

# *Mario hat gesagt, der und der hätte das und das gemacht: On a Weird Determiner in German*

Maria Cieschinger  
Institute of Cognitive Science  
University of Osnabrück

`mcieschi@uni-osnabrueck.de`

Cornelia Ebert  
Department of Germanic and General Linguistics  
University of Stuttgart

`Cornelia.Ebert@ling.uni-stuttgart.de`

## Abstract

This paper investigates a special kind of DP in German that has not been discussed in the linguistic literature so far, namely DPs with doubled definite determiners (we call them 'DD-DPs' in the following for *doubled definite DPs*). We argue that they are non-referential expressions that not only constrain the current discourse model in which they can be used felicitously, but also a related speech context. In particular, we suggest that DD-DPs presuppose the existence of a speech act other than the current one, and that a definite or name must be used in the presupposed conversation.

## 1 Introduction

In German, there is a special kind of determiner that, as far as we know, has gone unnoticed in the linguistic literature so far. This determiner is built up by conjoining two instances of the definite article *der/die/das* ('*the*') with the conjunction *und* ('*and*'). It can be used with or without overt 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.)

In the following we will call these DPs with doubled definite determiner 'DD-DPs'. The examples below further illustrate the use of DD-DPs.

- (2) Das Erste berichtet, er sei nachts um 24 Uhr von **dem und dem** angerufen  
 the ARD reports he be at night at 24 hrs by the and the called  
 worden und habe **das und das** gemacht.  
 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’).<sup>1</sup>
- (3) Skrupellos eingesetzt [liegt der wissenschaftliche Wert von Umfragen]  
 unscrupulously employed lies the scientific value of surveys  
 nicht viel höher ... als die Behauptung, dass neun von zehn Stars **die**  
 not much higher ... than the claim that nine of ten stars the  
**und die Seife** vorzögen.’  
 and the soap prefer  
 ‘If used unscrupulously, the scientific value of surveys is not much higher than  
 that of the claim that nine out of ten stars would prefer a certain soap (‘the and  
 the soap’).<sup>2</sup>

The example in (2) contains a DD-DP without NP complement, whereas the DD-DP in (3) is used with an overt NP complement (*Seife* (‘soap’)). Strikingly, the DD-DP is embedded under a verb of saying in (2) and under a noun that relates to a speech context in (3) (*Behauptung* (‘claim’)). We take it that the use of a DD-DP is only licensed if it is embedded under a verb of saying or if a related speech context can plausibly be inferred in some way (for instance, via the use of a noun like *Behauptung* (‘claim’), which relates to a speech context). In particular, we suggest that DD-DPs presuppose the existence of a speech context that is not the current one, and in which a definite or proper name was used.

In this paper, we will concentrate on DD-DPs used in truly embedded contexts, i.e., in indirect speech only. It should be noted, however, that DD-DPs can also felicitously be used in direct quotes, as the following two examples illustrate:

- (4) 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.’<sup>3</sup>
- (5) Sie spielen mit der Playstation und unterhalten sich: **“Der und der**  
 they play with the Playstation and talk themselves the and the  
 hat Ärger gehabt in Buxtehude. **Der und der** ist von der Schule geflogen.”  
 has trouble had in Buxtehude the and the is from the school expelled  
 ‘They play with their Playstation and talk: “Someone (‘the and the’) got into

<sup>1</sup>Die Zeit online 2005: Der Kanzler und die lieben Zwerge.

<sup>2</sup>Die Zeit 33/1996, Modernes Leben: Umberto Eco: Die Umfrage.

<sup>3</sup>Die Zeit 42/2000, Wissen, Bildung: Retter in letzter Minute.

trouble in Buxtehude. Someone ('the and the') was expelled from school."<sup>4</sup>

Since DD-DPs are frequently used in indirect speech reports as well, we will here concentrate on an analysis of DD-DPs in such indirect speech reports and leave the analysis of DD-DPs in direct quotes for future work.

Note also that, additionally to conjunctions of the definite article, adverb-conjunctions can be used in German as well (e.g., *dann und dann* ('then and then'), *da und da* ('there and there'), *so und so* ('so and so')). In this paper, however, we will be concerned with DD-DPs only<sup>5</sup>.

