'Der und der hat mir neulich das und das erzählt':
On the Interpretation of DPs with Article Conjunction

Maria Cieschinger　　　*Cornelia Ebert*

Universität Osnabrück

In this paper, we investigate DPs with article-conjunction heads in German (AC-DPs). We argue that they are non-referential expressions, which impose certain constraints on the discourse model in which they can felicitously be used. We suggest that AC-DPs presuppose the existence of a previous conversation between the speaker and someone other than the hearer, and that a definite or a name was used in this conversation to refer to the referent of the AC-DP. We also illustrate how the use of AC-DPs can be explained by way of general pragmatic principles like 'Maximise Presupposition'.

Keywords: Definiteness, Presuppositions, Maximise Presupposition

1　Introduction

In this paper, we are concerned with the semantics of DPs with article-conjunction heads in German (AC-DPs, cf. (1)), which, to our knowledge, have not yet been discussed in the linguistic literature. AC-DPs can occur with or without an NP complement (cf. (1a) and (1b), respectively):

(1)　a.　der und der Student; die und die Flasche; das und das Buch
　　　　the and the student; the and the bottle;　the and the book

　　　b.　der und der ;　　　die und die ;　　　das und das
　　　　the and the (masc.); the and the (fem.); the and the (neutr.)

The following examples serve to illustrate the use of AC-DPs:

(2)　Das Erste berichtet, er sei nachts　um 24 Uhr von **dem und dem**
　　　the　ARD reports　　he be at night at　24 hrs. by　the and the
　　　angerufen worden und habe **das und das** gemacht.
　　　called　　was　　and have the and the　done

'The ARD reports that he was called by someone ('the and the') at 24
hrs and that he did this and that ('the and the').'[1]

(3) Da   hören wir sehr häufig: Ihr müsst es in **dem und dem Zeitraum**
     there hear   we very often   you must it in the and the timeframe
     schaffen, egal,   was es kostet.
     get done no matter what it costs
     'We often hear: You have to finish this within this and that ('the and
     the') timeframe, no matter how high the costs are.'[2]

(4) Sie spielen mit der Playstation und unterhalten sich:
     they play   with the Playstation and talk   themselves
     "**Der und der** hat Ärger   gehabt in Buxtehude. **Der und der** ist von
       the and the   has trouble had   in Buxtehude the and the   is from
     der Schule geflogen."
     the school expelled.
     'They play with their Playstation and talk: "Someone ('the and the') got
     into trouble in Buxtehude. Someone ('the and the') was expelled from
     school." '[3]

Examples (2) and (4) contain AC-DPs without NP complements and example
(3) contains an AC-DP with an overt NP complement (*Zeitraum ('timeframe')*).
It is striking that the AC-DPs are embedded under a verb of saying in examples
(2) and (4) (*berichten ('report')* and *sich unterhalten ('talk')*) and under a per-
ception word which constitutes the counterpart to the process of talking (*hören
('hear')*) in (3). We take it that AC-DPs are only licensed in such configurations,
i.e., when they are embedded under a verb of saying or when such a verb can
plausibly be assumed. We propose to analyse AC-DPs as non-referential ex-

[1] Die Zeit online 2005: Der Kanzler und die lieben Zwerge.
[2] Die Zeit 42/2000, Wissen, Bildung: Retter in letzter Minute
[3] Die Zeit 46/2000, Leben: Mama, da ist Ei auf dem Teppich . . .

pressions that impose certain constraints on the discourse model in which they can be used felicitously. More specifically, we suggest that AC-DPs presuppose the existence of a previous discourse in which a definite or a proper name was used. In case of AC-DPs with non-empty NP complements, the existence of more than one object that fits the descriptive content of the NP complement is required.

Besides article-conjunction heads, also other conjunctions can be used as in *da und da ('there and there'), so und so ('so and so'), dann und dann ('then and then')*. In this paper, however, we will concentrate on article-conjunction DPs only.

2 Characteristics of AC-DPs

As we will see in this section, AC-DPs exhibit particular characteristics regarding their interpretation, and their felicitous use is restricted to certain contexts. We will explore the behaviour of AC-DPs in some detail in the following.

