Universität Konstanz

Article Systems in Germanic and Romance Languages

17.-18. October 2003

University of Konstanz, Room G305

Prof. Dr. Manuel Leonetti — University of Alcal
Prof. Dr. Klaus von Heusinger — University of Stuttgart
Prof. Dr. Georg Kaiser — University of Konstanz

Student Workshop on 'Article Systems' with Invited Speakers

October, 17th (Friday), Room G 305

13.45-14.00	Introduction (Klaus **von Heusinger** / Georg A. **Kaiser**)
14.00-15.00	Nikola **Kohl**: The development of articles and clitics in Romance Languages Uta **Jansen**: The development of articles in Germanic Languages Discussion
15.00-16.00	Maria Sabina **Franz**: The Romanian Article Cristina **Ghodsi-Khameneh**: The Romanian particle "pe" Discussion
16:00 - 16:30	Coffee break
16:30 - 17:30	**Elisabeth Stark (LMU M nchen / FU Berlin):** **Determination and typology or why Er verwendet Butter, und nicht l and** **Usa burro, e non olio, but not *Il utilise beurre, et non pas huile?**
17:30 - 18:30	**Roberto Zamparelli (Universit di Bergamo):** **Singular determiners in Italian**
18.30-19.30	Consulting time with students Comorovski: Franz & Ghodsi-Khameneh Stark: Kohl & Jansen
20.00-	**Zum Pfannkuchen**, H etlinstr. 39, Konstanz (bitte anmelden)

Oktober, 18th (Saturday), Room G 305

9:00 - 10:00	**Ileana Comorovski (Universit Nancy 2):** **On Some Indefinite Determiners of French**
10.00-11:00	**Mirjam Huss**: Generic readings: kind vs. characteristic readings Magdalena **Thomas**: On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars Discussion
11:00-11:30	coffee break
11.30-12.30	Dilek **Donat**: Definiteness and Genericity in French and Turkish. A contrastiv study Olga **Kounakova**: Definiteness and Genericity in German and Russian. Tobias **Weber**: Noun Incorporation in Hungarian Discussion
12.30-13.30	Nicole **Falkenhayner**: Possessive Noun Phrases in English Chryssoula **Stefanou**: Cardinaletti, ªOn the Deficient / Strong Opposition in Posessive Systems Nathalie **Fritz**: The Theory of the Romance Adjective Position
13.30-13:45	Final discussion (Manuel **Leonetti**)
13:45-14:45	Consulting time with students Leonetti: Mirjam Huss, Magdalena Thomas, Melanie H gle Zamparelli: Nicole Falkenhayner, Nathalie Fritz, Tobias Weber

Invited Guests:

On some indefinite determiners of French

Ileana Comorovski
(Universit Nancy 2)
Ileana.Comorovski@univ-nancy2.fr

The talk will present a French indefinite determiner from each of the two traditional classes of indefinites: indefinite articles and cardinal determiners. The article *quelque* will be analyzed in its combination with a singular count noun (e.g. *quelque question*). It will be shown that in such DPs *quelque* can have two interpretations, one being that of a free choice indefinite (Corblin (2003)) and the other one being that of a possibility operator. We will next trace the history of the lexical item *divers* from pre-Classical French to contemporary French; the purpose of this inquiry into the diachrony of *divers* is to show how *divers* has come to function as a cardinal determiner when occurring in prenominal position (*diverses questions*) and as an adjective when occurring postnominally (*des questions tr s diverses*).

Singular determiners in Italian

Roberto Zamparelli
(Universit di Bergamo)
roberto@unibg.it

In this talk I will give an overview of the behaviour of various Italian singular determiners:

qualche N (singular "some")
qualcuno (someone)
qualcosa (something)

nessun N ("no")
nessuno (no-one)

ogni N ("every")
ognuno ("every-one")

niente   (singular "no")
qualsiasi (free_choice "any")

These determiners have various peculiarities. The "-uno" form refers to humans, and agrees in gender. All the other forms have no agreement, tolerate N-conjunctions ("qualche adulto e bambino" 'some adult and child', 2 people) and cannot be predicative (with interesting exceptions). In addition "Niente" is negative but with a definite meaning, while "qualsiasi" can appear under an indefinite article ("un qualsiasi N" 'an any N'). I will relate these semantic properties to the structural position these elements occupy, and discuss some implications for the syntax/semantics interface.

