague : weak definites as a subtype of incorporation
(48) L'emploi de la préposition *à* dénotant une 'routine sociale' sélectionne indistinctement des noms de lieux ou d'objets, pour peu que ceux-ci évoquent une activité ou un état. *Max est à l'école/l'hôpital* signifieraient : 'Max est dans l'activité/état évoqué par le nom 'école/hôpital' (pour une cible animée bénéficiaire)'. Selon le mécanisme ainsi esquissé, les descriptions analysées n'introduiraient aucun référent spécifique correspondant au Nsite et se limiteraient, de ce point de vue, à l'exploitation du lexique et des seuls types lexicaux (Asher, 2011). Ce contenu sémantique minimal se verrait, cependant, associé à une inférence pragmatique (défaisable) selon laquelle,

pour chaque Ncible linguistiquement relié à un Nsite, une ou plusieurs entités du type requis (par le Nsite) sont normalement présentes dans la situation.

Les définis de ces constructions introduisent non pas un *lieu* particulier dans le discours, mais un individu exemplaire de l'institution, la localisation de cette institution dans un lieu dédié, n'étant qu'une implicature.

3- SYNTHESE AND PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Two types of analyses of weak definites

1. A weak definite determiner?
2. A defective noun?

3.1.1. A weak definite determiner?

Current analyses : two uses of definites (anaphoric and generic)

(49) *a. Le chat de Marie est malade.*
b. Le chat est un mammifère carnivore de la famille des félidés.

• Anaphoric definites

familiar + two presuppositions : existence and uniqueness
binding or accommodation. (cf van der Sandt)

Existence presupposition failure:

(50) *A : Le chat de Marie est malade.*
B : Ah bon, elle a un chat. / Parce qu'elle a un chat maintenant !

Uniqueness presupposition failure:

(51) *A : Le chat de Marie est malade.*
B : Lequel ? Elle en a tellement.

• Generic definites

Existence presupposition failure:

(52) *A : La licorne est généralement décrite comme proche du cheval et de la chèvre, de couleur blanche, possédant un corps chevalin, une barbiche de bouc, des sabots fendus et une grande corne au milieu du front, droite, spiralée et pointue, qui constitue sa principale caractéristique.*
B : Parce que ça existe, les licornes ? / Mais ça n'existe pas les licornes.

Uniqueness presupposition failure:

(53) *A : Le chat est un mammifère carnivore de la famille des félidés.*
B : # Lequel ? Il y en a tellement.

What are weak definites ?

1) a third type
2) a particular case of generics
3) a counter example to the uniqueness presupposition which deals to recast the semantic analysis of the definite determiner.

3.1.2. A defective noun

Lexical or syntactic defectivity: Baldwin et al. (2006), Stvan (2009), Himmelmann (1998)
Defectives nouns explain the occurrences of bare nouns.

(54) a. I left college/court/hospital/jail/port/school/town/university.
b. Court/hospital/jail/school/university is boring.

(55) Defectivity hypothesis: defective nouns can project a DP without an overt article, e.g. [DP prison+], and they are of type e (kind reference). Defectiveness as an idiomatic lexical property of nouns.

Certain prepositions and verbs can select a defective noun.

Problem : the approach doesn't generalize across languages. For example, the only defective noun in Dutch is *school* ('school'). I

An alternative: a typology of nouns, as proposed by Löbner (2011).
The distinction according to inherent uniqueness and relationality gives rise to a system of four logical types of nouns (Table 1).

	[–U]	inherently unique [+U]
[–R]	SORTAL NOUNS *stone book adjective water*	INDIVIDUAL NOUNS *moon weather date Maria*
[+R] inherently relational	RELATIONAL NOUNS *sister leg part attribute*	FUNCTIONAL NOUNS *father head age subject* (gramm.)

The type distinction corresponds to the basic types distinguished in first-order predicate logic:

- individual nouns correspond to type e (individual terms),
- sortal nouns to type <e,t> (one-place predicate terms),
- relational nouns to type <e, <e,t>> (two-place predicate terms),
- and functional nouns to <e,e> (one-place function terms).

• The system of types directly interacts with types of determination such as definite, indefinite, and possessive. Nouns of any type can be shifted to any other type by various mechanisms such as determination or modification. For example, use of an inherently unique noun with indefinite determination will coerce a shift of the lexically individual or functional concept to a sortal or individual concept; possessive use of nonrelational nouns will shift the respective concept to a relational or functional one; modification of sortal concepts with superlatives yields individual concepts, and so on. ô (L‡bner, 2011)

3.2 Only one definite, but different types of nouns, and no uniqueness presupposition

3.2.1. No generic determiner
cf. Dayal (2004) : ι always indicates maximality.
(56) *a. La baleine est un mammifère*
b. Mammifère ($\iota(x_k)$ $Baleine_k$ (x_k))

3.2.2 Lack of uniqueness
a) The uniqueness is only within certain contexts/domains, not in the universe as a whole.
(57) *Jean a rencontré le boucher.*

b) Explicit non uniqueness
(58) *a. Un ami de Pierre vendit sa voiture à un autre de ses amis. L'ami de Pierre partait au Canada et ne pouvait emporter sa voiture.*
b. Un ami de Pierre vendit sa voiture à un autre de ses amis. L'ami de Pierre en fut satisfait. (Corblin, 2001)

(59) *L'un des enfants de Marie est venu.*

- The partitive *des enfants* pressupposes a plurality of friends
- The definite *l'un* presupposes the uniqueness.