## 2 Semantic and Pragmatic Characteristics of DD-DPs

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

### 2.1 Non-Referential Readings of DD-DPs

Looking back at the examples in (2) and (3) above, it might be tempting to conclude that DD-DPs not only presuppose a related speech context in which a definite or proper name was used, but also that they are referential expressions themselves and have to refer to particular individuals<sup>6</sup>. In contrast to definite descriptions and proper names, however, DD-DPs can also be used non-referentially, as the following example illustrates.

- (6) Wenn ich behaupte, **der und der** schreibe wie Mankell, glaubt jeder  
 when I claim the and the write like Mankell believes everyone  
 sofort zu verstehen, was ich meine.  
 immediately to understand what I mean  
 'If I claim that someone ('the and the') writes like Mankell, then everyone immediately believes to know what I mean.'<sup>7</sup>

Here, the DD-DP is in the scope of a universal quantifier over possible worlds that is triggered by the conditional. It seems that the value of the DD-DP varies with the

<sup>4</sup>Die Zeit 46/2000, Leben: Mama, da ist Ei auf dem Teppich ...

<sup>5</sup>Note that this also means that we concentrate on *das* ('the')-conjunctions used as *determiners* only. As the use of *das und das* ('the and the') in example (2) illustrates, it seems that *das und das* ('the and the') can also be used to refer to events, but we will refrain from an analysis of these cases in this paper.

<sup>6</sup>We often translate DD-DPs without an NP complement with indefinites like *someone* or those with NP complements with *some* or *a certain* in English. Although this might not be the best translation, it is the best we could come up with. Non-German native speakers should bear in mind that DD-DPs involve only the definite article and do not realize any kind of overt indefiniteness marking.

<sup>7</sup>Die Zeit online 2005: Der Mord und die Grenzen des Verstehens.

values of another quantifier and can thus not be referentially fixed. In other words, the speaker is not referring to a particular author in (6).

Furthermore, DD-DPs show the same scope ambiguities as ordinary indefinites (cf. (7) and (8)):

- (7) Nur zwei Drittel der Leute wollten sich festlegen / haben gesagt, dass  
 only two thirds the people wanted themselves commit have said that  
**ein Teilnehmer** gewinnen wird.  
 some participant win will  
 ‘Only two thirds of the people wanted to commit themselves to saying / have  
 said that some participant will win.’
- (8) Nur zwei Drittel der Leute wollten sich festlegen / haben gesagt, dass  
 only two thirds the people wanted themselves commit have said that  
**der und der** gewinnen wird.  
 the and the win will  
 ‘Only two thirds of the people wanted to commit themselves to saying / have  
 said that someone (‘the and the’) will win.’

Just like the indefinite in (7), the DD-DP in (8) can take either wide or narrow scope over the numeral (*der und der* >  $2/3$  or  $2/3$  > *der und der*, respectively). We could paraphrase the wide-scope reading of the DD-DP along the lines of ‘There is someone, and two thirds of the people said that this person will win’. In other words, the person that is said to win is the same for each member of the set of ‘two thirds of the people’. The narrow scope reading, on the other hand, allows the potential future winner to be different for each one of the two thirds of the people. This could then be paraphrased as ‘For each member  $x$  of the set ‘two thirds of the people’ there is someone ( $y$ ), such that  $x$  said that  $y$  will win.’

Summing up, the value of a DD-DP is not referentially fixed when the DD-DP is in the scope of another quantifier, and DD-DPs show the same scope ambiguities as ordinary indefinites. We therefore analyse DD-DPs as non-referential expressions, even though, at first glance, they seem to be used to refer to particular individuals.

## 2.2 Embedding Under Verba Dicendi and the Existence of a Related Speech Context

As we noted above, DD-DPs very frequently occur embedded under so-called *verba dicendi*, i.e., verbs of saying like *say*, *report*, *state*, etc. If such a verb is missing or a verb that relates to a speech context cannot plausibly be inferred from the context, the use of a DD-DP is unacceptable (cf. the contrast between (9) and (10)).

- (9) #**Die und die** ist von der Schule geflogen.  
 the and the is from the school expelled  
 #‘Someone (‘the and the’) has been expelled from school.’

- (10) Luise hat gesagt, dass **die und die** von der Schule geflogen ist.  
 Luise has said that the and the from the school expelled was  
 ‘Luise said that someone (‘the and the’) has been expelled from school.’