Non-Referential Readings of AC-DPs

Looking at examples (2)–(4), one might be tempted to conclude that AC-DPs not only presuppose a previous discourse with the use of a related definite or name, but that they themselves are referential and have to refer to particular individuals[4]. In contrast to (referential) definite descriptions and proper names, however, AC-DPs can also be used non-referentially (cf. (5) and (6)).

(5)   Wenn ich behaupte, **der und der** schreibe wie Mankell, glaubt
       when I claim   the and the   write   like Mankell believes

---

[4] We often translate AC-DPs without NP complement with *someone* or those with NP complements with *some* in English. Although this might not be the best translation as it unwillingly suggests some kind of indefinitess, it is the best we could come up with. Non-German native speakers should bear in mind that AC-DPs involve only the definite article and do not suggest any kind of indefinitess per se.

jeder   sofort   zu verstehen, was ich meine.
everyone immediately to understand what I   mean.
'If I claim that someone ('the and the') writes like Mankell, then every-
one immediately believes to know what I mean.'[5]

(6)   Niemand hört gerne, dass er **die und die Entscheidung** falsch
nobody   hears gladly that he the and the decision   wrong
getroffen hätte.
decided   would-have.
'Nobody likes to hear that he chose wrongly on some ('the and the')
occasion.'

In both cases, the AC-DP is in the scope of another quantifier: in (5) the AC-DP
is in the scope of a universal quantifier over worlds (triggered by the condi-
tional), and in (6) the AC-DP is embedded under the quantifier *niemand* ('*no-
body*'). The value of the AC-DPs thus varies with the values of other quantifiers
in (5) and (6) and thus cannot be referentially fixed. In other words, the speaker
is not referring to a particular author or to a particular decision, respectively.

AC-DPs Cannot Serve as Antecedents
Proper names and certain definite description can sometimes introduce new dis-
course referents into the common ground of the interlocutors, and they can
then serve as antecedents, e.g., for pronouns. AC-DPs, however, do not seem
to introduce new discourse referents, and they cannot be picked up again by
anaphoric expressions. The continuation in (7a) is felicitous, while the one in
(7b), where an AC-DP is used, is not.

(7)   a. Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   der Student aus   München
          Luise has   yet again   complained the student from Munich

---

[5]   Die Zeit online 2005: Der Mord und die Grenzen des Verstehens.

/ Ludwig hätte   schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.

  Ludwig would-have yet   again   the window open left

Der ist aber auch bescheuert.

he   is but   too   stupid.

'Luise complained again that the student from Munich / Ludwig has left the window open. That guy *is* stupid though.'

b. Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   **der und der** hätte

Luise has   yet again   complained the and the   would-have

schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen. #Der ist aber auch

yet   again   the window open left   he   is but   too

bescheuert.

stupid.

'Luise complained again that someone ('the and the') has left the window open. #This guy *is* stupid though.'

In (7a), a definite description or a proper name is used and we can easily refer to the corresponding referent with the help of a pronoun. This is not possible, however, if an AC-DP is used, as in (7b).

Embedding Under Verba Dicendi

AC-DPs occur particularly frequently embedded under what are usually called 'verba dicendi', i.e., verbs like *say, report, state*, etc. If such a verb is missing and it cannot plausibly be inferred from the context that such a verb could easily be inserted, sentences containing AC-DPs are unacceptable (cf. (9)).

(8)   Luise hat gesagt / würde gerne hören, dass **die und die** von   der

      Luise has said   / would gladly hear   that the and the from the

      Schule geflogen ist.

      school expelled was.

'Luise said / would like to hear that someone ('the and the') has been expelled from school.'

(9)   #Luise glaubt   / bedauert es, dass **die und die** von   der Schule
        Luise believes / regrets   it   that the and the from the school
        geflogen ist.
        expelled was.
        #'Luise believes / regrets that someone ('the and the') has been expelled
        from school.'