Determination and Typology:
Why *Er verwendet Butter, und nicht Öl* and *Usa burro, e non Olio,* but not **Il utilise beurre, et non pas huile*?

Elisabeth Stark
(Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)
Elisabeth.Stark@romanistik.uni-muenchen.de

The aim of the talk will be to find an adquate (and typologically convincing) explanation for the distribution and functional load of non-determination in Italian. Compared to French, one of its sister languages in Romance, Italian admits more readily non-determined noun phrases in argument position — but still much less than e.g. German. Two proposals of classification and explanation for these facts (Schroten 1991 and Chierchia 1998) will be discussed and criticized in a Romance perspective, before an alternative explanation will be given, which considers Romance indefinite determiner systems as a supplmentation and/or complementation of the original Latin classification system via a considerably complex noun morphology.

Chierchia, Gennaro (1998): ªReference to Kinds across Languages , in: *Natural Language Semantics* 6-4, 339-405.
Lehmann, Christian (1991): ªThe Latin Nominal Group in a Typological Perspective , in: Robert Coleman (ed.): *New Studies in Latin Linguistics. Selected Papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Cambridge, April 1987*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 203-232.
Schroten, Jan (2001): ªL absence de d terminant en espagnol , in: Georges Kleiber / Brenda Laca / Liliane Tasmowski (eds.): *Typologie des groupes nominaux*, Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 189-203.

Student Contributions°:

Definiteness and Genericity in French and Turkish. A contrastive study

Dilek Donat
dilekdonat@hotmail.com

1.a) The definite article in French is often unsed before a noun. This indicates an object that is known by the speaker .The singular definite article can also be used when one considers a species, a category, and not only one individual. The definite article is used to refer to an identifiable entity starting from the only descriptive contents of the remainder of the noun. The reference which is established can be specific, can relate to particular individuals,(definiteness) or to a group of a class or of a subclass from individuals(genericity).

Theories of definiteness:
- theory of anaphoricity   identification
- theory of uniqueness   inclusiveness
- theory of deictic   salience

b) The indefinite article is placed in front of an unspecified noun.

2. Turkish does not have a definite article, corresponding to the French. The number bir , which means, one in English functions as an indefinite article when it is not stressed. The absence of bir is one way of definitizing NPs. In fact, definiteness and referentiality of NPs are signaled by a varieta of strategies in Turkish, namely Morphological marking, word order, stress, and context, among which there is an intricate interplay. The indefinte article bir gives an indefinite reading to any NPs. Whether the indefinite subject is specific or non-specific is dependent on factors such as context, stress, or tenst/aspect. A subject Np not preceded by bir is either definite or non-referential. This ambiguity is resolved by word order and/ or stress. The apparent semantic role of the accusative marker may seem to be one of definitizing the NP.

Examples:

a) definiteness in French

(1) bana   kitab-**i**   uzat
    1sgl-dat   book-acc   give
    Passe-moi le livre

(2) (benim)   ogl-um   araba-**yi**   sevi-yor
    1sgl-pos   son-1sgl-dat   car-acc   love-aor
    mon fils aime la voiture

(3) ekip   mac-**I**   kaybet-ti
    team   game-acc   lose-past-3sg
    l'equipe a perdu le jeu
  referential+specific reading in Turkish.

b) genericity in French

(4) (Ben)   roman   sev-er-im
    I   roman   love-aor-1sgl
    J'aime les romans

(5) (Ben)   bir   grenci   ari yor um
    I   a   student   look_for-prog-1sgl
    je cherche un tudiant

(6) polis   insan-lar-i   kor-ur
    police   human-pl.-acc   protect-aor
    la police prot ge les gens

Examples:

(7) (Ben)   insan-lar-**I**   sev-er-im
    I   human beeing-pl-acc   love-aor-1sg
    I love human beeings
    J'aime l' tre humain

(8) *(Ben)   elma-lar-**i**   severim
    I   apple-pl-acc   love-aor-1sg
    I love apples
    J'aime les pommes

Conclusion:
Proper nouns which are inherently definite obligatorily take the accusative marking when they are the object. Common nouns differ from proper nouns in that they may or may not take the

accusative case when they are the direct object, and this is where the case marking appears to have a definitizing function. Especially in statements of general truth, must be in the accusative case, without necessarily having a definite reading. In such a case a direct object with the accusative marking may have a non-referantial or indefinite(non-specific) reading. Whereas when the direct object is unanimate cannot take the case marking to express the non-referntial reading of the NPs.

Literature:

Eser Emine Erguvanli, *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar*, University of California Press, p.17-21.

Martin Riegel, Jean-Christophe Pellat, Ren Rioul*, Grammaire m thodique du francais* p.154-160

Maurisse Grevisse, *le bon usage*, p.870-871
Yusuf Mardin, *Colloquial Turkish*, p.8

Possessive Noun Phrases in English

Nicole Falkenhayner
nicole.falkenhayner@uni-konstanz.de

In my presentation I would first like to outline how possessiveness is seen as being a part of the notion of definiteness by Lyons, so I will try to give some arguements why possessives are among definites. I will then try to illustrate how the structure of possessives is normally categorized into DP-structure. Lyons, drawing on further literature, is presenting a Movement operation in which the possessiveness marker, believed to originate in SpecifierNP, moves upwards to SpecDP. After the Movement, the expression for possessiveness (such as the English clitic *'s*) could either fall under Dß, or it could stay in SpecDp and D would be null.

For English, a [a]full movement is assumed in contrast with only a partial movement in Western Romance languages such as Spanish or Italian (Comp. Lyons, ch. 8). In this way, a definite article may appear in the structure in Romance, but in English, D is either *'s* or null, so there is no space for a further definite determiner (**Peter s the pictures*).

Lyons entertains the idea that there is a certain form of D that only occurs with Poss Movement, and which can assign genetive case. He calls this [a]DPoss .

But are English possessives really [a]watertight in their definiteness? I will try to present some data where they can have indefinite readings, especially in existential sentences (*There was a man's job at stake,* example taken from Schoorlemmer) . What could be the principle accounting for them? And what is the relationship between possessives and definiteness?

Literature

Lyons, C. *Definiteness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999
Schoorlemmer, M. [a]Possessors, Articles and Definiteness in: Alexiadou, A./Wilder, C. (eds.). *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1998
Vangsnes, fl.A.*The Syntactic Source and Semantic Reflexes of the Definiteness Effect*. Cand. Phil. Thesis, University of Bergen, 1994

The Romanian Article

Maria Sabina Franz
sabina.ionita@uni-konstanz.de

A. The Romanian Article is a regular component of the flexion, a so-called "morpheme of minimal determination" (Iordan /Robu, Limba romana contemporana).It is a dependent element whose pragmatical and communicative function is to isolate, to identify and to individualize a noun or a substitute of a noun.It is the flexional element which agrees with the noun in gender and number putting case in a concrete form. The definite article has a syntactical content. Even if it melts with an adjective the definite article is considered to be an element depending of the noun: frumosul castel.

B.Description:
°°   1. The enclitic definite article joins the noun in the singular by:
°°   a) Agglutination
°° ° °   b) Adding the vowel -u to the nouns ending in a consonant, the vowel a, the vowel i;
°° ° °   c) Replacing the nominal ending with the definite article.
°°   2. Adjectives can also be accompanied by the enclitic definite °article.

