

## Telic definites and their preposition(s) : French Vs Serbian

Tijana Ašić (University of Kragujevac)  
Francis Corblin (Université Paris-Sorbonne)

The talk focuses on a sub-class of weak definites<sup>1</sup> exemplified in French by (1) and by its close English counter-part in (1'):

(1) Jean est allé à la banque. (1') John went to the bank.

The main distinctive properties of a weak definite reading of “the bank” in (1') are as follows:

- a. The identity of the individual bank is not under discussion.
  - b. In the continuation (2), it is not implied that Mary and John went to the same place:
- (2) John went to the bank, and Mary did, too.

c. Weak readings emerge only in some lexical contexts:

- Only some nouns give rise to the considered reading:

(3) John went to the **bank** Vs John went to the **building**. (C&S 2003)

- Only some embedding contexts trigger it:

(4) John is **at** the store Vs John is **behind** the store (C&S 2003)

(5) John **checked** the calendar Vs John **tore** the calendar. (C&S 2003)

(6) My **father** went the bank. Vs My **dog** went to the bank

d. It is implied in the weak reading of “the bank” in (1) that the agent of the sentence is (goes) in (to) a bank in order to receive the kind of service a bank is designed for. Since this interpretation looks connected to what is called in the generative lexicon theory, the “telic qualia” of nouns like *bank*, we identify this weak definite reading as a “telic reading”.

We adopt as a starting point an analysis of French examples close to (1) introduced in Corblin (2011) and based on three ingredients:

- the French definite of this construction is a regular *associative* (Hawkins 1978) or *functional* (Löbner 1985) definite;

- the functional reading of the head-noun is based on the *telic qualia* (Pustejovsky 1995) of this noun;

- once admitted that the associated function takes its argument in its own sentence, the dynamic properties of the NP can be explained.

The link between the interpretation of these WD and the telic *qualia* of their lexical head is explicitly made in Borillo (1983) for French, and Stvan (1998) for English.

First, we introduce the great lines of this approach on French data, then we will turn to Serbian data with two main concerns.

1. Checking whether comparable Serbian constructions can be analyzed as involving a definite NP, or should be best analyzed as involving a true bare singular.

2. Comparing the lexical constraints on the emergence of telic readings, especially the constraints on the selection of the preposition.

---

<sup>1</sup> The general notion of “Weak definites” is a topic widely discussed in the literature on French (Milner 1975, Corblin 1987, 2001, Flaux 1992, 1993 among others) and there is also a long-standing interest for comparable definites in English (Poesio 1994, Barker 1992, Stvan 1998, Roberts 1983, Carlson & Sussman 2005) and in German (Bosh 2010, Vogel 2011).

# 1 Telic definites in French

## 1. Weak definites as functional definites.

In contrast to some approaches analyzing the French weak definite as “generic” (e.g. Vandeloise 1987, Aurnague 2004 or “intensional” Furukawa 1986), Corblin (2011) takes the definites under consideration to be plain “functional” (Löbner 1985) or “associative” (Hawkins 1978) definites, of the same kind than *le docteur* in sentences like (7) :

(7) The docteur m’a dit d’arrêter de fumer.

The doctor told me I had better stop smoking.

Most distinctive properties of WD are satisfied: the identity of the actual role-player has no relevance, anaphoric devices admit sloppy readings, and only some lexical contexts preserve the reading.

(8) Le docteur a dit à Pierre d’arrêter de fumer; moi, il ne m’a rien dit.

The doctor told Peter to stop smoking; to me, he did not say anything.

Sloppy reading accessible : (8) can mean “my doctor did not say anything”.

(9) Le docteur déteste Pierre. Moi, il ne m’aime pas.

The doctor hates Peter. Me, he does not like me.

No sloppy reading accessible : (9) cannot mean “my doctor does not like me”.

It is well known that in general, sloppy readings are licensed iff their antecedents themselves are interpreted as functional predicates finding their argument in their own sentence:

(10) Marie<sub>i</sub> met son<sub>i</sub> salaire à la banque, mais Jean le (= le salaire de Jean) dépense aussitôt.

Mary<sub>i</sub> puts her<sub>i</sub> salary to the bank, but John spends it (John’s salary) immediately.

(11) Marie<sub>i</sub> met son<sub>j</sub> salaire à la banque, mais Jean le (≠ le salaire de Jean) dépense aussitôt.