It seems that the use of AC-DPs indicates that the speaker is conveying information that she herself has acquired in the course of a previous conversation. Verba dicendi are normally used to make the relation to a previous conversation explicit. The standard reading of (9), therefore, is unacceptable because the relevant verb is missing. It is, however, possible that in some cases such a verb can rather easily be inferred, even though it is not realised overtly, thus making the use of AC-DPs felicitous. The sentences in (9) could, e.g., in some situations, be interpreted in such a way: The hearer could infer from the speaker's utterance, and, particularly, from her using an AC-DP, that Luise has indeed voiced her beliefs or regrets explicitly in a conversation that the speaker had with Luise. The sentences in (9) could then be paraphrased along the lines of 'Luise said she believes / regrets that somebody has been expelled from school'.

Furthermore, the continuations in (10) also appear to be appropriate, even though we said earlier that AC-DPs do not introduce discourse referents that can then be referred to with the help of a pronoun, or some other anaphoric expression.

(10)   Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   **der und der** hätte   schon
        Luise has   yet again   complained the and the   would-have yet
        wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.
        again   the window open left.

'Luise complained again that someone ('the and the') has left the window open.'

a. Außerdem hätte   er auch noch den Briefkastenschlüssel
    Moreover would-have he also   the letterbox key
    verloren.
    lost.
    'Moreover, he also lost the letterbox key (she said).'

b. Außerdem hat sie sich   noch aufgeregt, er hätte   den
    Moreover has she herself also upset   he would-have the
    Briefkastenschlüssel verloren.
    letterbox key   lost.
    'She also complained that he lost the letterbox key.'

The difference between (7b) and the continuations in (10) is that in (10) the speaker can be understood as still reporting something that Luise said, so the AC-DP is modally subordinated under a verbum dicendi, thus licensing the use of a pronoun.

Hyperdefiniteness of AC-DPs

Additionally to indicating that the speaker is conveying information that was presented to her in a previous conversation, the use of an AC-DP indicates that a definite description or proper name was used in this conversation to refer to the referent of the AC-DP (cf. (11) and (12)), and that is why they could be called 'hyperdefinites'.

(11) *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

      Luise: "Der Student aus   München / Ludwig hat schon wieder das
      Luise: "The student from Munich   / Ludwig has yet   again   the
      Fenster offen gelassen."
      window open left."

'Luise: "The student from Munich / Ludwig left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   jemand   / **der und der**
Luise has   yet again complained someone   the and the
hätte   schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
would-have yet   again   the window open left.

'Luise complained again that someone / someone ('the and the') has left the window open.'

(12)   *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

Luise: "Irgendjemand hat schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
Luise: "Someone   has yet   again   the window open left."

'Luise: "Someone left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   jemand   / **#der und der**
Luise has   yet again complained someone   #the and the
hätte   schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
would-have yet   again   the window open left.

'Luise complained again that someone / # someone ('the and the') has left the window open.'

The indefinite *jemand* (*'someone'*) can be used in both situations, while the AC-DP is only acceptable if a definite description or proper name has been used in the previous conversation, i.e., if the speaker was able to uniquely identify the referent of the definite and thus *knows* who she is talking about.

Differences between Specific Definites and AC-DPs

The intuition that the speaker knows who she is talking about, while this information is not available to her audience, might lead one to suspect that AC-DPs can be analysed in a fashion similar to the analysis of specific indefinites. Both specific indefinites and AC-DPs seem to pattern in this way (cf., e.g., Farkas (2002), Jayez & Tovena (2006), Ionin (2006)). The use of AC-DPs, however, is more restricted than that of specific indefinites (cf. (13)).

(13) *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

Luise: "Ein bestimmter / gewisser Student hat schon wieder das
Luise: "A   particular / certain   student has yet   again   the

Fenster offen gelassen."
window open left."

'Luise: "A particular / certain student left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   jemand   / ein
Luise has   yet again   complained someone   a

bestimmter/gewisser Student / **#der und der** hätte   schon
particular/certain   student   #the and the   would-have yet

wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
again   the window open left.

'Luise complained again that someone / a particular/certain student /
#someone ('the and the') has left the window open.'

