

## Indefinite Proper Names and Quantification over Manifestations

(Klaus von Heusinger & Johannes Wespel, University of Stuttgart)

Proper names are semantically definite and primarily used without articles or with the definite article depending on the particular language, as in (1) and (2), respectively. However, there are secondary uses of proper names with the indefinite article. (3) shows one reading in which we generically quantify over individuals with the name George Bush. However, it also has a second meaning according to which we assert that George Bush *in all his relevant manifestations, aspects or roles* does not lie. We account for this reading by assuming that the indefinite article introduces a variable over “manifestations”, “roles” or “aspects” of the single most salient bearer of the name (here: President George Bush). The (hidden) generic operator can then bind this variable yielding the correct reconstruction of the intuitive meaning, which is easily available in Spanish and German, but only marginally acceptable in English – see however (4) from a google-search.

- |     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
| (1) | a <i>George Bush</i> does not lie.<br>c <i>George Bush</i> no mente.  |  | b <i>George Bush</i> ne ment pas.<br>d <i>George Bush</i> lügt nicht.          |
| (2) | a (*The) <i>George Bush</i> does not lie.<br>c (*El) <i>George Bush</i> no mente.   |  | b (*Le) <i>George Bush</i> ne ment pas<br>d <i>Der George Bush</i> lügt nicht. |
| (3) | a ?A <i>George Bush</i> does not lie.<br>c <i>Un George Bush</i> no mente.  |  | b ?Un <i>George Bush</i> ne ment pas.<br>d <i>Ein George Bush</i> lügt nicht.  |
| (4) | Thus, <i>a George Bush</i> is particularly despised on his far Right as <i>a Tony Blair</i> is on his far Left. ( <a href="http://www.brothersjudd.com/index.cfm/fuseaction/reviews.detail/book_id/1529/">http://www.brothersjudd.com/index.cfm/fuseaction/reviews.detail/book_id/1529/</a> ) |  |  |

Besides the primary use of proper names without articles, as in (1), or with the definite article, as in (2), we assume (at least) four different classes of secondary uses: (i) in the denominative use, the proper name is used as a common noun, as in (5). (ii) in the metaphorical use, as in (6), the proper name refers to a set of objects that have the (contextually) salient properties of the bearer of the name. A metaphorical use strongly depends on the prototypicality of the properties and the prominence of the bearer of the name. Therefore it is preferably used with personalities of public life. (iii) in the stage-use, as in (7), the PN “cuts” out a certain stage from the “whole” individual. The stage  $x_s$  is related to the whole individual by a realization relation (Carlson 1977). (iv) in the manifestation-use, the actual bearer of the name is instantiated by a manifestation. This can be illustrated by example (8), which has (at least) two readings or uses. According to the metaphorical use, we need another person called Roosevelt. According to the manifestation use, we need Roosevelt in another manifestation:

- |     |   |                                  |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|
| (5) | I would rather talk to <i>a Carmen</i> than to <i>a Gertrudis</i> . | $x$ is called PN                 |
| (6) | He is <i>a James Joyce</i> (of the 21 <sup>st</sup> century).       | $x$ has salient properties of PN |
| (7) | <i>The young Isaac Newton</i> did not show any sign of genius.      | $x_s$ is a stage of PN           |
| (8) | We need <i>another Roosevelt</i>                                    |                                  |
| (a) | We need another individual <i>called</i> Roosevelt. (= (6))         |                                  |
| (b) | We need another <i>manifestation</i> of Roosevelt.                  | $x_m$ is a manifestation of PN   |

Manifestations differ from stages in that several manifestations can hold of one individual at the same time. We can say (Chomsky 1972, 67) “I am not against MY FATHER, only against THE LABOR MINISTER” referring to different manifestations of the same individual at the same time without contradiction. The idea of manifestations, “social roles”, “aspects”, etc. is often employed for cases of more fine-grained

referential contexts, as in (9) (Brown & Yule 1983). We therefore suggest that predicates are lexically ambiguous so that they either take a simple individual or a manifestation of an individual as arguments.

- (9) a As a colleague you're deficient but as a neighbor you're marvelous.  
b As his neighbor I see quite a lot of him, as his colleague I hardly ever see him.

We analyze the generic sentences (1) and (3) according to Krifka et al. (1995) with a hidden generic quantifier binding free variables. In (1), repeated as (10), the operator binds just the situation variable  $s$ . In (3), repeated as (11), the indefinite article introduces a variable – either of the simple individual type, of the stage-type, or of the manifestation-type. We focus on the latter case. The variable over manifestations stands in a realization relation  $R$  to the bearer of the name George Bush, where  $x_m$  is contextually restricted in order to give us only the salient or prominent manifestations of George Bush (such as *president*, *Republican*, *Christian* etc.). Non-salient manifestations (such as *milk drinker*, *late riser* etc.) are not under discussion here. The variable over manifestations can be bound by the generic operator yielding the logical form (11b) and its paraphrase (11c).

- (10) a George Bush does not lie.  
b Gen(s) [gb says something in s] [gb does not lie in s]
- (11) a *Un George Bush ne ment pas. / Un George Bush no miente. / Ein George Bush lügt nicht.*  
b Gen( $x_m$ , s) [R( $x_m$ , gb) & C( $x_m$ , gb) &  $x_m$  in s] [ $x_m$  does not lie in s]  
c For every contextually salient manifestation of George Bush and every relevant situation, the manifestation does not lie in that situation.

While the truth-conditions of the two sentences are the same, the subtle meaning difference is caused by the different logical forms. (10b) makes an assertion about the individual George Bush, while (11b) makes an assertion about different manifestations of George Bush.

Summarizing our analysis of generic sentences with indefinite proper names, we assume that (i) manifestations are sub-individual objects that stand in a realization relation to an individual; (ii) the indefinite article introduces a variable that can range over such manifestations (in certain circumstances), and (iii) the (hidden) generic operator can quantify over such manifestations.

We will extend this analysis to the use of the indefinite article with (bare) common nouns in predicative position. The form without article, as in (12), asserts that the individual John is in the set of professors, while (13) asserts that he has a manifestation of a professor (without asserting that he *is* a professor).

- |        |                      |        |                         |
|--------|----------------------|--------|-------------------------|
| (12) a | Jean est professeur. | (13) a | Jean est un professeur. |
| b      | Juan es professor.   | b      | Juan es un professor.   |
| c      | Hans ist Professor.  | c      | Hans ist ein Professor  |

Brown, Gillian & Yule, George 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.

Carlson, Gergory 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana 1977.

Chomsky, Noam 1972. *Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.

Krifka, Manfred et al. (1995). *Genericity: An Introduction*, in: G. Carlson & F. Pelletier (eds.). *The Generic Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-124.