Mary<sub>i</sub> puts his<sub>j</sub>/her<sub>j</sub> salary to the bank, but John spends it (≠ John’s salary)

immediately.

This gives a plausible explanation for the specific anaphoric properties of these definite NPs, which are very similar to the classical “sloppy reading” examples, once made the additional assumption that these “functional definites” take an argument *in their own sentence*.

In contrast to (8) consider (12) which does not license a sloppy reading:

(12) Le docteur de Jean a dit à Pierre d’arrêter de fumer, mais à moi il ne m’a rien dit rien dit.

John’s doctor told Peter to stop smoking, but to me he told nothing.

No sloppy reading. “He” = John’s doctor.

And this accounts as well for the dynamic properties which renders impossible to analyze the definite NP as generic or as incorporated nominal<sup>2</sup>:

(13) Pierre est à l’hôpital. Cet hôpital est près d’ici.

Peter is at the hospital. This hospital is close.

(14) Pierre est à l’hôpital. Lequel? Il y en a plusieurs.

Pierre is at the hospital. Which one? There are many.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See Farkas & de Swart (2004) for the dynamic properties of incorporated nominals and plain NPs.

<sup>3</sup> See [http://www.answerbag.com/q\\_view/729166](http://www.answerbag.com/q_view/729166) for the discussion: Do you say, "I went to the hospital" or "I went to hospital".

## 2. Telic Vs locative definites.

We focus in this presentation on weak definites governed by a (potentially) locative preposition.

- (15) Pierre va (est) à l'école.  
Pierre goes (is) to/at school.

In French the construction is ambiguous:

- (16) Le chien va/est à l'école = locative sentence. \*telic  
The dog goes to school

- (17) Pierre va/est à l'école = (preferred) telic./Locative.

We assume that the noun *school* is ambiguous :

Sortal interpretation : place, building, hosting the homonymous institution.

Functional interpretation : social institution designed to educate young humans.

Telic readings, as already said, require a functional interpretation (*school*) finding in the sentence the argument of its stereotypical *telic qualia* (*l'école de Pierre* = "the school in which he is a school boy")<sup>4</sup>.

They require, moreover "generic" (underspecified) verbs of movement or of localization.

*Aller* and *être* are perfect, but most lexical features adding some specific information regarding the movement or the localization, tend to make the telic reading less likely.

No telic reading for:

Pierre réside à l'école	Pierre lives at the school
Pierre habite à l'hôpital	Pierre lives at the hospital
Pierre s'installe à l'école	Pierre settle at the school

Even for generic movement-verbs like *aller* and *être*, which allows different spatial preposition, there is a strict constraint in French regarding the preposition : only the preposition *à* can trigger a telic reading:

No telic reading for:

Pierre va vers l'école
Pierre est près de l'école
Pierre est dans l'école.

This constraint may at first, looks like a strong difference between French and some other languages for which similar telic definites occur with different prepositions.

In English for instance, telic definites can occur with *at* and *to*.

But since they are the regular locative prepositions respectively for static and dynamic prepositions, both French and English can illustrate the same tentative generalization:

Telic definites are built on the top of locative readings (dynamic and static).

They are a special reading emerging from weakly specified locative sentences.

Telic definites are just functional definites taking their saturating argument within their own sentence.

---

<sup>4</sup> For the interpretation of « possessive NPs » (Le livre de Pierre, John's book) see a.o. Barker (1992), Milner (1982), Corblin (1987, 2001).

General picture :

Pierre est à l'hôpital

The use of “le” (*in the absence of any clue in the context*) indicates that the noun is interpreted as functional and saturated by a relevant argument (see Löbner 1985, 2011) to be found in its own sentence:

Hôpital (Pierre) → Hôpital<sub>i</sub>

The interpretation is roughly: “the hospital relevant for Pierre”

It is a matter of lexical knowledge that there is a hospital relevant for someone when this person is injured or ill, hence the “additional” information that Pierre is injured or ill.

This approach has some advantages over others:

It takes telic definites for true definites, as based on the core properties of the category, in contrast to C&S (2005), for instance, who take it as a separate, if not marginal use.

It derives the apparently contradictory dynamic properties of the definite NP: it introduces a specific entity, but as the value of a function, which explains sloppy readings in proper contexts.

It proposes a derivation for the content of the reading : a is located in “the X relevant for a”, which means the X a uses as a beneficiary of X’s telic qualia.

It accommodates some constraints on the emergence of the reading : the localization must be so to speak “generic”, and no specific information regarding the localization are allowed : only very unspecified spatial verbs and for a given verb only the basic weakly specified prepositions are compatible with a telic reading.