The sentence in (9), uttered out of the blue, does not contain a *verbum dicendi*, nor can a verb that points to a speech context plausibly be inferred, and the DD-DP can thus not be used felicitously. The DD-DP in (10), on the other hand, is embedded under a *verbum dicendi* (*sagen* (‘say’)) and its use is felicitous. In contrast, the verbs in example (11) below (*glauben* (‘believe’) and *bedauern* (‘regret’)) are not verbs of saying, and the standard readings of these sentences are unacceptable.

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

We take it that DD-DPs are generally used to indicate that the speaker is conveying something that was uttered in a speech context that is not the current one. *Verba dicendi* are normally used to make this relation to another speech context explicit. The standard readings of sentences like those in (11) are hence unacceptable at first sight because the relevant verb is missing. It is, however, sometimes possible to infer a related speech context in cases where no *verbum dicendi* is present. The sentences in (11) could, for instance, in some situations be interpreted as follows: The hearer can infer from the speaker’s utterance (and, in particular, from her using a DD-DP) that Luise has indeed voiced her beliefs or regrets explicitly in a conversation the speaker had with her, i.e., that the speaker is conveying something that has been said in a speech context other than the current one.

### 2.3 Relatedness to a Definite or Name

Additionally to indicating that the speaker is reporting something that was uttered in a speech context other than the current one, the use of a DD-DP also indicates that a definite description or a proper name was used in that conversation (cf. the contrast between (12) and (13)).

- (12) *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, **der und der** hätte schon  
Luise has herself 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’) left the window open,  
yet again.’

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

Luise: “**Irgendjemand / Ein Freund von mir aus München** hat schon  
Luise: someone a friend of mine from Munich has yet  
wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.”  
again the window open left

‘Luise: “Someone / A friend of mine from Munich left the window open, yet  
again.”’

*Speaker to hearer:*

#“Luise hat sich mal wieder beklagt, **der und der** hätte schon  
Luise has herself 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’) left the window open,  
yet again.’

In both cases, the speaker is conveying information she acquired in a previous conversation with Luise. In (12), Luise used a definite (*der Student aus München* (‘the student from Munich’)) or a proper name (*Ludwig*) and the speaker was able to uniquely identify the corresponding referent in that conversation. The use of a DD-DP is felicitous in the report in (12). In contrast, Luise used an indefinite (*irgendjemand* (‘someone’) or *ein Freund von mir aus München* (‘a friend of mine from Munich’)), and the use of a DD-DP in the report in (13) is not acceptable<sup>8</sup>.

## 2.4 The NP Complement of DD-DPs

We saw above that DD-DPs can be used with or without an overt NP complement. It seems that there is an interpretative peculiarity for the use of a DD-DP with an

<sup>8</sup>Note that also the use of the specific indefinite (*ein Freund von mir aus München* (‘a friend of mine from Munich’)) does not render (13) felicitous, although it is usually assumed that the speaker (in this case Luise) can uniquely identify the individual she is referring to when she uses a specific indefinite. It seems to be necessary for the felicitous use of DD-DPs that the speaker and the hearer are able to uniquely identify the referent under discussion so that the use of a definite or proper name is licit in the conversation that is reported.

NP complement, however: it indicates that the restrictor set of the DD-DP is not a singleton. Consider the examples in (14) and (15) for illustration.

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

Luise: “**Der neuste Mitarbeiter von Peter** hat schon wieder das Fenster  
Luise: the newest assistant of Peter has yet again the window  
offen gelassen.”  
open left

’Luise: “Peter’s latest assistant left the window open, yet again.”’

*Speaker to hearer:*

“Luise hat sich beklagt, **der und der (Mitarbeiter von Peter)**  
Luise has herself complained the and the assistant of Peter  
hätte schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.”  
would-have yet again the window open left

’Luise complained that one of Peter’s assistants (‘the and the (assistant of Peter)’)

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

Luise: “**Der Mitarbeiter von Peter** hat schon wieder das Fenster offen  
Luise: the assistant of Peter has yet again the window open  
gelassen.”  
left

’Luise: “Peter’s assistant left the window open, yet again.”’

