Swan, T. (1992): „All about Eve: Women in Norwegian papers in the 20th century". Working Papers on Language, Gender and Sexism, 37–54.

Swan, T. (1997): „Kjønn, språk og ideologi". Språknytt 4. (Bezogen aus dem Internet)

Teleman, U. (1965): „Svenskans genusmorfem". Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi 80, 217–230.

Teleman, U., Hrsg. (1987a): Grammatik på villovägor. Stockholm.

Teleman, U. (1987b): „Hur många genus finns det i svenskan?" In: U. Teleman, Hrsg. (1987a), 106–114.

Teleman, U. (1995): „Han, hon eller vem som helst". Språkvård 1/95, 3–9.

Thorell, O. (1981): Svensk ordbildningslära. Stockholm.

Thorell, O. (1984): Att bilda ord. Stockholm.

Trömel-Plötz, S. (1978): „Über Frauensprache: Sprecher, die ihren Mann stehen wollen". Linguistische Berichte 57, 49–68.

Trömel-Plötz, S. (1982): Frauensprache: Sprache der Veränderung. Frankfurt.

Ulrich, M. (1988): „,Neutrale' Männer – ,markierte' Frauen. Feminismus und Sprachwissenschaft". Sprachwissenschaft 13, 383–399.

Van Alphen, I.C. (1985): „Eine Frau – ein Wort: Über die Gleichbehandlung von Frauen und Männern und die Konsequenzen für Berufsbezeichnungen im Niederländischen". In: M. Hellinger, Hrsg. (1985), 123–131.

Wegener, H. et al., Hrsg. (1990): Frauen fordern eine gerechte Sprache. Gütersloh.

Wessén, E. (1965): Svensk språkhistoria II: Ordbildningslära. Stockholm.

Widell, P. & M. Kunøe, Hrsg. (1997): 6. Møde om Udforskningen af Dansk Sprog. Aarhus.

Widmark, G. (1979): „Han och hon". Språkform och språknorm, 264–271.

Wodak, R. et al. (1987): Sprachliche Gleichbehandlung von Frau und Mann. Klagenfurt.

Zimmer, D. (1986a): Redens Arten. Über Trends und Tollheiten im neudeutschen Sprachgebrauch. Zürich.

Zimmer, D. (1986b): „Der, die, das. Sprache und Sexismus". In: D. Zimmer, Hrsg. (1986a), 63–79

Zimmer, D., Hrsg. (1997a): Deutsch und anders. Die Sprache im Modernisierungsfieber. Hamburg: Rowohlt

Zimmer, D. (1997b) „Die Berichtigung. Über die Sprachreform im Zeichen der Politischen Korrektheit". In: D. Zimmer, Hrsg. (1997a), 105–180.

Mainz

Damaris Nübling

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Fachbereich 13, Philologie I, 55099 Mainz

Semantik

Definite type and indefinite token: the article *son* in colloquial German[1]

Daniel Hole, Gerson Klumpp

Abstract

In the present paper, we argue that colloquial German has a fully grammaticalized article which simultaneously expresses definite type reference and indefinite token reference. Apart from semantically justifying the article *son* as appropriate in clearly delineated contexts, we also provide evidence for its entirely regular status based on facts of cross-paradigmatic coherence, information structural effects, and co-occurence restrictions with other articles. A survey of translational equivalents in other languages uncovers similar phenomena and supports the general claim.

1 (In-)Definiteness and the type-token distinction in Standard German

Grammars of German invariably distinguish a definite and an indefinite article. Both of them inflect for case and gender. Definite articles also inflect for number, whereas there is no plural form of the indefinite article in German, this being a reflex of its lexical origin, the numeral *ein(s)* 'one'. The respective paradigms are given in table 1 and table 2.

Table 1

	masculine singular	feminine singular	neuter singular	plural
nominative	*der*	*die*	*das*	*die*
genitive	*des*	*der*	*des*	*der*
dative	*dem*	*der*	*dem*	*den*
accusative	*den*	*die*	*das*	*die*

Table 2

	masculine singular	feminine singular	neuter singular	plural
nominative	*ein*	*eine*	*ein*	*ø*
genitive	*eines*	*einer*	*eines*	*ø*
dative	*einem*	*einer*	*einem*	*ø*
accusative	*einen*	*eine*	*ein*	*ø*

In more tradititional syntactic frameworks, articles were taken to adjoin to nouns or nominals to form complex noun phrases; in recent years the generative idea that articles are actually functional heads taking nouns or nominals as complements has been influential (cf. Abney 1987 and successive work in this tradition). In this framework, if a noun and an article are combined the resulting expression is no longer a noun phrase, but rather a DP (determiner phrase), and it is DPs, not NPs which figure as argument expressions. For the discussion in this paper the difference between the DP approach and the NP approach is irrelevant.

