

Definiteness, possessivity and exhaustivity:

formalizing synchronic and diachronic connections

Many formal semantic and typological studies have addressed the relation between possession and definiteness, where definiteness encompasses uniqueness- and antecedent-based reference resolution or weak and strong definiteness in the sense of Schwarz (2009).

Morphosyntactic and semantic split alignment. From the point of view of morphosyntax, there is a typological split between languages that allow for all kinds of possessive and definiteness markers to cooccur within one and the same DP (1), and those in which there are possessive markers that are in complementary distribution with definiteness markers (2) (for a rich typological survey see Haspelmath 1999).

RUSSIAN

- (1) et-a moj-a podrug-a
this-F.SG my-F.SG friend-NOM.SG

‘this (female) friend of mine’

ENGLISH

- (2) *this/the his friend / ^{OK} this friend of his

On the semantic side, languages again split in that some have markers of possession that impose an exhaustive quantification on the domain denoted by the possessee nominal (in the sense that the resulting DP is normally taken to denote the totality of individuals with the relevant nominal property related to a given possessor), while other languages do not have such possessives.

West Germanic prenominal possessors (3), French prenominal possessors, and Hebrew and Arabic construct state possessives (4) (e.g. Heller 2002, Dobrovie-Sorin 2004, Barker 2011) all encode exhaustive quantification. For instance English (3) is felicitous just in case all of Sam's daughters study in Great Britain, not just some of them, and Hebrew (4) in case the teacher has only one house.

ENGLISH

- (3) Sam's daughters study in Great Britain.

HEBREW

- (4) beyt-hamore
house-DEF teacher

‘The teacher’s house’ (from Barker 2011)

In languages and language groups such as Italian, Spanish, Slavic, Finno-Ugric, Austronesian (Chung 2008), there is no possessive configuration with an exhaustivity effect. For example, in (5) and (6) from Russian and Beserman Udmurt (Uralic, Finno-Ugric), respectively, the

possessee NP is not implied to denote all of the individuals with the relevant nominal property related to the possessor, but possibly only some of them.

RUSSIAN (SLAVIC)

- (5) nash petukh
 our rooster
 ‘our rooster / one of our roosters’

BESERMAN UDMURT (URALIC)

- (6) petuk-m̃
 rooster-POSS.1PL
 ‘our rooster / one of our roosters’

Importantly, we assume that quantification in natural language is contextually restricted to a certain domain (e.g. von Stechow (1994) and much subsequent work). That is, when saying that a marker triggers an exhaustive/non-exhaustive quantification, we assume that any such statement for a given case should be qualified with respect to a contextually established domain over which quantification takes place. For instance, the possessive pronoun in ‘my roosters’ in English is understood to trigger exhaustive quantification over a certain domain, which is not necessarily equal to the actual world as a whole. This means that the denotation of such DP may well be smaller than the absolute (i.e. with respect to the whole actual world) totality of roosters in speaker's possession. However, *relative to a contextually established domain*, the contribution of the possessor pronoun in English does seem to be such that the DP denotes the totality of roosters possessed by the speaker. This is what we take to make languages such as English differ in the relevant respect from languages such as Beserman Udmurt: in (6) the use of a possessive suffix does not imply that the DP denotes the totality of roosters related to the possessor *even relative to a contextually salient domain*. An utterances such as this one may well be used to refer to two roosters in a context where it has just been stated that the speaker overall has five roosters, an interpretation not compatible with the parallel English example. In what follows, we omit such domain qualifications for the sake of readability; however, it is crucial to bear them in mind when evaluating claims about quantificational properties of possessivity and definiteness markers.

There is evidence for the typological alignment of the morphosyntactic and semantic splits identified above. That is, on the one hand, it is precisely in those cases where possessive markers trigger exhaustive quantification that they are in a complementary distribution with definiteness markers; on the other, languages which do not have exhaustivity-triggering possessives, seem to mark, if at all, specificity (in the sense of Enç (1991); partitive type in terms of von Stechow (2002) rather than definiteness. The latter clustering of properties is illustrated with (5) and (7) from Russian and (6) and (8) from Beserman Udmurt (Finno-Ugric).

RUSSIAN

- (7) et-ot nash petukh
 this-M.SG our rooster
 ‘this rooster of ours’

BESERMAN UDMURT

- (8) So korka-mê vuž n’i val.
 this house-POSS.1PL old already be.PST
 ‘This house of ours became old’

One of the goals of this workshop is the identification of systematic alignments between the morphosyntactic and semantic splits described above and the exploration of the semantic and/or structural underpinnings of the alignments.

Diachronic transition between the two types of systems. The two types of systems – with article/possessive complementary distribution and exhaustive possessives and with article/possessive cooccurrence and no exhaustive possessives – are not impermeable, however. For instance, Medieval French drifted from a system with the pre-nominal possessives cooccurring with the articles originating from Late Latin distal demonstratives, (9) to a system where the two series of markers are in a complementary distribution, (10) and where the pre-nominal possessives have an exhaustive interpretation, (11).

MEDIEVAL FRENCH

- (9) la sue juvente fut honeste e spirituel.
 DEF POSS.3SG youth was virtuous and spiritual
 ‘His youth was virtuous and spiritual.’ (From *La vie de St. Alexis*, ca. 1050 A.D.)

MODERN FRENCH

- (10) (*La) sa jeunesse était très spirituelle.
 DEF POSS.3SG youth was very spirituality
 ‘His youth was very spiritual.’