The specific indefinites in (13) appear to be felicitous, but AC-DPs can only be used in contexts like (11), where a definite description or a proper name was used. The difference between specific indefinites and AC-DPs can therefore be characterised in terms of the kind of information or knowledge that the speaker

is required to have about the referent of the AC-DP: While it is sufficient for the felicitous use of specific indefinites to know who the referent is or to know something about the referent that goes beyond the descriptive content of the relevant NP, the requirements on the appropriate use of AC-DPs is more demanding. Not only need the speaker know something about the referent of the AC-DP, it is also important in which way the information that the speaker is conveying has been presented to the speaker herself (cf. the paragraph about the hyperdefiniteness of AC-DPs).

The NP Complement of AC-DPs

We saw above that AC-DPs can occur with or without an NP complement. It should be noted that there appears to be an interpretative difference between these two uses. For illustration, consider the examples in (14) and (15).

(14) Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   **der und der** hätte   schon
      Luise has   yet again   complained the and the   would-have yet
      wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.
      again   the window open left.
      'Luise complained again that someone ('the and the') has left the window open.'

(15) Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   **der und der Mitarbeiter**
      Luise has   yet again   complained the and the assistant
      hätte   schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.
      would-have yet   again   the window open left.
      'Luise complained again that some ('the and the') assistant has left the window open.'

As we said above, a definite must have been used in the conversation that the speaker is reporting. But an AC-DP *with* an NP complement, like the one in (15), additionally indicates that there is more than one assistant that the AC-DP

could potentially be used to refer to. The example in (16) makes this even more obvious:

(16)   *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

Luise: "Mein ältester Bruder / mein Cousin aus   Frankreich hat
Luise: "My   oldest bother / my   cousin from France   has
schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
yet   again   the window open left."

'Luise: "My oldest brother / cousin from France left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   **der und der Bruder / Cousin**
"Luise has   yet again   complained the and the brother / cousin
hätte   schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
would-have yet   again   the window open left."

'"Luise complained again that one of her ('the and the') brothers / cousins has left the window open."'

From Luise's utterance it is clear that she has more than one brother (or cousin), and that she is talking about one of them. The use of the AC-DP *der und der Bruder / Cousin* ('*the and the brother / cousin*') is felicitous because there are several referents that the AC-DP could in principle be used to refer to. (Note that the English translation *one of her brothers / cousins* corresponds to our observations.)

    Furthermore, it does not seem to be sufficient for the felicitous use of an AC-DP that the speaker knows that there is more than one potential referent, she also has to know to *which* of these referents the definite description or proper name was used to refer to in the original conversation (cf. (17)).

(17)   *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

Luise: "Mein Bruder / Cousin hat schon wieder das Fenster offen
Luise: "My   bother / cousin has yet   again   the window open
gelassen."
left."

'Luise: "My brother / cousin left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

#"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,
#"Luise has   yet again   complained
der und der Bruder / Cousin hätte   schon wieder das Fenster
the and the brother / cousin   would-have yet   again   the window
offen gelassen."
open left."

'"Luise complained again that her (the and the) brother / cousin has
left the window open."'

The last sentence would be appropriate only if the speaker knew that Luise had
more than one brother or cousin, and the speaker would also have to know *which*
of the brothers or cousins of Luise's it was that left the window open. These re-
quirements do not seem to be fulfilled in the standard reading of (17): (i) Luise
could be speaking about her *only* brother or cousin, or (ii) she could have more
than one brother or cousin (and the speaker may know this), but it may be un-
clear about *which* of her brothers or cousins Luise is talking. In both cases, the
use of an AC-DP with an NP complement is infelcitous.

Here is a short summary of the characteristics regarding the interpretation of
AC-DPs and of their distributional restrictions: AC-DPs . . .

(i) ...can be used non-referentially.

(ii) ...cannot serve as antecedents for pronomial reference.

(iii) ...have to be embedded under verba dicendi (sometimes such a verb has to be inferred).

(iv) ...indicate that the speaker is conveying information that she herself acquired in a previous conversation.

(v) ...also presuppose that a definite description or a proper name has been used in the previous conversation.

(vi) ...are more restricted in their use than specific indefinites are.

(vii) ...seem to indicate that there are several potential referents that the AC-DP could be used to refer to *if* the AC-DP has an NP complement.