## 2. Telic definites in Serbian

Serbian is a good case for testing the robustness of this analysis for at least two reasons:

- Serbian has no definite article.
- Serbian has a system of spatial preposition different from French : it has no equivalent of the so-called “colorless preposition *à*” (Asic, 2008), it selects different prepositions for dynamic and static localizations, and selects different spatial prepositions depending of the representation of the site.

Typical cases of telic readings in Serbian are exemplified in the following examples:

(18) Ici na more/ plazu/fakultet/pijacu/planinu/selo  
Go on sea/ beach/ faculty/market/mountain/village

(19) Biti na moru/planini/fakultetu/pijaci/planini/selu  
Be on sea/ beach/ faculty/market/mountain/village

(20) Biti u školi/prodavnici/ bolnici/ hotelu/ crkvi/ parku/ bioskopu/pozorištu/zatvoru  
Be in school/shop/ hospital/hotel/ church/park/ cinema/ theatre/ prison

(21) Otici u školu/prodavnicu/ bolnicu/ hotel/ crkvu/ park/ bioskop/pozorište/zatvor  
Go in school/shop/ hospital/hotel/ church/park/ cinema/ theatre

They combine a generic localization verb (*Ici* and *biti*) with bare singular Nouns (fakultet,

školi). When used with a human subject, they do have the telic interpretation (e. g. *to go to school* = *to be a school girl/boy*).

## 2.1 The bare Noun of Serbian telic readings is a functional definite NP

The nominal being a bare noun, to analyse it as a generic NP, or even as some special case of incorporation or as an idiomatic construction might seem even less controversial than for the corresponding cases in French<sup>5</sup>. But, as for French (see Corblin 2011) the dynamic properties of this nominal element show that it behaves as a functional definite (it allows modification, anaphora, demonstratives, and the equivalent of "lequel"), and the telic interpretation is preserved even in case the definite NP is specific :

- (22) Dusan ide u najbolju skolu u nasem kraju.  
Dusan goes in best school in our district  
*Dusan attends the best school in our district.*

Anaphora can refer back to the spatial entity underlying the telic reading

- (23) Dusan je u skoli. Srecom ona nije daleko odavde.  
Dusan is in school Fortunately she isn't far here from  
*Dusan is in school. Fortunately, it is not far from here.*

Our intuition about the nature of bare nouns in Serbia is confirmed by the fact that in general, they can be interpreted as functional definites in many other contexts :

- (24) Postar mi je doneo tri pisma.  
*The postman brought me three letters.*

- (25) Konsultovao sam doktora.  
*I have consulted the / my doctor.*

We see no reason then, not to analyse the nominal element of telic readings in Serbian as a true functional definite NP. In other words, although Serbian uses formally a bare singular, it should be analyzed as closer to the French and English telic definites than to the English bare singular.

---

<sup>5</sup> The author of this paper actually heard a following statement, used as a kind of pun: *Moj muz je u zatvoru, ali ustvari nije u zatvoru* (*My husband is in jail but actually he is not in jail*). The lady wanted to say that her husband works in a prison, so he is physically there but he is not imprisoned.

## 2.2 Telic readings occur only with the definite functional NPs interpretation.

If the head noun is modified with indefinite adjectives<sup>6</sup>(*jedan, neki*) or with demonstratives the reading becomes spatial. Compare (26) with (27):

(26) Dusan je otisao na fakultet. Danas ima puno casova.  
Dusan AUX gone on university Today has many hours  
*Dusan went to university. He has lots of classes today.*

(27) Dusan je otisao na jedan/taj fakultet. Tamo ce da prodaje knjige.  
Dusan AUX gone ono one/that faculty There will to send books  
*Dusan went to the faculty. He will sell books there.*

With nouns referring to locations to which social activities are not typically associated the reading is normally spatial.

