Distinctions

- Schwarz (2009):  
  strong [familiarity] vs. weak [uniqueness]

- Coppock & Beaver (2015):  
  weak [existence+uniqueness] vs. super-weak [uniqueness only]
Anti-uniqueness effects

Uniqueness presupposed:

(1) She is the princess. \([1]\)
(2) She is not the princess. \([0-1]\)
(3) Is she the princess? \([0-1]\)

But inserting an exclusive can negate that effect:

(4) She is the only princess. \([1]\)
(5) She is not the only princess. \([>1]\)
(6) Is she the only princess? \([\geq 1]\)
Key point

What anti-uniqueness effects show is that the definite article does not presuppose existence.
Anti-uniqueness effects: Lack of existence

*She is not the princess.*  *She is not the only princess.*

→ uniqueness of ‘princess’  → uniqueness of ‘princess’
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Anti-uniqueness effects: Lack of existence

*She is not the princess.*

→ uniqueness of ‘princess’

*She is not the only princess.*

→ uniqueness of ‘only princess’

✓ existence of ‘only princess’
Not just an idiosyncrasy of *only*

(7) Lack of supply is not the *sole* cause of Britain’s housing crisis.

(8) Search engine optimization is not the *single* thing to think about with regards to search engine ranking.

(9) It is worthwhile to visit Kuala Lumpur to see the future of modern Asia, but it is not the *one* reason to visit.

(10) Dean Hall doesn’t have the *exclusive* right to open-world multiplayer zombie apocalypse simulators, you know.
Predicative definite description

\[ \text{et} \]

\[ \text{the} \quad \text{princess} \]
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\[ \langle et, et \rangle \]

\[ \lambda P . \lambda x . [\partial(|P| \leq 1) \land P(x)] \]

et

\[ \text{PRINCESS} \]

the

princess
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\[ \langle \text{et}, \text{et} \rangle \]

\[ \lambda P . \lambda x . \left[ \partial(|P| \leq 1) \land P(x) \right] \]

\[ \text{PRINCESS} \]

\[ \text{the} \]

\[ \text{princess} \]
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\[ \sim \equiv \neg [\vartheta(|\text{ONLY(AUTHOR}(w))| \leq 1) \land \text{ONLY(AUTHOR}(w))(s)] \]
Good result!

(11)  Scott is not the only author of ‘Waverley’

\[ \sim \]

\[ \equiv \neg \left[ \partial(\left\lfloor \text{ONLY} \left( \text{AUTHOR} \left( \text{W} \right) \right) \right\rfloor \leq 1) \land \text{ONLY} \left( \text{AUTHOR} \left( \text{W} \right) \right) (s) \right] \]
\[ \equiv \left[ \partial \left( \text{AUTHOR} \left( \text{W} \right) (s) \right) \land \neg \forall y [s \neq y \rightarrow \neg \text{AUTHOR} \left( \text{W} \right) (y)] \right] \]
Anti-uniqueness effects with argumental definites

(12) Anna didn’t \textit{cheer for} the only goal.
\[ \Rightarrow \text{only one goal} \]

(13) Anna didn’t \textit{score} the only goal.
\[ \Rightarrow \text{one or multiple goals} \]
Proposal

Two meaning shifts:

- **IOTA**: $P \mapsto \iota x [P(x)]$
  yields a **determinate** interpretation

- **EX**: $P \mapsto \lambda Q \exists x [P(x) \land Q(x)]$
  yields an **indeterminate** interpretation
System for English

\[ \langle e, t \rangle \]

- \( e \)
- \( \langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle \)

- IOTA
- EX
Typology

- definites
  - familiarity
    - strong
  - uniqueness
    - weak
    - super-weak
Two questions one can ask

Regarding a given marker:
- Does it encode familiarity or uniqueness?
- If uniqueness, existence too?
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Turoyo: the basics

Origin

- SE Turkey, Midyat region
- Speakers now in Diaspora (New Zealand, Sweden, Germany; our speakers: Massachusetts and Indiana)
- Village and language identity remain distinct
Family tree and status

- A Central Neo-Aramaic language, part of the Semitic family
- Strong influences from Classical Syriac
- Threatened (ethnologue.com)
Scripts and phonological inventory

Scripts

- Three scripts used since 1880s: Serto, Madnhaya, and Estrangelo
  - Our consultants were asked to use Estrangelo
- Letters are consonants, diacritics used to denote vowels (similar to Hebrew and Arabic scripts)

Sound System

- Iconic root-and-pattern morphology
- Phonology is different than Hebrew, but the scripts match the Hebrew script 1:1
- Using this and Miriam’s Hebrew background we were able to ‘transliterate’ the Turoyo data and make educated attempts at pronunciations and identifying cognates and structures
The details

Square-off: Definite vs. Copula vs. Pronoun vs. Demonstrative

- Previous research told us that the definite article appears as ʔi (fem) or ʔu (masc), but more work was required to pick these forms out of our preliminary written data.
- The latter two appeared in a variety of locations.
- After speaking with our consultant and learning about the underlining process in Estrangelo orthography that silences segments, we found the following:
Distinguishing forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Allomorphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>A-H-I</td>
<td>?i</td>
<td>FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>A-H-U</td>
<td>?u</td>
<td>MASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>H-I-A</td>
<td>jo</td>
<td>PRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>H-U-A</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td>PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>H-I-A</td>
<td>hiyə</td>
<td>FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>H-U-A</td>
<td>huwə</td>
<td>MASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>H-I-A</td>
<td>jo</td>
<td>FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>H-U-A</td>
<td>wo</td>
<td>MASC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we can begin studying the behavior of the definite article.
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Translation survey

We carried out a translation survey, with:

- sentences drawn from Schwarz’s (2009) dissertation, adapted to the Turoyo setting
- additional sentences testing for the possibility of indeterminate uses
Schwarz: Weak

(14) Der Ampfang wurde *vom / von dem* Burgermeister eröffnet.
The reception was *by-the\text{\textsubscript{weak}} / by the\text{\textsubscript{strong}}* mayor opened.