(60) *He is not the sole/ only author.* (Coppock et Beaver, CSSP 2011)

- *The sole/ only author* pressupposes the existence and the uniqueness of the author.
- The sentence asserts that there is at least two author

Coppock and Beaver's claim:
Definites are initially predicative and presuppose weak uniqueness
weak uniqueness : if x exists, x is unique.

CONCLUSION

1) Are weak definites defective definites, i.e. definites without some of their properties, or are strong definites enriched definites, due to their context of occurrences, to pragmatic inferences... ?

2) Pragmatic definiteness ≠ Semantic definiteness (cf. Löbner)

Pragmatic definitness = the definiteness associated with anaphoric and deictic function.

A man and a woman came into the room. The man seemed nervous.

Semantic definitness = the definiteness for non-anaphoric and non-deictic definite uses which are generally but not necessary unique e.g :

within a flat: the kitchen, the bathroom,
within the social/ family setting: the father, the mother, the dog, the car
within a village setting: the doctor, the mayor, the priest etc.

3) Various types of weak definites, in relations with the types of noun used in the DD. The special case of part of body :

(i) Jean s'est cassé le bras.
(ii) Jean a l'oeil vitreux.

4) Weak definites are referential but not specific. They tolerate underspecification of reference.

Strong indefinites assert existence while weak indefinites don't : they only entails it via VP.

Strong definites trigger an uniqueness infernce (présupposition ? implicature ?), weak definites don't : they only presuppose existence.

Weak definites , as weak indefinites, never in subject position, but only in object position.

Selected References

Aguilar-Guevara, A. & Zwarts, J. 2011. Weak definites and reference to kinds. *Proceedings of SALT* 20, 179–196.

Aurnague, M. to appaer. Quand la routine s'installe : remarques sur les emplois de *à* de type 'routine sociale'. *Revue Romane.*

Baldwin, T., Beavers, J., van der Beek, L., Bond, F., Flickinger, D. & Sag, I. A. 2006. In search of a systematic treatment of determinerless PPs. In Patrick Saint-Dizier (ed.), *Computational Linguistics Dimensions of Syntax and Semantics of Prepositions.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, 163-179.

Barker, C. 2005. Possessive weak definites. In Possessives and Beyond: Semantics and Syntax, eds. Kim, Ji-yung, Lander, Yury, and Partee, Barbara H. 89-113. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.

Beyssade, C. & Simatos, I., 2009. Le déterminant *le.* In Abeillé, A., Godart, D. & Delaveau, A., *Grande Grammaire du français*, Actes Sud (à paraître).

Bosch, P. 2010. Weak definites and German preposition-determiner contractions. Invited talk at the Workshop on Specificity from theoretical and empirical points of view. Inst. of Linguistics, University of Stuttgart, 31. Aug., 2010.

Carlson, G. 2006. The Meaningful Bounds of Incorporation. in S. Vogeleer and L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Non-Definiteness and Plurality*, in the Linguistik Aktuell series. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 35-50.

Carlson, G., & Sussman, R. 2005. Seemingly indefinite definites. In S. Kepsar & M. Reis (Eds.), Linguistic evidence. Berlin: de Gruyter, 71-86.

Carlson, G., Sussman, R., Klein, N., & Tanenhaus, M. K. 2006. Weak definite noun phrases. In Davis, Deal, & Zabbal (eds.), Proceedings of NELS 36. Amherst, MA: GLSA, vol 1, 179-196.

Christophersen, P. 1939. *The Articles*. London: Munksgaard, Copenhagen and Oxford University Press.

Cohen, B. 2011. Weak definites, Semantic incorporation and reference, ms.

Corblin, F. 2001. Défini et génitif: le cas des définis défectifs. In *Cahier Jean-Claude Milner*, Jean-Marie Marandin (ed.), Editions Verdier, 19-54.

Corblin, F. 2011. Des définis para-intensionnels : *être à l'hôpital, aller à l'école*. *Langue Française* 171, 55-75.

Corblin, F. to appaer. Locus et telos : *aller à l'école, être à la plage*. In Fagard B. & Stosic, D. (eds.), *Corela,* Special issue on Expression(s) de l'espace en français.
Dayal, V. 2004. Number marking and (In)definiteness in Kind Terms. *Linguistics and Philosophy* **27**, 451-490.
Himmelmann, N. P. 1998. Regularity in irregularity: article use in adpositional phrases. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 315-353.
Klein, N.M.,Gegg-Harrison, W.M,Sussman, R.S., Carlson, G.N., Tanenhaus, M.K, 2009, Weak Definite Noun Phrases: Rich, But Not Strong, Special, But Not Unique. In Sauerland, U. & K. Yatsihshiro (eds.), Semantics and pragmatics, from experiment to theory, Palgrave Macmillan. 264-175.
Làbner, S., 2011. Concept types and determination. *Journal of Semantics* 28(3), 279-333.
Parsons, T. 1990. Events in the Semantics of English. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Poesio, M. 1994. Weak Definites. *SALT IV*. Ithaca: Cornell.
Roberts, C. 2003. Uniqueness in Definite Noun Phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy* **26**: 287-350.
Russell, B. 1905. On Denoting. *Mind* **14** 479–493.
Scholten, J. 2010. Weak Definites and Bare Singulars: Their Syntactic Peculiarities, Master thesis, ms.
Stvan, L. S. 2009. Semantic Incorporation as an Account for some Bare Singular Count Noun uses in English. *Lingua* 119.2, 314-333.
Vandeloise, C. 1987. La préposition *à* et le principe d'anticipation. *Langue Française* 76, 77-111.
Vandeloise, C. 1988. Les usages statiques de la préposition *à*. *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 53, 119-148.