3 Towards an Analysis

In the previous section we presented several characteristics of AC-DPs and a proper semantic analysis of AC-DPs should be able to account for these observations. In this section, we will argue that AC-DPs should be analysed as presupposing (i) the existence of an information exchange in which a definite was used, and (ii) the existence of more than one object that fits the descriptive content of the AC-DP. If, however, the NP complement is empty, some kind of default is at work: We assume that these AC-DPs are actually applied to a default complement with little semantic content, i.e., something along the lines of $\lambda x.THING(x)$. Brasoveanu & Farkas (2007) propose a semantic account of the verb *say*, and we will build on some of the insights provided by Brasoveanu

& Farkas' proposal. We will diverge from their views in some respects, however, and with these amendments we can then handle AC-DPs adequately, as we will show on the basis of linguistic data below.

3.1   Treatment of *say* Reports in Brasoveanu & Farkas (2007)

Brasoveanu & Farkas (2007) analyse reports of assertive speech acts as being anaphorically related to a particular conversation in which the reported state of affairs was mentioned. This seems to correspond well to our observations regarding the felicitous use of AC-DPs.

To account for the fact that certain *say* reports are infelicitous (cf. (18), 2007:28), Brasoveanu & Farkas introduce a "faithfulness to meaning dimensions" requirement that the complement of *say* has to fulfil (2007:28ff).

(18)   a. Mary: *Peter ate some of the cake.*

      b. Sam: *#Mary said that there is some cake left.*
        (or: *#Mary said that Peter didn't eat the whole cake.*)

According to Brasoveanu & Farkas, examples like the one in (18) show that, e.g., we cannot report the implicatures of the source sentence as having been *said*. More generally, *say* reports have to fulfil the following requirement with regard to their source sentence: "the at-issue entailments of the former must follow from the at-issue entailments of the latter, the implicatures of the former must follow from the implicatures of the latter and, finally, the presupposition/at-issue content division of the source speech act must be preserved in the report" (2007:28). The example that Brasoveanu & Farkas use to demonstrate the validity of their "failfulness to meaning dimensions" requirement is (19) (cf. (2007:30)):

(19)   a. Sam: "*Mary stopped smoking.*"

      b. Sue: (#)"*Sam said that Mary used to smoke.*"

c. Sue: (#)"*Sam said that Mary used to smoke and then she stopped.*"

It is our intuition that both (19b) and (19c) are, in fact, acceptable in certain contexts, e.g, if the question under discussion in the current conversation is to name people who used to smoke or who stopped smoking. Similarly, our judgement about the example in (18) is also that the utterances are felicitous in certain contexts, e.g., if Sam realises that the whole cake is gone and now complains that he was misinformed by Mary by uttering (18b).

It seems that the requirement that the distinction between what is asserted and what is presupposed in the original statement must be reflected in the report is too strong. Consider also example (20), a slightly modified version of (11) above:

(20) *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

Luise: "Der Student aus   München / Ludwig hat schon wieder das
Luise: "The student from Munich   / Ludwig has yet   again   the
Fenster offen gelassen."
window open left."

'Luise: "The student from Munich / Ludwig left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   jemand   hätte   schon
"Luise has   yet again   complained someone would-have yet
wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
again   the window open left."

'"Luise complained again that someone has left the window open."'

The indefinite *jemand* ('*someone*') does not carry any presuppositions at all, i.e., the presuppositions associated with the definite description or the proper

name in the original report are *not* preserved.

All in all, it seems that the requirement that the distinction between the at-issue content and the presuppositions (as in (19) and (20)) or implicatures (as in (18)) of the source sentence have to be preserved in reports of assertive speech acts is too strong.

There *are*, however, certain cases in which the presuppositions of the source sentence need to be preserved (cf. (21)).

(21)   *Previous conversation between the speaker and Luise:*

Luise: "Dieser Student aus   München/Ludwig treibt mich noch in
Luise: "This   student from Munich   forces me   soon into
den Wahnsinn! Nicht nur, dass er nie   aufräumt, jetzt hat er auch
the madness!   Not   only that he never cleans up now has he also
noch schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
      yet   again   the window open left."
'Luise: "This student from Munich is driving me crazy. Not only does
he never clean up, now he also left the window open, yet again."'