*Speaker to hearer:*

“Luise hat sich beklagt, **der und der (#Mitarbeiter von Peter)**  
Luise has herself complained the and the assistant of Peter  
hätte schon wieder das Fenster offen gelassen.”  
would-have yet again the window open left

’Luise complained that one of Peter’s assistants (‘the and the (#assistant of Peter)’)

Luise uses a definite description in both (14) and (15), and in both cases the use of a DD-DP without overt NP complement is felicitous in the speaker’s report of the previous conversation between her and Luise. In contrast, using a DD-DP with an overt NP complement (here, *Mitarbeiter von Peter* (‘assistant of Peter’)) is only acceptable in (14), but not in (15). In (14), it is clear from Luise’s utterance that Peter has more than one assistant and that she is talking about one of them<sup>9</sup>. This means that the

<sup>9</sup>Note that the English translation *one of Peter’s assistants* corresponds to this observation.

restrictor set of the DD-DP is not a singleton, i.e., that there are several referents the DD-DP could in principle be related to, and the use of the DD-DP *der und der Mitarbeiter von Peter* ('the and the assistant of Peter') is therefore felicitous. The use of the definite *der Mitarbeiter von Peter* ('the assistant of Peter') in (15), on the other hand, indicates that Peter has only one assistant. The restrictor NP thus denotes a singleton set, and, therefore, the use of a DD-DP with an overt NP complement is infelicitous.

## 2.5 Summary of the Semantic and Pragmatic Characteristics of DD-DPs

Taking all of the above considerations into account, here is a short summary of the characteristics regarding the interpretation of DD-DPs and their distributional restrictions:

DD-DPs ...

- (i) ... are non-referential expressions.
- (ii) ... presuppose the existence of a conversation other than the current one and hence are usually embedded under *verba dicendi*.
- (iii) ... also presuppose that a definite description or a proper name is used in the relevant conversation.
- (iv) ... indicate that the NP complement denotes a non-singleton set.

## 3 A Formal Analysis of DD-DPs

In the previous section we presented several semantic and pragmatic characteristics of DD-DPs, and a proper analysis of DD-DPs should be able to account for all of these observations. In this section we will argue that DD-DPs presuppose the existence of a speech context other than the current one, in which a definite description or proper name is used. It will also follow from our analysis that the restrictor set of the DD-DP is a non-singleton set if the DD-DP is used with an overt NP complement. In cases where a DD-DP is used without an NP complement, we suggest that some kind of default is at work and that the DD-DP is applied to a semantically vacuous NP denotation such as  $\lambda x.x = x$ . We will also show that our analysis can account for all of the discussed characteristics of DD-DPs.

### 3.1 Analysis of DD-DPs

Taking into account all of the observations presented in the previous section, it appears that DD-DPs are used in contexts in which (i) the speaker wants to be as faithful as



possible to a speech context other than the current one and thus does not want to lose all presuppositions (i.e., she wants to indicate that a definite or proper name was used in the reported conversation, cf., e.g., (Brasoveanu & Farkas, 2007) on *say*-reports), and in which (ii) the use of a (simple) definite description or proper name would be infelicitous because the relevant existence and uniqueness presuppositions are not part of the common ground of the current conversation and cannot be accommodated either. Suppose, for instance, the speaker and Luise have been talking about Luise’s flatmate, who recently moved in with her, and that the speaker now wants to tell someone else, who has never heard of Luise’s flatmate, about her conversation with Luise. It seems that in such contexts, the speaker has two possibilities: she could introduce new presuppositions which are accommodatable by the hearer (e.g., by using a complex definite 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 eingezogen ist* (‘the guy who recently moved in with Luise’)). Or, if the first option is not desired, she could use a DD-DP.

We suggest that a DD-DP carries the following information:

- (16) a. *At-issue semantics*:  
 $\llbracket \text{der und der } N \rrbracket^c = \lambda Q[\exists x[\llbracket N \rrbracket^c(x) \wedge Q(x)]]$   
 b. *Presupposition*<sup>10</sup>:  
 There is a related speech context  $c'$  such that  $c \neq c'$  and  $x$  can be identified uniquely in  $c'$  with respect to a salient property  $P \subset \llbracket N \rrbracket^c, P \neq \emptyset$ .

Note first that the at-issue semantics we assign to *der und der*-DPs<sup>11</sup> in (16a) is the usual semantics of the indefinite. DD-DPs that are used without an overt NP complement can be seen as cases where the restrictor set  $\llbracket N \rrbracket$  denotes a default property with little semantic content, i.e., something like  $\lambda x.x = x$ . Note also that, according to our analysis, the restrictor set  $\llbracket N \rrbracket$  is a proper superset of  $P$ , i.e., it is *not* a singleton<sup>12</sup>. The presuppositional content of DD-DPs we propose in (16b) ensures that the speaker is conveying information from a conversation other than the current one, and that a uniquely identifying expression, i.e., a definite description or a proper name, is used in that conversation.