C. Forms:

		masculine	feminine	neuter
Singular	N. Ac.	-l, -le, -a	a	-l, -le
	G. D.	-lui, -i	-i	-lui
	V.	-le	-	-le
Plural	N. Ac	-i	-le	-le
	G. D.	-lor	-lor	-lor
	V.	-lor	-lor	-lor

The definite article -l is very often not pronounced; it is never pronounced in the colloquial language; its function is taken over by the phoneme (u), which is always obligatory in order to join together the stem of the noun and the article: tricou (-ow) : tricou'(-ou)

D. Uses:
°°   The definite article always appears with:
°°1. Specific names and generic names:
°° °   Lupul isi schimba parul, dar naravul ba.
°° ° °   The wolf may lose his teeth, but never his nature.
  2. Nouns which express unique objects from the world around (names of towns, headlines)
° 3. Abstract nouns:
°° ° °   Pacea este bunul cel mai de pret.
°° ° °   Peace is the most precious thing.
°° 4. Various conceptions of time and measure:
°° ° °   Vinerea este rezervata consultatiilor.
°° ° °   Friday is reserved for consultations.
°° ° °   Materialul costa 100 de lei metrul.
°° ° °   The material costs 100 lei per meter.
°° 5. Proper names who are known (enough) to the hearer:
°° ° °   Joi vin Dumitrestii.
°° ° °   The Dumitrescus come on Thursday.

Usually there is no definite article after prepositions: in padure : in the woods. But there are a few exceptions: the preposition cu , some prepositions which appear with nouns in the genitive or dative case, prepositions + certain nouns which express persons or animals (real or not) known to the hearer.

°E. Functions:
°°   1. Conversion
°°   2. Gender-markers for nouns designating inanimate entities
°°   3. Formative in the structure of ordinal numerals.

The theory of the Romance adjective position

Nathalie Fritz
nathalie.fritz@uni-konstanz.de

In many languages attributive adjectives stand either in front of or after the noun; in Germanic Languages, like English or German, they <u>must</u> stand in prenominal position.

(1) a beautiful city / * a city beautiful (engl.)
(2) eine sch ne Stadt / * eine Stadt sch ne (deutsch)
    a   beautiful city   a   city beautiful

In other languages, the standard order is Noun-Adjective:

(3) hiri polit   bat / * polit   hiri bat (Basque)
    city beautiful one / beautiful city a

In Romance Languages both orders are allowed; mostly without any semantic difference:

(4) une belle city / une ville belle (French)
    a beautiful city / a city beautiful
(5) una bonita ciudad / una ciudad bonita (Spanish)
    a beautiful city / a city beautiful

From a statistic point of view, the postnominal position (N-Adj) ist more common than the prenominal postion of adjectives in French or Spanish.
The following question arises:
Which principles determine the adjective position in Romance Language? Or, to be more precisely, under which circumstances the adjective is allowed in a prenominal position?
In order to answer this question, I will try to present an approach by Radatz (2001) who tries to explain the adjective order in Romance Languages by using semantic principles.

Literature:
        Radatz, Hans-Ingo, *Die Semantik der Adjektivstellung: eine kognitive Studie zur Konstruktion ªAdjektiv + Substantiv im Spanischen, Franz sischen und Italienischen *, T bingen, Niemeyer 2001
        Fuchs, Voker, *Taschenlexikon der franz sischen Grammatik*, A. Franke Verlag in T bingen und Basel, 2001

The Romanian Particle ªpe

Cristina Ghodsi Khameneh
cristina.balan@uni-konstanz.de

In my presentation I will discuss the preposition pe as Accusative marker of the Direct Object and especially NPs and quantity markers with pe under certain factors: [–definite], [–specific], [–human], [–generic].

Example:

      a) O   vad   **pe**   Maria.
      Her see 1sg   prep Acc.   Mary.
      I see Mary.

      b) L   -am   observat   **pe**   Ion.
      Him aux 1sg   noticed (past) **prep Acc.** John.
      I noticed John.

An overview will be given over the most important context in which the use of the preposition pe in Romanian is possible, optional or obligatory and they will be illustrated in examples.