Speaker to hearer:

"Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   #jemand   hätte   schon
"Luise has   yet again   complained #someone would-have yet
wieder das Fenster offen gelassen."
again   the window open left."
'"Luise complained again that someone has left the window open."'

It seems that when the referent of the definite description or proper name were the topic of the previous conversation, the use of, e.g., an indefinite like *jemand* (*'someone'*) is infelicitous, and an expression that carries some kind of presupposition is required. Possibly this can be accounted for with a requirement of

presupposition preservation in the sense of Brasoveanu & Farkas after all, the details of which still need to be worked out, however.

3.2 Our Analysis of AC-DPs

To sum up, we can say that AC-DPs are used in contexts in which (i) the speaker does not want to lose all presuppositions, i.e., she wants to indicate that a definite description or a proper name has been used in the previous conversation, and in which (ii) the use of a definite description or proper name would be infelicitous because the relevant presuppositions (e.g., those of *der Student aus München* ('*the student from Munich*') or *Ludwig*) are not part of the common ground of the current conversation and cannot be accommodated either. It seems that in such contexts, the speaker has two possibilities: she could introduce new presuppositions which are accommodatable (e.g., by uttering something like *der Student aus München, der Luise so auf die Nerven geht* ('*the student from Munich who annoys Luise so much*') or *der Typ, der neulich bei Luise in die WG gezogen ist* ('*the guy who recently moved in with Luise*')), or she could use an AC-DP.

The first characteristic of contexts in which AC-DPs can be used (cf. (i) above), is reminiscent of Brasoveanu & Farkas' "failfulness to meaning dimensions" requirement in that we assume that the speaker wants to be as faithful as possible to the way in which the relevant information was presented in the original conversation. This means that, as a default which can sometimes be over-ridden, the speaker does not want to lose any presuppositions, and wants to keep as many presuppositions as possible. Put in another way, it seems that the use of AC-DPs is governed by Heim's (1991) 'Maximise Presupposition' requirement (MP) which states that a speaker should presuppose as much as possible in her utterances (cf. 1991:515). It is generally assumed that, in order to fulfil MP, the speaker has to chose between several possible alternatives (cf.,

e.g., Percus (2006), Sauerland (to appear), Schlenker (2006, 2007)). So, what alternatives are there to report an utterance like (22)?

(22) Ludwig hat den Briefkastenschlüssel verloren.
Ludwig has the letterbox key lost.
'Ludwig lost the letterbox key.'

We assume that all of the following DPs are possible alternatives:[6]

(23) a. Ludwig

b. der Student aus München
the student from Munich
'the student from Munich'

c. der und der (Student)
the and the (student)
'someone ('the and the') (some student)'

d. jemand / irgendwer
someone / somebody
'someone / somebody'

e. ein Freund von Luise
a friend of Luise
'a friend of Luise's'

The DPs in (23a) and (23b) carry strong existence and uniqueness presuppositions that are, by assumption, not part of the common ground of the current conversation and cannot easily be accommodated therein. The DPs in (23d) and (23e), on the other hand, do not presuppose anything and, hence, do not fulfil MP. The remaining alternative, (23c), is an AC-DP and we suggest that it carries the following information:

---

[6] On this view, alternatives are not alternatives between different lexical items, but rather between different kinds of DPs. This contrasts with approaches like, e.g., Percus' (2006), where alternatives are only defined for lexical items (cf. 2006:14).

(24)   a. *Semantics:*

        $[\![\text{der und der}]\!] = \lambda P \lambda Q.Q(\varepsilon x P(x))$

    b. *Presupposition:*

        The speaker was the listener of a previous conversational act, in which an expression with existence and uniqueness presuppositions (i.e., a definite description or a proper name) was used.

    c. *Implicature:*

        The restrictor set (i.e., *P* in (a)) is not a singleton set (and the speaker knows *which* member of that set she is talking about).