### 3.2 Applying the Analysis

In this section, we will show that the analysis proposed in (16) makes the correct predictions, and we will look at each of the four characteristics we presented in Section 2.

<sup>10</sup>It should be noted that the variable  $x$  can be dynamically bound by the existential quantifier in the at-issue semantics (cf., e.g., (Beaver, 1992) for a formal implementation).

<sup>11</sup>We use the variant *der und der* here for simplicity only. It should be noted that the at-issue semantics (and the presuppositional content) we propose are, of course, the same for all DD-DPs, irrespective of different case or gender.

<sup>12</sup>We thank Arnim von Stechow for discussion on this issue. For a previous version cf. (Cieschinger & Ebert, 2009).

### 3.2.1 Non-Referentiality of DD-DPs

The fact that DD-DPs behave like ordinary indefinites in many respects (e.g., the interpretation under other quantifiers and the scope ambiguities discussed in Section 2.1), and that they should thus be regarded as non-referential expressions, directly follows from our definition of the at-issue semantics in (16a): we assign DD-DPs the standard semantics of the indefinite, thereby accounting for examples like (6) and (8).

### 3.2.2 Verba Dicendi and the Presupposed Speech Context

From our definition of the presuppositional content in (16b) it follows directly that DD-DPs are related to a speech context that is not the current one: the presupposed speech context  $c'$  is required not to be identical to the current context  $c$ .

It also follows from (16b) that DD-DPs are usually embedded under verba dicendi. The existence of a speech context other than the current one ( $c'$ ) is normally made explicit by using verba dicendi. The presupposition we assign to DD-DPs can then be bound directly to the speech context indicated by such a verb. In other cases, the existence of a verb that relates to a speech context can be inferred from the current context and the relevant conversation can be accommodated (cf. (11) above and (17)).

- (17) Politiker, die **meinen**, dass man [...] für junge Frauen von 28 [...] **das**  
 politicians who mean that one for young women of 28 the  
**und das** machen muss, sehen das viel zu schlicht.  
 and the make must see this much too simple  
 ‘Politicians who think that this and that (‘the and the’) should be done for  
 28-year-old women, simplify matters too much.’<sup>13</sup>

Here, the DD-DP is embedded under the verb *meinen* (‘think’), which is neither a verbum dicendi nor does it directly relate to a speech context. It is, however, very likely that the speaker knows the opinions of the respective politicians simply because they have stated them explicitly in public discussions. Hence, the existence of a relevant speech context can easily be accommodated, thus making the use of a DD-DP felicitous. As usual, however, there seem to be gradual differences in how easily a given presupposition can be accommodated. Consider the contrast in (18) for illustration.

- (18) Luise hat **gehört** / ??**vergessen**, dass **die und die Prüfung** ausfällt.  
 Luise has heard forgot that the and the exam be cancelled  
 ‘Luise heard / ??forgot that a certain exam was cancelled.’

The verb *hören* (‘hear’) easily allows for the accommodation of a speech context other than the current one (namely the conversation in which Luise *heard* something), whereas accommodation appears to be more difficult if a verb like *vergessen* (‘forget’) is used, but not necessarily impossible. As we saw above when discussing the exam-

<sup>13</sup>Die Zeit 1/2003, Politik: Keine Verhandlungen mit einer Schill-Partei.

ples in (11) and (17), in many cases it is possible to infer that the speaker knows that someone else believes, thinks, heard, or forgot something *just because* it was stated explicitly in a particular conversation of which the speaker was a participant. While the fact that Luise heard about a certain event necessarily implies that there has been a speech context concerning this event, the fact that she forgot a certain event does not imply that there was a speech context broaching the issue of this event. Hence the accommodation of a relevant conversation is much harder for *vergessen* ('forget') than for *hören* ('hear'). If, however, the DD-DP is used in a matrix clause, i.e., if it is unembedded, and the existence of a verb related to a speech context cannot plausibly be inferred from the current context, then the use of a DD-DP is infelicitous (cf. (9), repeated here as (19)).