(28) Biti na jezeru/ livadi/proplanku/ steni/Novom Beogradu/ tavanu  
To be on lake/ field/ glade/ rock/New Belgrade/ attic

It should be mentioned that *na* is also used with nouns referring to activities (morphologically derived from verbs) and with nouns referring to typical events (temporal entities that last in time)

(29) Ići na pecanje / plivanje /crtanje.  
Go on fishing / swimming/drawing

(30) Ići na ručak / sastanak / rođendan.  
Go on lunch/meeting/birthday

However if a noun representing an activity is modified with an indefinite adjective, the NP in question obtains a different interpretation. Compare:

(31) ?Idem na ručak ali neću nista jesti.  
Go on lunch but won t nothing eat  
*I am going to have lunch but I won t eat anything.*

(32) Idem na neki ručak, ali neću ništa jesti (imam gastroenteritis).  
Go on certain lunch but won t nothing eat  
*I m going to a lunch but I won t eat anything. I have a gastroenteritis.*

In (32) the speaker states that he will attend a social event – a lunch, which does not necessarily mean that he will eat.

As a conclusion, we can see that indefinite determiners cancel the telic reading in Serbian.

---

<sup>6</sup>Words like *jedan, neki, dva, tri, nekoliko* indicate that the referent of NP is not known to the hearer. The semantics of the indefinite adjectives in Serbian is close to the semantics of indefinite determiners in French (*un, des, plusieurs, quelques, trois* etc.).

### 2.3 Telic readings and the selection of the preposition : *na* and *u*.

In general, only the preposition that can be used for the spatial reading can convey the telic reading.

As for their spatial usage, *na* denotes a topological relation of weak contact between a figure and a ground (*knjiga je NA stolu – the book is on the table*) while the carrier/carried relation often presented in this relation is usually pragmatically inferred (Asic, 2008).

The basic semantics of the preposition *u* is the mereological relation of inclusion by which a figure is totally (*prsten je u kutuji – the ring is in the box*) or partly (*cvece je u vazi – the flowers are in the vase*) included in (the hole) in the ground.

Roughly speaking, *na* is used for loci without definite boundaries (like fields and markets), and *u* for loci confined within strict boundaries (like buildings). Serbian data shows that the preposition selected for locus conveys telic readings if the N has a telic qualia, and that, as a rule, *only* this preposition can convey a telic reading.

Only some very rare nouns can be used with both prepositions, for instance *selo (village)* and *more (sea)* and its similars (nouns referring to water surface/containers) *jezero (lake)*, *reka (river)*, *bazen (swimming pool)*.

In all these cases NA is telic and with U we have the idea that the subject is going INTO the water. However, with *bara (pond)*, *only* U can be used, for there is no accessible telic function.

(33) Otisao je NA more, reku, jezero, bazen, baru  
*He went to sea side, river, lake, swimming pool, pond*

(34) Otisao je U more, reku, jezero, bazen, \*baru  
*He went into the sea, river, lake, swimming pool, pond*

The case of *selo (village)* represents quite an interesting situation. When *na* is used the reading is telic: *selo* is interpreted as a countryside designated for holiday and relaxation. Interestingly the sentence in (34) could never be used if the subject lives and works in a village (for him it would be absurd to *rest* in the countryside):

(35) Aleksa je otisao na selo.  
*Aleksa went to the countryside.*

The same is valid if there is an adverbial adjunct in the sentence clearly stating that the reason for going to *selo* is not for holiday. Only *u* can be used:

(36) Otisao je u / \*na selo po drva  
*He went to the village to fetch wood.*

Actually in Serbian *na selo* is used as a phraseologism for denoting the holidays spent at the countryside (maybe it could designate the life style too).

What we can observe is that:

a. *Na selo* does not admit possessives, demonstratives, indefinite adjectives and appositions:

(37) Otisao je U /\* NA nase/to/jedno selo.  
Gone is In on our/this/one village

(38) Otisao je U / \* NA selo Dobracu.  
Went is in/on village Dobraca

b. the construction *na selo* can never have the spatial interpretation, and it is impossible to use an anaphoric pronoun to refer back to a specific entity:

(39) Dusan je otisao na selo. \*Ono se nalazi blizu Kragujevca.  
Dusan is gone on village it poss finds next to Kragujevac  
*Dusan went to countryside. It is situated in the vicinity of Kragujevac.*

c. with *selo*, if a subject is inanimate, U is obligatory, and NA agrammatical (which is expected, for a telic relation cannot be inferred) :

(40) Kompjuter je otisao u selo.  
Computer is gone in village

This sentence means that a village got a computer.

Interestingly, there is no such an opposition for a noun *grad* (town), with which only *u* can be used. Note that *u grad* can have a telic interpretation:

(41) Ceca je otisla u grad.  
Ceca is gone in town

It means that she went in town either to have fun (especially if it is uttered in the evening), or because she has some everyday obligations (to pay the bills, go to the bank etc)

Conclusion : for the small set of nouns accepting *na* or *u*, the generalization according to which telic readings of definite NPs are built on the top of a locative reading cannot be maintained.