Literature:

Farkas, Donka (1978), *Direct and Indirect Object Reduplication in Romanian*. In: Chicago Linguistic Society 14.1:88-97

Popescu, Stefania (1997), *Gramatica Practica Limbii Romane*, Editura Lider Bucuresti.
Popescu, Alexandra (1997), *Objectklitika und Argumentlinking im Rum nischen* , Heirich-Heine Universit t, D sseldorf

Genericity - Generic readings: kind vs. characteristic readings

Mirjam Huss
Miri.huss@gmx.de

My aim is to give an overview of topics and issues within the area of generics, with emphasis on the distinction between kind and characteristic reading.

We differentiate between two basic varieties:

- reference to a kind

  Example: <u>The potato</u> was first cultivated in South America

- reference to a general property (characteristic sentences)

  Example: John smokes a cigar after dinner.

They are called *generic* sentences.

We classify the kind-referring NPs and the characterizing sentences that way: we look at the behaviour of kind-referring NPs vs. object-referring NPs and their basic properties and we will also have a look at the difference between characterizing sentences and particular sentences and their basic properties.

Basically an overview over the most important characteristics of genericity in kind-referring NPs and characterizing sentences will be given and these will be illustrated in examples.

The development of articles in the Germanic languages

Uta Jansen
ujansen77@hotmail.com

- Two theories of possible grammatical factors triggering the development of articles will be presented:
  - Heinrichs theory (1954):
    Since the demonstrative force of the suffix *en/on* eroded and was no longer sufficient to indicate the demonstrative character of the adjective, the need for a new reference marker arose. Therefore, the demonstrative pronoun *sa/thata/so* was used in pre-adjectival position.
  - Theory of other scholars (Behagel,1923; Paul, 1959; Giusti 1993: Holmberg, 1993):
    The loss of nominal morphology led to the rise of the article
- Counterarguments against both theories will show the difficulty of this subject
- It will be shown that there is good reason to analyse definite determiners as demonstratives in the older Germanic languages:
  - They have the same distributional properties as demonstratives in the modern Germanic languages
  - They are used to translate demonstrative pronouns from the source text
  - They may be used pronominally in the older Germanic languages
  - Definite determiners cannot move to a governing prepositional head in Gothic and Old High German
- A diachronic perspective on the rise of lexical determiners will show that the restrictions on the use of definite determiners are gradually lost. Determiners are no longer used as demonstrative elements. Their new function is to mark NPs for definiteness.

The development of articles and clitics in Romance languages

Nikola Kohl
niko.kohl@gmx.net

In my presentation I will draw the attention to the emergence of a D-system in the Romance languages which was not present in the earlier stages of Classical Latin. As we know, the Classical Latin was characterized by the absence of articles and clitic pronouns in the modern Romance sense. The system of CL only knew the deictic and/or emphatic elements *ipse* and *ille* on which I will focus here because both lead to the rise of the Romance articles.

In CL, the semantic properties of *ille* and *ipse* differ in certain respects: while *ille* has a distal and anaphoric meaning, *ipse* is used to emphasize and contrast the relevant items in the discourse. Later, *ille* and *ipse* still have distinct but overlapping functions (the former a cataphoric and the latter an anaphoric function).

I will first of all refer to an article from Vincent Nigel "The emergence of a D-system in Romance" (1997:150-168).

Vincent suggests that the developments of articles and clitics in Romance languages are linked and that they are both assigned to the category D. Vincent argues that the different patterns of morphological realization of the third person clitics (which always derive from Latin *ille*) and the articles (which sometimes derive from *ille* and sometimes from *ipse*) are reflections of two independent and convergent developments. The development of the clitics concerns the verb-object relation and the development of the articles involves the clause-subject relation. Furthermore he argues that these changes show the emergence of a subject-object asymmetry that we do not find in Latin.