- (19) #**Die und die** ist von der Schule geflogen.  
       the and the is from the school expelled  
       #'Someone ('the and the') has been expelled from school.'

The presupposition that there is a speech context other than the current one can neither be bound nor accommodated in (19), leading to the unacceptability of the DD-DP.

### 3.2.3 Relatedness to a Definite or Name

Our definition in (16) also accounts for the fact that a definite description or proper name was used in the conversation that the speaker is presupposing: the object  $x$  whose existence is asserted according to (16a) is required to have been uniquely identifiable with respect to some salient property  $P$  in the presupposed speech context (cf. (16b)). If this is indeed the case, then, following general conversational maxims, a definite description or proper name will have been used in that speech context.

### 3.2.4 The NP Complement of DD-DPs

As discussed in Section 2.4, if a DD-DP is used with an NP complement, it indicates that the restrictor set of the DD-DP is a non-singleton set. The presuppositional content we propose in (16b) directly accounts for this observation. The restrictor set  $\llbracket N \rrbracket$  is a proper superset of  $P$ , i.e., there exists at least one element of  $\llbracket N \rrbracket$  that is not contained in  $P$ . And since the set  $P$  cannot be empty (it is the salient property with respect to which the object  $x$  can be uniquely identified), the restrictor set of the DD-DP is not a singleton. In cases where a DD-DP is used without an overt NP complement, we suggest that, by default, the DD-DP is applied to the semantically vacuous predicate  $\lambda x.x = x$ . The constraint that this restrictor set be non-empty is trivially fulfilled.

## 3.3 Summary

In this section we argued for a presuppositional analysis of DD-DPs (cf. (16)), and we have shown that all of the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of DD-DPs can be

accounted for under this analysis. Here is a short summary of the properties of DD-DPs and of the way in which they can be explained:

DD-DPs ...

- (i) ... are non-referential expressions.  
 $\leftrightarrow$  by definition of the at-issue semantics of DD-DPs in (16a)
- (ii) ... presuppose the existence of a conversation other than the current one and hence are usually embedded under *verba dicendi*.  
 $\leftrightarrow$  by definition of the presuppositional content of DD-DPs in (16b)
- (iii) ... also presuppose that a definite description or a proper name is used in the relevant conversation.  
 $\leftrightarrow$  by definition of the presuppositional content of DD-DPs in (16b)
- (iv) ... indicate that the NP complement denotes a non-singleton set.  
 $\leftrightarrow$  by definition of the presuppositional content of DD-DPs in (16b)

## 4 Discussion and Outlook

In the previous section, we presented a formal analysis of DD-DPs that can account for the characteristics regarding the interpretation of DD-DPs and their distributional restrictions. In this section, we discuss our results critically and point to possible directions for further research.

### 4.1 A Related Approach: (Sudo, 2008) on Japanese *wh-doublings*

In Japanese, there appear to be expressions that share some of the properties of DD-DPs. As Sudo (2008) has argued, so-called *wh-doublings* can be used in closed quotations only<sup>14</sup>. Consider example (20) for illustration (cf. Sudo 2008, ex. 15):

- (20) John-wa “Bill-ga **dare-dare**-o aishiteiru” to itta.  
 John-TOP “Bill-NOM who-who-ACC love” C said  
 ‘John said “Bill loves X”.’

It seems that *wh-doublings* can only appear in place of referring expressions (i.e., definite descriptions or proper names), and Sudo proposes that ‘they are indefinites [quantifying] over referring expressions’ (Sudo, 2008, p. 629). We will not go into the details of this analysis here, for our purposes it suffices to know that the sentence in (20) is interpreted as ‘For some expression *X* such that *X* denotes a person, John said “Bill loves *X*”’

<sup>14</sup>Here is a list of the possible *wh-doublings* from (Sudo, 2008, p. 614): *dare-dare* (‘who-who’), *nani-nani* (‘what-what’), *itsu-itsu* (‘when-when’), *doko-doko* (‘where-where’), *dore-dore* (‘which-which’), *ikura-ikura* (‘how.much-how.much’), *ikutsu-ikutsu* (‘how.many-how.many’).

(Sudo, 2008, p. 622). Japanese wh-doublets are analysed by Sudo (2008) as indefinites that can only substitute referential expressions and that can only be used in closed quotations. The first property is reminiscent of the characteristic features of DD-DPs, and, indeed, also DD-DPs can be used in closed quotations, as we pointed out in Section 1: examples (4) and (5) (the first of which we repeat here as (21)) illustrated this use of DD-DPs.