- (11) Mes amis ne viennent pas ce soir.
 POSS.1PL friends NEG come.3PL NEG this evening

‘My friends are not coming tonight.’ (None of the situationally relevant friends of the speaker are coming.)

Examination and formalization of such diachronic transitions is the second major goal of the meeting.

Finally, a connection seems to emerge between the etymological origins of definiteness/specificity markers and whether their semantics involves exhaustive quantification. As shown in Schroeder (2006), the main diachronic sources of definiteness/specificity markers belong either to the domain of direct anaphora (demonstratives, personal pronouns) or to the domain of elements expressing associative relations (which includes possessive markers).

- (i) Demonstratives, which are commonly assumed to imply the relation of identity with a discourse or deictic antecedent, historically give rise to the definite articles (see, e.g., De Mulder and Carlier 2011). Within the Russellian/Fregean approach, these articles are taken to trigger an exhaustive quantification over the nominal domain (modulo the relevant domain restrictions). This is, for instance, the case for the West Germanic articles.
- (ii) Non-exhaustive possessives typically give rise to reference markers not triggering an exhaustive quantification (Schroeder 2006). This case can be illustrated with the 3rd person singular suffixes used in non-possessive contexts in a number of Finno-Ugric languages (see Am-David (2014) for an overview). This is also the case for the specificity markers in some Ethiopian languages and Indonesian (Rubin 2010), which have also developed from possessives and which likewise do not trigger an exhaustive quantification.

However, etymology does not categorically determine the presence/absence of the exhaustivity component and a non-exhaustive configuration may develop into an exhaustive one. For instance, Khanty (Uralic) has developed an antecedent identity-based definiteness marker from a third person possessive marker.

Goals of the workshop. Taking as its core business the relation between possession, reference, and exhaustivity, the workshop focusses on answering the following questions:

- How much typological evidence is there for the alignment between (non-)cooccurrence of definiteness and possessive markers and possessor (non-)exhaustivity?
- What are the possible semantic explanations of the ban on possessive and definiteness markers' cooccurrence in light of the alignment of the morphosyntactic and semantic splits in question?
- What is the inventory of syntactico-semantic elements that would allow us to account for the independence of the exhaustivity quantification and possessive relation cross-linguistically?
- What are the possible inventories of possessive constructions in languages in terms of (non-)exhaustivity?
- How much diachronic evidence is there for the passage from non-exhaustive to exhaustive possessive configurations?
- How can such transitions be formally modeled?
- How can we formally model the evolutionary developments leading from the direct anaphora and possession markers to the definiteness and specificity (partitivity) markers respectively?
- Does quantifier domain restriction happen the same way in the case of definiteness and possessivity markers?

The workshop is aimed at bringing together specialists working on the formal (synchronic and diachronic) representations of the structure and the semantics of the DP and the scholars engaged in the data-driven research on particular languages featuring any of the phenomena above.

References

- Am-David, Assif. 2014. *The distribution of definiteness markers across languages – a semantic typology*. Saarbrücken: Lambert.
- Barker, Chris. 1998. Partitives, double genitives, and anti-uniqueness. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, pp. 679–717.
- Barker, Chris. 2011. Possessives and relational nouns. *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, 2, pp.1109–1130.
- Chung, Sandra. 2008. Possessors and Definiteness Effects in Two Austronesian Languages. In *Quantification: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Ed. by Lisa Matthewson. North-Holland Linguistic Series 64. Bingley, UK: Emerald, pp. 179–224.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2004. Genitives and determiners. In *Possessive and beyond: Semantics and Syntax*. Ed. by Kim et al., pp. 115–132.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Giurgea, Ion, Farkas, Donka. 2013. Introduction: Nominal features and nominal projections. In *The reference grammar of Romanian*. Vol.1: The Noun Phrase. John Benjamins, 2013.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2008. Demonstratives as individual concepts. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 31(4), pp. 409–466.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic inquiry*, pp.1–25.
- Farkas, Donka. 2013. The semantics of determiners. In *The reference grammar of Romanian*. Vol.1: The Noun Phrase. John Benjamins, 2013.
- von Fintel, Kai. 1994. *Restrictions on Quantifier Domains*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Explaining article-possessor complementarity: economic motivation in noun phrase syntax. *Language* 75(2), 227–243.
- Heller, Daphna. 2002. Possession as a lexical relation: evidence from the Hebrew Construct State. In *WCCFL 21 Proceedings*. 2002.
- von Heusinger, Klaus. 2002. Specificity and Definiteness in Sentence and Discourse Structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19. 245–274
- de Hoop, Helen. 1997. A semantic reanalysis of the partitive constraint. In *Lingua*, 103, pp. 151–174.
- de Mulder, Walter, and Anne Carlier. 2011. Definite Articles. In *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, ed. Heine Bernd and Narrog Heiko, 522–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, Aaron. 2010. The development of the Amharic Definite Article and an Indonesian Parallel. In *Journal of Semitic Studies* LV/1, Spring 2010, pp. 103–114.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2006. Article systems in some areas of Europe. In *Pragmatic organization of discourse in the languages of Europe* (Eurotyp 20-8). Ed. by G. Bossong, B. Comrie. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Storto, Gianluca. 2000. On the Structure of Indefinite Possessives. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistics Theory X*. Ed. by B. Jackson, T. Matthews. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University. 2000.

Schwarz, Florian. 2009. *Two types of definites in natural language*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.