

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS

General Editors: W.SIDNEY ALLEN, B.COMRIE, C.J.FILLMORE E.J.A.HENDERSON, F.W.HOUSEHOLDER, R.LASS, J.LYONS R.B.LE PAGE, F.R.PALMER, R.POSNER, J.L.M.TRIM

Referential—semantic analysis
Aspects of a theory of linguistic reference



In this series

- I DAVID CRYSTAL: Prosodic systems and intonation in English*
- 2 PIETER A. M. SEUREN: Operators and nucleus
- 3 RODNEY D. HUDDLESTON: The sentence in written English
- 4 JOHN M. ANDERSON: The grammar of case*
- 5 M. L. SAMUELS: Linguistic evolution*
- 6 P. H. MATTHEWS: Inflectional morphology*
- 7 GILLIAN BROWN: Phonological rules and dialect variation*
- 8 BRIAN NEWTON: The generative interpretation of dialect*
- 9 R. M. W. DIXON: The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*
- 10 BRUCE L. DERWING: Transformational grammar as a theory of language acquisition*
- II MELISSA BOWERMAN: Early syntactic development*
- 12 W. SIDNEY ALLEN: Accent and rhythm
- 13 PETER TRUDGILL: The social differentiation of English in Norwich*
- 14 ROGER LASS and JOHN M. ANDERSON: Old English phonology
- 15 RUTH M. KEMPSON: Presupposition and the delimitation of semantics*
- 16 JAMES R. HURFORD: The linguistic theory of numerals
- 17 ROGER LASS: English phonology and phonological theory
- 18 G. M. AWBERY: The syntax of Welsh
- 19 R. M. W. DIXON: A grammar of Yidin
- 20 JAMES FOLEY: Foundations of theoretical phonology
- 21 A. RADFORD: Italian syntax: transformational and relational grammar
- 22 DIETER WUNDERLICH: Foundations of linguistics*
- 23 DAVID W. LIGHTFOOT: Principles of diachronic syntax*
- 24 ANNETTE KARMILOFF-SMITH: A functional approach to child language
- 25 PER LINELL: Psychological reality in phonology
- 26 CHRISTINE TANZ: Studies in the acquisition of deictic terms
- 27 ROGER LASS: On explaining language change
- 28 TORBEN THRANE: Referential—semantic analysis
 - *Issued in hard covers and as a paperback



REFERENTIAL-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

Aspects of a theory of linguistic reference

TORBEN THRANE

Lecturer in English Language and Literature University of Copenhagen

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE
LONDON NEW YORK NEW ROCHELLE
MELBOURNE SYDNEY



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521105712

© Cambridge University Press 1980

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1980 This digitally printed version 2009

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Thrane, Torben. Referential-semantic analysis.

(Cambridge studies in linguistics; 28)
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.

1. Reference (Linguistics) 2. English language –
Semantics. I. Title. II. Series.
P325.5.R44T5 415 79-17405

ISBN 978-0-521-22791-9 hardback ISBN 978-0-521-10571-2 paperback



BIRGITTE MARIE LOUISE



Contents

	Preface	xi
	Introduction: The functions of language	I
	PART I: THE PRELIMINARIES	
I	THE LINGUISTIC PRELIMINARIES	7
1.1	Pronominalization	7
I.2	Linguistic relations and linguistic models	12
1.3	Predicational structure and explanatory adequacy	15
2	THE PHILOSOPHICAL PRELIMINARIES	22
2.0	Introductory comments on 'meaning'	22
2. I	Existence and location	26
2.2	Existence and denotation	27
2.3	Existence as categorial location	28
2.4	Categorial and spatio-temporal location	29
2.5	Reference and referentiality	30
	PART II: THE THEORY	
3	SOME FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS	33
3. I	Referential function and referential potential	33
3.2	Syntactico-semantic and referential-semantic analyses	35
4	THE BASIS OF RS-ANALYSIS	39
4. I	Form and function	39
4.2	Metatheoretical considerations	43
	4.2.1 The metaphysical basis: 'mentioning things'	43
	4.2.2 'Referential function' defined	46
	4.2.3 The set of referential functions	51
	4.2.3.1 supported	52
	4.2.3.2 established	54
4.3	The elements of NP	59
	4.3.1 Noun phrases, nominals, and nouns	50



viii	Contents	
	4.3.2 Constituency vs. dependency	61
	4.3.3 Class, category, and feature	66
4.4	Referential phrases	70
	4.4.1 Functional and lexical categories: FC and L	70
	4.4.2 The referential phrase	71
4.5	Summary of main points	72
5	REFERENTIAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES	74
5.1	Features on FC	74
	5.1.1 on gen	76
	5.1.2 on ind	77
	5.1.3 on part	78
	5.1.4 and on pres	81
	5.1.5 Lexical reflexes of FC	83
5.2	The hierarchy of referential phrases	86
5.3	Features on L	90
	5.3.1 on L_{pres}	91
	5.3.2 \dots on L_{gen} and L_{part}	92
	5.3.3 and on \mathbf{L}_{ind}	95
5.4	Summarizing rules and sample derivation	97
5.5	Lexical insertion: initial statement	98
6	SUBJUNCTION AND ADJUNCTION	102
6. ı	Serialization	102
6.2	Subjunction	102
	6.2.1 L-subjunction	104
	6.2.2 RP-subjunction	105
	6.2.3 The relationship between L-subjunction and RP-subjunction	107
	6.2.4 The Mirror-Image convention	114
6.3	The morphophonemic component	116
6.4	Adjunction	119
6.5	Preliminary comments on recursion	121
	PART III: THE APPLICATION	
7	REFERENTIAL FUNCTIVES	125
7.1	'Referential functive' defined	125
7.2	Delimitative and juxtapositive serialization	126
7.3	The classes of referential functives	127
	7.3.1 The class of quantifiers	128
	7.3.2 The class of determiners	130
	7.3.3 The class of E-classifiers	132
	7.3.4 The class of pronouns	133
7.4	Ill-formed, well-formed, and deviant strings	134