- (21) 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.’<sup>15</sup>

Despite these apparent similarities, there are empirical differences between Japanese wh-doublets and German DD-DPs, however. Firstly, wh-doublets can be used embedded among foreign words (cf. (22), Sudo 2008, ex. 12), whereas DD-DPs cannot (cf. (23)):

- (22) Galileo-wa [**nani-nani** si muove to] itta.  
 Galileo-TOP “what-what si muove” C said  
 ‘Galileo said “X si muove”.’
- (23) Galileo sagte: “#**Das und das** si muove.”  
 Galileo said the and the si muove  
 ‘Galileo said “#Something (‘the and the’) si muove”.’

Secondly, and crucially, DD-DPs are used not only in closed quotations, but are also frequently used in indirect speech reports, for which we offer an account in this paper. Possibly Sudo’s (2008) analysis of Japanese wh-doublets is applicable to the German cases of DD-DPs in direct quotes, but we leave the task of spelling out the details of an analysis of DD-DPs in direct quotes for future work.

## 4.2 Our Presuppositional Analysis

A potential problem for our analysis is that, from the perspective of the hearer, the presupposition of DD-DPs we propose in (16b) can never be falsified, since there always is a speaker-hearer asymmetry<sup>16</sup>. This problem may be resolvable, however, if we follow (Schlenker, 2007): Schlenker, discussing expressives, argues that certain expressions carry a particular kind of presupposition, namely ‘self-fulfilling presuppositions’ which are always satisfied, irrespective of any speaker-hearer asymmetries. A self-fulfilling presupposition is ‘one which is *indexical* (it is evaluated with respect to a context),

<sup>15</sup>Die Zeit 42/2000, Wissen, Bildung: Retter in letzter Minute.

<sup>16</sup>This problem also arises for certain presuppositional approaches to specific indefinites (e.g., Cresti 1995; Yeom 1998; Krifka 2001; Schlenker 2006; Jäger 2007).

*attitudinal* (it predicates something of the mental state of the agent in that context), and sometimes *shiftable* (the context of evaluation need not be the context of the actual utterance)' (Schlenker, 2007, p. 237). The presupposition of DD-DPs could accordingly be regarded as being both indexical and shiftable. The remaining question, however, is whether it is also attitudinal in Schlenker's (2007) sense. If that were the case, we could regard the presupposition of DD-DPs as systematically informative, i.e., as a self-fulfilling presupposition (cf. Schlenker, 2007, p. 240), and the problem that the presupposition we assign to DD-DPs can never be falsified by the hearer could be resolved.

Another puzzle that arises from our analysis is that unembedded DD-DPs are not acceptable, even in cases where the preceding discourse would satisfy the DD-DP's presupposition. Consider the example in (24) for illustration.

- (24) Ich habe gestern mit Luise geredet und sie hat mir von ihrem  
 I have yesterday with Luise spoken and she has me of her  
 Arbeitsalltag erzählt. #**Der und der** lässt immer die Fenster offen.  
 work routine told the and the leaves always the windows open  
 'I spoke to Luise yesterday and she told me about her work routine. #Someone  
 ('the and the') always leaves the windows open.'

At the point where the DD-DP in (24) is evaluated, it is clear from the speaker's utterance that there indeed exists a relevant speech context other than the current one, namely a previous conversation between the speaker and Luise. It seems that the presupposition we propose in (16b) can be bound to that context, nonetheless the use of the DD-DP is infelicitous. And, adding to the confusion even more, DD-DPs appear to become acceptable if they appear as items in a list as in the following example:

- (25) Ich habe gestern mit Luise geredet und sie hat mir von ihrem  
 I have yesterday with Luise spoken and she has me of her  
 Arbeitsalltag erzählt. **Der und der** lässt immer die Fenster offen, **die**  
 work routine told the and the leaves always the windows open the  
**und die** trödelt immer und **der und der** kommt immer zu spät.  
 and the dallies always and the and the comes always too late  
 'I spoke to Luise yesterday and she told me about her work routine. Someone  
 ('the and the') always leaves the windows open, someone else ('the and the')  
 always dallies, and someone else ('the and the') is always late.'