Note first that we give the semantics for *der und der* in (24a), which we assume has to apply to the denotation of an NP complement first and to the denotation of a VP predicate next. AC-DPs without overt NP complements can be seen as cases where the NP complement is empty, and the semantics of 'der und der' in (24a) is applied to a default property $\lambda x.THING(x)$ in these cases. (24b) ensures that AC-DPs indicate that the speaker is conveying information that she acquired in a previous conversation, and that a uniquely identifying expression, i.e., a definite description or proper name, was used in this conversation. The condition in (24c) states that there has to be more than one object that fits the descriptive content of the NP complement of the AC-DP. So if an NP complement *is* used, there must be more than one object that fits the descriptive content of the complement. This accounts for examples like (15), (16), and (17) above. (24c) is an implicature, not a presupposition, because the speaker would have used a different (more informative) expression if (24c) did not hold: in (15) she would have used something like *ihr Mitarbeiter* (*'her assistant'*) and in (16) the definite description *ihr Bruder / Cousin* (*'her brother / cousin'*) would have been appropriate. Note that this also explains why the use of an AC-DP with an NP complement is infelicitous in (17): (24c) is not fulfilled (because Luise either only has one brother or cousin or the speaker does not know *which*

of her brothers or cousins Luise was talking about). The speaker would hence have used a different more informative expression, i.e., the speaker would rather have said something like *ihr Bruder / Cousin* (*'her brother / cousin'*) or *einer ihrer Brüder / Cousins* (*'one of her brothers / cousins'*). Hence the use of an AC-DP is infelicitous.

All in all, it seems that in certain situations the AC-DP is the preferred alternative (cf. (23)) that satisfies MP. It carries more presuppositions than the alternatives in (23d) and (23e), whereas those in (23a) and (23b) presuppose something that is too strong for the current conversation. But why should the speaker not use a rather detailed definite description that can easily be accommodated by the hearer? Here is one way to explain this: first, the speaker wants to be as faithful to the original utterance as possible. Hence she cannot insert new lexical material as she pleases. And second, as noted above, AC-DPs do not introduce new discourse referents. Now, it may be plausible that a speaker does not always want to introduce new discourse referents, especially if she does not intend to elaborate on them any further or for some reason does not want to disclose to her audience who exactly she is talking about. In such a case then, it would be more appropriate to say something that does not introduce new unnecessary referents, and AC-DPs seem to be well-suited for such occasions. A more detailed way to phrase this intuition is provided by Sauerland (to appear) who argues that MP can be reformulated with the help of Schlenker's (2007) theory of presuppositions: Sauerland proposes a new maxim, 'Maximise Redundancy' (to appear:19), which makes use of Schlenker's maxims 'Be Articulate' and 'Be Brief' (2007:10). The pragmatic principle 'Be Articulate' "requires that *whenever possible* the distinguished status of a pre-condition [i.e., of a presupposition] should be made syntactically apparent, and thus that the meaning of an expression *dd'* should be preferably expressed as *(d and dd')*" (2007:10), where *d* is a presupposition associated with the expression *d'*. This alone would mean that presuppositions should always be stated explicitly *unless*

this is ruled out by other pragmatic principles. One principle that can over-ride 'Be Articulate' is 'Be Brief', according to which a speaker is prohibited unnecessary verboseness. For our purposes, this means that a sentence like (22) above *could*, according to the 'Be Articulate' principle, be reported along the lines of (25) or (26).

(25)   Der Typ, der neulich in der WG   von Luise eingezogen ist,
       The guy who recently in the flat share of   Luise moved in   has
       heißt   Ludwig und Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   Ludwig
       is called Ludwig and Luise has   yet again   complained Ludwig
       hätte   den Briefkastenschlüssel verloren.
       would-have the letterbox key   lost.
       'The guy who recently moved in with Luise is called Ludwig and Luise
       has complained again that Ludwig lost the letterbox key.'

(26)   Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   der Typ, der neulich in ihrer
       Luise has   yet again   complained the guy who recently in her
       WG   eingezogen ist, hätte   den Briefkastenschlüssel
       flat share moved in   has would-have the letterbox key
       verloren.
       lost.
       'Luise has complained again that the guy who recently moved in with
       her has lost the letterbox key.'