Literature:

Greenberg, *Joseph Numeral classifiers and substantival number: Problems in the genesis of a linguistic type* in: Heilmann, Luigi (ed.) Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Linguists, Bologna-Florence, Aug. 28 - Sept. 2, 1972, 2Bdd., Bd 1, Bologna 1974. S. 17-37

Meisterfeld, Reinhard *Die unbestimmte Bestimmung: Zur Entstehung des unbestimmten Artikels in den romanischen Sprachen* in: Staib, Bruno (ed.), Linguistica romanica et indiana: Festschrift f r Wolf Dietrich zum 60. Geburtstag. T bingen 2000

Nigel, Vincent *The emergence of the D-system in Romance* in: Parameters of morphosyntactic change. Cambridge 1997

Selig, Maria, *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Sp tlatein* . T bingen 1992

Definiteness and Genericity in German and Russian

Olga Kounakova
olga.kounakova@uni-konstanz.de

In many languages a noun phrase may contain an element which seems to have as its principal role to indicate the definiteness or indefiniteness of the noun phrase. In German as well as in most other Germanic and Romance languages this element is a lexical item, namely the definite and indefinite article. Their presence or absence in the NP shows the degree of familiarity or identifiability of the referent. In the language like Russian there are no articles, but the indication of definiteness is realized by certain morphosyntactic means, for example syntactic structure of the sentence or the position of the verb and the NP. In my work I would like to show by which means definiteness is expressed in Russian in comparison with German. Among the main points I am going to look at are the topic-comment relation ,V-N and N-V structures ,sentences with direct and indirect object, indefiniteness realized by attributive modifiers, particles and indefinite pronouns and anaphoric use of NPs.

Cardinaletti, ªOn the Deficient / Strong Opposition in Posessive Systems

Chryssoula Stefanou
chrisastefanou@yahoo.com

Anna Cardinaletti compares in her paper pre-nominal and post-nominal possessive pronouns, drawing mainly on Italian data. She argues that pre-nominal possessives are deficient. Post-nominal possessives on the other hand are strong. She takes evidence from the fact that properties of possessives can vary with position, e.g. a possessive pronoun can be focalised, coordinated or modified only when it is in the post-nominal position. This analysis requires movement from a common post-nominal base position into one higher position in the DP. The so-called N to D movement is also supported by Longobardi. In my presentation I will summarize Cardinaletti s main points and compare her arguments with Longobardi s DP Hypothesis.

On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars

Magdalena Thomas
magdalenathomas@gmx.de

The distribution of indefinite singular generics and bare plural generics is very different. Indefinite singulars are one possibility to express genericity in English, but their distribution is quite limited. They are restricted to properties that are in some sense, necessary , essential , inherent , or analytic .
Ariel Cohen comes in his article, On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars 2001 to the point that indefinite singulars are disallowed in characterizing generic statements, in contrast to bare plurals. For example it s possible to say:
    (1) Dinosaurs were huge (characterizing generic) but not
    (2) *A dinosaur was huge
The same happens with the direct kind predication. We re allowed to say:
    (3) Dinosaurs are extinct (direct kind predication) but not
    (4) *A dinosaur is extinct.
As we have seen, there are some examples where we achieve the generic reading only with bare plurals. But there are also various situations where it seems possible to use indefinite singulars for a generic reading. Indefinite singulars may receive a generic reading in a context that makes it clear that a rule or a regulation is referred to. The same happens with definitions. Definitions are seen as linguistic rules and can also be expressed by indefinite singulars.
(The various differences between the two types of generic are shown to follow.)

Noun Incorporation in Hungarian

Tobias Weber
toweb@gmx.ch

The main question is whether bare noun (BN) + verb sequences in Hungarian behave like compounds or not.

Before being able to respond to this question we must consider the key concepts of the sentence structure of Hungarian. The succession of the constituents is independent of their syntactic function. Nevertheless, there are two constraints. Firstly, the topic always appears at the beginning of a sentence. And, secondly, a focussed element immediately precedes the verb.

Then we turn to some properties of preverbal BNs. They are always singular and are affixed by the accusative case ending. They are non-referential in the sense that they cannot be used to identify an object in the world. Furthermore, they do not admit any modification.

From a syntactic point of view BN + verb sequences behave like other phrasal constituents. On the other hand, from a semantic point of view the object noun and the verb form a semantic unity.

The following argumentation about the incorporatedness of BN leads to the conclusion that it is not clear whether noun incorporation is the underlying principle of BN + verb sequences in Hungarian.