The telic meaning is restricted to NA, and the constraints on the emergence of this meaning casts even doubt on the claim that the bare singular of this constructions is a definite NP. If we take English as a point of comparison, *otisao na selo* looks closer to *to go to school*, than *to go to the bank*. (See Stvan 1998 for a detailed study).

In other words, although Serbian uses massively weak definites for expressing the telic meaning (as French does exclusively), Serbian may also use marginally true bare NPS, as English does.

Let us mention that there is in Serbian a preposition semantically close to *na*, the preposition *po* (over) – it actually indicates that the figure is either continuous by nature or that it is moving on the ground (see Asic, 2008).

With *po* the reading is always purely spatial, for it accentuates the physical contact between the figure and the ground:

(41) Dusan ide po plazi  
Dusan goes over beach  
*Dusan is walking all over the beach.*



## 2.4 Other related prepositional constructions

Our attention was caught by the existence of some prepositions in Serbian expressing similar readings. For example the preposition *pred* (see Ašić et Stanojević, 2008.) does not only convey the information about the figure position but also expresses the existence of the active relation between the figure (it has to be animate – this explains the unacceptability of (45) and (46) and ground:

(42) ) Dušan je pred loptom. Sprema se da je šutne.  
*Dusan is in front of the ball. He is about to shoot it.*

(43) Pas je pred koskom. Sad će da je smaže  
*The dog is in front of the bone. It will devour it.*

(44) Mačka je pred činijom mleka. Celu će da je iskapi.  
*The cat is in front of the bowl of milk. It will drink it to the last drop.*

(45) \*Bicikl je pred kosilicom.  
The bike is in front of a lawnmower

(46) \*Upaljač je pred budilnikom.  
*The lighter is in front of the alarm clock.*

The preposition *pred* can alternate with the purely spatial preposition *ispred*<sup>4</sup>. The choice of *pred* signals that there is a kind of intentional relation between a figure and a ground, while the choice of *ispred* states that the relation is only spatial<sup>7</sup>:

(47) Dušan je ispred Maneove slike. Hoću da ga fotografisem.  
Dusan is in front Manet s painting. I want to take a photo.  
*Dusan is in front of a Manet s painting. I want to take a photo of him.*

(48) )Dušan je pred Maneovom slikom. Divi se nijansama narandzaste boje.  
Dusan is in front Manet s painting. Admires poss nuances orange colour  
*Dusan is in front of a Manet s painting. He is admiring nuances of the orange colour.*

Similarly, the preposition *za* does not only designate a contact between a figure and a ground but also states that the (obligatory) animate and active subject is performing an activity linked to the (obligatory inanimate and concrete) ground:

(49) Ema je za klavirom. Divno svira  
Ema is ZA piano. Wonderfully plays  
*Ema is at the piano. She is playing in a wonderful way.*

(50) Dusan je za stolom. Gladan je.  
Dusan is ZA table. Hungre is  
*Dusan is at the table. He is hungry.*

---

<sup>7</sup> Morphologically these two prepositions are connected: *ispred* = prefix *IZ* + *pred*

It is important to emphasize in contrast to what happens for true telic readings, that the usage of indefinite adjective does **not** cancel the “active” reading here:

(51) Dušan je pred jednom slikom. Divi se nijansama narandzaste boje.  
Dusan is in front one painting. Admires poss nuances orange colour  
*Dusan is in front of a Manet's painting. He is admiring nuances of the orange colour.*

(52) Ema je za jednim velikim klavirom. Divno svira  
Ema is ZA one big piano. Wonderfully plays  
*Ema is at a big piano. She is playing in a wonderful way.*

Our hypothesis is that some sort of “agentive implication” is triggered by the lexical content of the preposition itself, and hence preserved in any context.

This is in contrast to true telic readings of the preposition *na* and *u* which is a constructional meaning emerging only for definite NPs.

### 3. Conclusions

By comparing French and Serbian, we show that a general notion of telic reading for functional definites applies to two languages with different properties w.r.t. the crucial ingredients of the construction, i.e. the lexical marking of definiteness, and the selection for prepositions.

In both languages the interpretation emerges from a locative construction and requires the same conditions : a functional definite taking its argument in its own sentence, a generic expression of spatial relations and a Noun denoting both a location and the social associated activity. In both languages the telic qualia of the noun is the basis of the non-locative interpretation, and this interpretation is activated only for the less specified locative prepositions.