‘The reception was opened by the mayor.’
Schwarz: Strong

(15) Hans hat einen Schriftsteller und einen Politiker interviewt. Er hat vom* / von dem Politiker keine interessanten Antworten bekommen. ‘Hans interviewed a writer and a politician. He didn’t get any interesting answers from the politician.’
## Distributional environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate situation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger situation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global situation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-whole bridging</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>church-tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product-producer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>book-author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>that boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper nouns</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Sargon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind reference</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>whales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superlatives</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>highest mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusives</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>only author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aside

- The strong article is used in Partee ‘marble’ cases, like:
  \( I \) dropped 10 marbles and found nine.
  ??It/The missing marble was under the couch.

- If ‘weak familiarity’ in Roberts’s (2006) sense is all that is required for the use of a strong definite, as this suggests, then when are strong definites really predicted not to be usable?
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Anaphoric use (Strong-only env.)

(16) ʔu Sargon semle mkabalyotha am kathowo wa politikaya. 
DEF Sargon made interview with writer and politician. 
la athile fonya tave m-u politikaya 
NEG got answers good from-DEF politician 
‘Sargon interviewed a writer and a politician. He didn’t get any good answers from the politician.’

(17) zvn l-i furtkala. ?i furtukala galbo basimto wa 
bought for-me orange. DEF orange very tasty COP.PST 
‘I bought an orange today. The orange was very tasty.’
Global situation use (Weak-only env.)

(18)  Armstrong wa ?u barnasho qadmoyo d-fa‘er l-u
Armstrong COP.PST DEF person first that-fly to-DEF
sahro moon
‘Armstrong was the first person to fly to the moon.’
Anti-uniqueness use (Super-weak env.)

(19) Moushe let-jo ?u kathowo yixidoyo d-u
Moushe NEG-COP.PRES DEF author only of-DEF
kthowa-wo
book-DEM.FEM
‘Moushe is not the only author of that book.’
Superlative construction

(20) emo sjamle basəm kuko b-u ?olmo kul-o mom makes tasty.DEG cookies in-DEF world all-it ‘Mom makes the best cookies in the whole world.’
## Summary of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Definites</strong></th>
<th><strong>STR</strong></th>
<th><strong>Wk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Eng.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tur.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ex.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate situation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>dog has a toothache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger situation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global situation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-whole bridging</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>church-tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product-producer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>book-author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓ +</td>
<td>that boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper nouns</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sargon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind reference</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>whales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superlatives</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>highest mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusives</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>only author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

- Turoyo’s definiteness-marker patterns just like English *the* except when it doesn’t:
  - superlatives (English yes, Turoyo no)
  - double-definiteness, proper names (English no, Turoyo yes)
Superlatives vs. other adjectives

(21) Sargon hub l-e wardo l-u axuno rabo
Sargon gave to-him rose to-DEF brother big
‘Sargon gave a rose to the older brother.’

(22) emo sjamle basəm kuko b-u ?olmo kul-o
mom makes tasty.DEG cookies in-DEF world all-it
‘Mom makes the best cookies in the whole world.’
Superlatives vs. other adjectives

(21) Sargon hub l-e wardo l-u axuno rabo
Sargon gave to-him rose to-DEF brother big
‘Sargon gave a rose to the older brother.’

(22) emo sjamle basəm kuko b-u Polmo kul-o
mom makes tasty.DEG cookies in-DEF world all-it
‘Mom makes the best cookies in the whole world.’

Speculation: Superlative occupies determiner slot.
Double definiteness

(23) Ashur kroxam ʔi  radayto semaqto
Ashur love DEF car red
‘Ashur loves the red car.’

(24) kroxam-no ʔi  radayta-jo ʔi  semaqto
love-I DEF car-DEM.FEM DEF red
‘I love that red car.’

We found that this is *not* conditioned by contrast, *contra* Doron & Khan (2016); (24) OK in situations with only one car.
Non-contrastive double definiteness

This is Ashur’s beautiful rosebush.

(25) hathe jo  ꜰi wardo d-Ashur ꜰi shafirto
this COP.PRES DEF rose of-Ashur DEF beautiful
‘This is Ashur’s beautiful rosebush’
There is no other rosebush in this scenario to compare Ashur’s to.
Possessive construction

(26) Atour ?i xut-aydi ?i habibto jo
Arour DEF sister-POSS DEF favorite COP.PRES
‘Atour is my favorite sister.’

(27) kroxam-no ?u kalb-aydi ?u shafiro
love-I DEF dog-POSS DEF beautiful
‘I love my beautiful dog.’
Our claim
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Our claim

- Turoyo’s definiteness-markers are semantically identical to those of English: they encode uniqueness.
- Both have familiarity uses because familiarity is a special case of uniqueness (Beaver & Coppock, 2015).
- Differences in their distribution are due to purely syntactic factors.
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Typological questions

- How many of the languages that have been categorized as ‘weak’ are really ‘super-weak’?
- Do uniqueness definites always have familiarity uses except when blocked by a more specific form?
- Predicted gap: familiarity definites with anti-uniqueness uses. What if we find such a language?