But, in contexts in which the speaker does not want to be so specific in his utterance, the 'Be Brief' principle kicks in and requires that the speaker is *less* articulate. Among the alternatives suggested in (23), the use of an AC-DP is the most appropriate, resulting in a report like (27).

(27)   Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt,   **der und der** hätte   den
       Luise has   yet again   complained the and the   would-have the

Briefkastenschlüssel verloren.

letterbox key   lost.

'Luise complained again that someone ('the and the') lost the letterbox key.' [7]

As we have seen, the semantic analysis of AC-DPs in (24), together with a maxim of 'Maximise Presupposition' and the pragmatic principles of 'Be Articulate' and 'Be Brief', can account for the characteristics regarding the interpretation of AC-DPs and for their distributional restrictions.

4   Conclusion

In this paper, we have given a semantic analysis of DPs with article-conjunction heads in German that, together with the pragmatic principles of 'Maximise Presuppositions', 'Be Articulate', and 'Be Brief', can account for the use of AC-DPs. The main characteristics of AC-DPs are that they are used in reports of assertive speech acts, i.e., they are related to a previous conversation, and that they indicate that a definite description or proper name was used in the previous conversation to refer to the intended referent of the AC-DP (if it is used referentially). Additionally, if used with an NP complement, AC-DPs implicate that there is more than one object that fits the descriptive content of the NP.

---

[7] The NP complement is empty, i.e., it does not contain something like *Student ('student')*, unless the speaker can reasonably assume that there are several students that stand in a particular relation to Luise. And even if she knows that there are several students *sharing a flat with Luise*, the use of *der und der Student ('the and the student')* might be misleading or uninterpretable for the hearer, because *he* may not know which set of students the speaker has in mind.

References

Brasoveanu, Adrian & Farkas, Donka (2007): *Say* Reports, Assertion Events and Meaning Dimensions. In: Alboiu, G., et al. (eds.). *Pitar Mos: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu.* Bukarest: Editure Universitatii din Bucuresti. 23–43.

Farkas, Donka (2002): Specificity Distinctions. *Journal of Semantics* **19**: 1–31.

Heim, Irene (1991): Artikel und Definitheit. In: A. von Stechow & D. Wunderlich (eds.). *Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung.* Berlin: DeGruyter. 487–535.

Jayez, Jacques & Tovena, Lucia (2006): Epistemic determiners. *Journal of Semantics* **23**: 217–250.

Ionin, Tania (2006): *This* is Definitely Specific: Specificity and Definiteness in Article Systems. *Natural Language Semantics* **14 (2)**.

Percus, Orin (2006): Anti-presuppositions. In: A. Ueyama (ed.). *Theoretical and Empirical Studies of Reference and Anaphora: Toward the establishment of generative grammar as an empirical science.* Report of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), Project No. 15320052, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 52–73.

Sauerland, Uli (to appear): Implicated Presuppositions. In: A. Steube (ed.). *Sentence and Context.* Berlin: DeGruyter. (We used the draft available online at: http://www.zas.gwz-berlin.de/mitarb/homepage/sauerland/downloads.html)

Schlenker, Philippe (2006): 'Maximize Presupposition' and Gricean Reasoning (Squib). Draft available online at: http://www.linguistics.ucle.edu/people/schlenker/MaxPre

Schlenker, Philippe (2007): Be Articulate! A Pragmatic Theory of Presupposition Projection. Unpublished manuscipt, ECLA and Institute Jean-Nicod.

Maria Cieschinger
Universität Osnabrück
Institut für Kognitionswissenschaft
Albrechtstr. 28
49076 Osnabrück
Germany
maria.cieschinger@uni-osnabrueck.de
http://www.cogsci.uni-osnabrueck.de/∼mcieschi/

Dr. Cornelia Ebert
Universität Osnabrück
Institut für Kognitionswissenschaft
Albrechtstr. 28
49076 Osnabrück
Germany
cornelia.ebert@uni-osnabrueck.de
http://www.cogsci.uni-osnabrueck.de/∼neliebert/