We have found however that there are some rather rare nouns for which the telic reading is conveyed by the preposition *na*, although *na* cannot be used for spatial readings with the same nouns. The hypothesis that these cases illustrate a bare singular construction has been discussed.

We show moreover that these telic constructions should be carefully distinguished from prepositions encoding in their lexical meaning that the animate subject of the sentence is supposed to play an active role w.r.t. an object or an activity.

#### Références :

- Asic, T. 2008. *Espace, temps, préposition*. Droz .Genève.
- Ašić T. & Stanojević V. 2008. O predlozima *ispred* i *pred* u srpskom jeziku, *Semantička proučavanja srpskog jezika*, eds. Milorad Radovanović i Predrag Piper, SANU. Beograd. 129-150.
- Aurnague, M. 2004. « À cet endroit Vs dans un tel endroit : ce que à nous dit d’endroit et vice-versa ». *Langages* 173, 34-53.
- Aurnague, M. 2004. Les structures de l’espace linguistique : regards croisés sur quelques constructions spatiales du basque et du français, Leuven/Paris : Peeters.
- Barker, C. 1992 "Definite Possessives and Discourse Novelty", *Chicago Linguistic Society Proceedings*, p. 26-41.
- Birner, B. & Ward, D.G. 1994. “Uniqueness, Familiarity, and the Definite Article in English”, *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20, 93-102.

- Borillo, A. 2001. « La détermination et la préposition de lieu à en français », in X. Blanco, P.-A. Buvet & Z. Gavriilidou (éds), *Détermination et formalisation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 85-99.
- Bosch, P. 2010. Weak definites and German preposition-determiner contractions. Workshop Specificity from theoretical and empirical points of view, Institut für Linguistik, Universität Stuttgart.
- Carlson, G. & Sussman, R.S. 2005. « Seemingly Indefinite Definites », In *Linguistic Evidence*, eds., S. Kepsar and M. Reis. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Corblin, F. 1987. *Indéfini, défini et démonstratif. Construction linguistique de la référence*, Paris/Genève : Droz.
- Corblin, F. 2001. "Défini et génitif: le cas des définis défectifs", in *Cahier Jean-Claude Milner*, Jean-Marie Marandin, ed., Editions Verdier, pp.19-54.
- Epstein, R. 1999. "Roles and non-unique definite", *Proceedings of the 25th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (BLS 20)*, Berkeley (CA): Berkeley Linguistics Society, 122-133.
- Farkas, D. and H. de Swart. 2004. *The semantics of incorporation: from argument structure to discourse transparency*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Flaux, N. 1992 "Les syntagmes nominaux du type le fils d'un paysan : référence définie ou indéfinie?", *le Français moderne* 1 , p. 113-140.
- Flaux, N. 1993 "Les syntagmes nominaux du type le fils d'un paysan : référence définie ou indéfinie?", *le Français moderne* 2, p. 23-45.
- Furukawa, N. 1986. *L'article et le problème de la référence en français*, Tokyo : France Tosho.
- Hawkins J.A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness . A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction* , Londres , Croom Helm.
- Löbner, S. 1985. "Definites". *Journal of Semantics* 4 : 279-326
- Löbner, S. 2011. *Functional concepts and frames*, ms.
- Milner J.-C. 1982. *Ordres et raisons de langue*, Paris, Seuil.
- Poesio, M. 1994. Weak definites. In *Proceedings of Salt IV*, eds. M. Harvey and L. Santelmann 282-299. DMLL, Cornell.
- Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon*, Cambridge (MA): The M.I.T. Press.
- Roberts, C. 2003. Uniqueness in definite noun phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy* .26:287-350.
- Stanojević V. (2010), O nekim aspektima referencijalnosti u francuskom i u srpskom jeziku, *Interdisciplinarnost i jedinstvo savremene nauke*, knjiga 4, tom 1, Univezitet u Istočnom Sarajevu, Pale, 155-167.
- Stvan, L. 1998. *The semantics and pragmatics of bare singular noun phrases*. Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Vandeloise, C. 1987. « La préposition à et le principe d'anticipation », *Langue française* 76, 77-111.
- Vater, H. 1991. « L'article défini et les noms institutionnels », *Rivista di Linguistica* 3 (1), 197-209.
- Vogel, S. 2001 *Weak definites and Generics*, Bachelor thesis, Onasbrück.