		Contents	ix
7.5	Derivational characteristics of the referential functives		135
	7.5.1 Juxtapositive serializations: quantifiers and determiners		136
	7.5.2 Delimitative serializations: quantifiers and E-classifiers		138
	7.5.3 Derivational characteristics of pronouns		149
	7.5.4 Juxtapositive serializations from complex structures		150
7.6	The notional content of the referential functives		154
8	INDEFINITE EXPRESSIONS		157
8. ı	Indefiniteness: sortal and selective expressions		157
	The classes of sortal and selective expressions		158
	All and some		159
8.4	Any		163
•	Specificness and 'genericness'		171
	•		
-	DEFINITE EXPRESSIONS		178
9.1	The influence of L _{ind}		178
	9.1.1 The justification of [aspace] and [atime]		179
	9.1.2 Positive expression of [atime]		183
9.2	Identitive the, this, and that		184
	9.2.1 Identitive the		189
	9.2.2 The utterance situation		192
	9.2.3 Identitive this and that		193
	9.3 Sortal the, this, and that		199
	9.3.1 Sortal the		200
	9.3.2 Sortal this and that		205
10	THE PRONOUNS		206
0.0	Introductory		206
	Categorial vs. non-categorial: evidence for the distinction		206
10.2	Simple non-categorial signs in English		207
	10.2.1 Definite simple non-categorial signs: I and me		207
	10.2.2 We, us, and you		209
	10.2.3 Proper names		214
	10.2.4 Indefinite simple non-categorial pronouns		216
10.3	The simple categorial pronouns: he, him, she, it, they		217
	10.3.1 He, him, she		218
	10.3.2 The anaphoric function: 'categorization'		220
	10.3.3 He vs. John		222
	10.3.4 It, they, and them		224
	10.3.5 The 'prop-word' one		227
10.4	The complex pronouns		228
	10.4.1 The possessive pronouns		228
	10.4.2 The reflexive pronouns		231
	10.4.3 The relative pronouns		235



x Contents

CONCLUSION: SUMMARY AND FURTHER PROSPECTS	238
Bibliography:	240
A. Lexica	
B. Bibliographical abbreviations	
C. References	
Index	248



Preface

The present work is intended as a contribution towards the clarification of one of the problems with which man has preoccupied himself at all times: the relationship between words and things. It is not a philosophical work although the problem is often considered to be primarily philosophical in nature. But the problem has many aspects. Some of these are philosophical, some are pragmatical, some are sociological – and some are linguistic. It is the latter aspects that will be treated here, although some notice will be taken of what philosophers have had to say on the question.

My interest in the problem was first awakened when I participated in a research seminar on the problems of 'linguistic representation', instigated and led by Professor Gunnar Bech, in 1968. Owing to his sad illness, which to the detriment of us all has since forced him to retire prematurely, no very clear conclusions emerged from the seminar, so when a few years later the British Council and the Danish Research Council for the Humanities made it financially possible for me to devote three years to full-time research, I began to explore the area on my own. I am grateful to these two bodies for their support. I am likewise grateful to the Department of English at the University of Copenhagen for supporting my application for such a long leave of absence from my departmental duties.

I spent the three years 1973-6 at the Department of Linguistics, University of Edinburgh, submitting towards the end of that time a thesis for the degree of PhD under the title A study in the referential functions of English noun phrases. I consider these three years the happiest and most fruitful period of my professional life, and I would like to thank all the teachers and fellow-students who contributed to it. There are two persons I would like to thank personally for this period: Dr John M. Anderson, with whom I had – and have since had – many a good discussion, and whose theories have played an important part in



my own work; but most of all Professor John Lyons, who took an active interest in my work which far exceeded the call of duty, and who has continued to do so.

Although the present work, like so many others in linguistics these days, has grown out of a PhD thesis, it is not identical to the thesis, mainly owing to the points of constructive criticism raised against the thesis by two anonymous readers for the Cambridge University Press. I am grateful to them both for forcing me to rethink some of the fundamental principles of the work.

Throughout the last two years I have been sorely trying the patience of my colleagues, friends and students at the Department here with questions and discussions. My thanks are due to them for keeping their patience, and especially to Dr Graham Caie, Peter Harder, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen, Christian Kock, Dr Ingeborg Nixon, and Svend Erik Rosenberg (the last of the Department of Linguistics).

I am also very grateful to Annette Götzsche and Tora Schou for typing the manuscript in record time, while at the same time tending their normal secretarial duties for the Department.

Yet over and above all others, I want to thank my wife and two daughters, to whom the work is dedicated. It is my wife's patient understanding and support more than anything that has carried me through the various crises I have undergone during the long history of the work. And it is my daughters who have provided, though unwittingly, much of the stuff that has gone into it.

Mørkøv, January 1979.

T.T.