The analysis we propose in (16) admittedly cannot account for this particular use of DD-DPs in any straight-forward fashion, but further work may provide new insights.

### 4.3 Evidentiality

Returning to the example in (24), it seems that expressions like *sollen* ('shall') or *angeblich* ('allegedly') make the use of DD-DPs in matrix clauses, i.e., in unembedded

contexts, acceptable (cf. (26)).

- (26) Ich habe gestern mit Luise geredet und sie hat mir von ihrem  
 I have yesterday with Luise spoken and she has me of her  
 Arbeitsalltag erzählt. **Der und der** lässt **angeblich** immer die Fenster  
 work routine told the and the leaves allegedly always the windows  
 offen. / **Der und der soll** immer die Fenster offen lassen.  
 open the and the shall always the windows open leave  
 'I spoke to Luise yesterday and she told me about her work routine. Someone  
 ('the and the') apparently always leaves the windows open. / Someone ('the  
 and the') is said to always leave the windows open.'

In contrast to (24), the insertion of expressions that can be regarded as evidential expressions (like, e.g., *sollen* ('shall') or *angeblich* ('allegedly'), cf., e.g., Schenner 2008) leads to the acceptability of DD-DPs in (26). It thus seems that the felicitous use of DD-DPs is somehow connected to evidentiality. This would correspond nicely to our observation that the information the speaker is conveying must have been presented in a certain way (i.e., with the help of a definite description or a proper name) and that the information is based on a certain source (i.e., the speaker in a presupposed speech context). One possible way to account for these observations would be to argue that evidential expressions, as well as subjunctive mood (which is usually used in indirect speech reports), indicate that the current context is not identical to the presupposed speech context (i.e., that  $c \neq c'$ ), which would fulfill the requirement for the felicitous use of DD-DPs stated in our definition in (16b)<sup>17</sup>. But, as of yet, we have not pursued this line of thought any further.

## Acknowledgements

Previous versions of this work were presented at *9. Norddeutsches Linguistisches Kolloquium* in Spring 2008 and at *Semantics and Philosophy in Europe 2* in Spring 2009. We are grateful to the audiences on those occasions and also to the audience at *Sinn und Bedeutung 14*, in particular Daniel Büring and Arnim von Stechow, for their very helpful comments.

---

<sup>17</sup>We thank Daniel Büring for pointing out this possible explanation.

## References

- Beaver, David (1992) “The Kinematics of Presupposition”, in Dekker, P. and Stokhof, M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Amsterdam Colloquium*, ILLC Publications, 17–36.
- Brasoveanu, Adrian and 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*, Editure Universitatii din Bucuresti, 23–43.
- Cieschinger, Maria and Ebert, Cornelia (2009) “Doubling Definite Determiners in German”, manuscript available online at: <http://www.semanticsarchive.net/Archive/2FINGQ10>.
- Cresti, Diana (1995) “Indefinite Topics”, Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Ionin, Tania (2006) “This is Definitely Specific: Specificity and Definiteness in Article Systems”, *Natural Language Semantics* **14**, 175–234.
- Jäger, Gerhard (2007) “Partial Variables and Sppecificity”, in Sauerland, U. and Staveva, P. (eds.), *Presupposition and Implicature in Compositional Semantics*, Palgrave McMillan, 121–162.
- Krifka, Manfred (2001) “Non-novel Indefinites in Adverbial Quantification”, in Condoravdi, C. and de Lavalette, R. (eds.), *Logical Perspectives on Language and Information*, CSLI Publications, 1–40.
- Schenner, Matthias (2008) “Semantic Complexity of Evidentials: Some Typological Parameters”, in Kokkonidis, M. (ed.), *Proceedings of LingO 2007*, UOP, 204–211.
- Schlenker, Philippe (2006) “Scopal Independence: A Note on Branching and Island-Escaping Readings of Indefinites and Disjunctions”, *Journal of Semantics* **23**, 281–314.
- Schlenker, Philippe (2007) “Expressive presuppositions”, *Theoretical Linguistics* **33**, 237–245.
- Sudo, Yasutada (2008) “Quantification into Quotation: Evidence from Japanese wh-doublers”, in Grønn, A. (ed.), *Proceedings of SuB12, ILOS 2008*, 613–627.
- Yeom, Jae-il (1998) “A Presuppositional Analysis of Specific Indefinites”, Garland Publishing.