A lot of research has been devoted to determining the exact meaning of definite and indefinite articles (cf., for instance, Hawkins 1978, van der Auwera (ed.) 1980, Barwise & Cooper 1981, Heim 1982, Vater 1984, Chesterman 1991 or Bisle-Müller 1991). We will endorse the traditional view which says that by using a nominal with a definite article reference to all the members of a set of contextually salient referents is made. The class to which the referents belong is specified by the common noun. Singular definites are cases in which the set of contextually salient referents has only one member. Argument expressions with indefinite articles are used to refer to some member, and necessarily not all members, of the set of referents which belong to the class referred to by the nominal. The indefinite article itself does not signal whether a particular or just any member of the class denoted by the nominal is referred to.

Another important semantic distinction in the domain of argument expressions involves the reference to types or tokens. The lexicon of German and other languages provides a number of expressions to make clear that what is referred to by an argument expression is not a certain individual mass or item, but rather a type; cf. (1).

(1) a. Diese Art/Diese Sorte/Dieser Typ Rotwein/Pullover ist besonders teuer.
     'This kind/This sort/This type of red wine/jumper is particularly expensive.'

If tokens of a quantified mass are to be referred to, measure words or container words combined with mass nouns can ensure the relevant interpretation unequivocally (2a.). For count nouns unambiguous token reference cannot be expressed with comparable ease: as (2b.) shows, count nouns with determiners are systematically ambiguous between a type interpretation and a token interpretation.

(2) a. diese Flasche/dieser Liter/dieses Gläschen Rotwein
        'this bottle/this litre/this little glass of red wine'
     b. dieser Pullover
        'this (type of/particular) jumper'

If one wants to mark token reference for referents of count nouns explicitly, one of a group of lexical nouns denoting single items as in (3) may be used.

(3) dieses Exemplar (*Buch)/dieses Stück (*Möbel)/dieses Teil (*Kleidungsstück) ...
     'this copy (*book)/this piece (*furniture)/this item (*piece of clothing) ...'

These nouns, however, do not take nominal complements, as can be seen from the ungrammatical nominal complements in (3).

Type-token ambiguities are usually illustrated by using argument expressions with demonstratives as in (2b.). We would like to stress the fact that the same ambiguity arises with definite and indefinite articles. A passionate knitter will think of a token interpretation of *einen Pullover* 'a jumper' when uttering (4a.); the owner of a knitting factory will, on the other hand, have a type of jumper in her mind if she utters (4b.) in a situation in which 10.000 jumpers have been knitted. (5) displays the same contrast with the definite article.

(4) a. INDEFINITE TOKEN
        Ich habe gestern einen Pullover gestrickt.
        'I knitted a jumper yesterday.'
     b. INDEFINITE TYPE
        Wir haben gestern einen Pullover gestrickt.
        'We knitted a jumper yesterday.'

(5) a. DEFINITE TOKEN
        Ich habe gestern den grünen Pullover fertiggestrickt.
        'Yesterday I finished (knitting) the green jumper.'

b. DEFINITE TYPE

    Wir haben gestern den grünen Pullover fertiggestrickt.
    'Yesterday we finished (knitting) the green jumper.'

2 Crossing the concepts

We have seen in the preceding paragraph that the use of the definite or the indefinite article is independent of the matter whether reference to a type or reference to a token is expressed. This means it should be possible to keep apart four logical types of reference as depicted in table 3.

Table 3

	TOKEN	TYPE
DEFINITE	*der*	*der*
INDEFNITE	*ein*	*ein*

But obviously this bigger number of categories is not reflected by the system of German articles. There are simply no more articles to keep apart type interpretations from token interpretations in these cases. Another picture emerges if we think of the (in-)definiteness of tokens as being logically independent of the (in-)definiteness of types. This will give us four complex types of reference as depicted in table 4.

Table 4

		TOKEN	
		DEFINITE	INDEFINITE
TYPE	DEFINITE	(6a.)	(6b.)
	INDEFINITE		(6c.)

Before turning to the relevant examples in (6) two caveats are necessary. We are not fully confident of the mutual independence of the two dimensions. It may be the case that definite token reference precludes indefinite type reference and that we are actually dealing with a hierarchical system of the following kind: definite vs. indefinite token; among indefinite tokens: definite vs. indefinite type. In the following we will not consider cases of definite token/indefinite type reference. If this type of reference exists at all it is at best marginal. The second proviso has to do with the matter of situational embeddings. In order to keep the examples short and comparable we will, wherever possible, only use a small set of minimally different situations as contextual embeddings. For the evaluation of these examples it will be crucial to think of the colour specification *grün* 'green'

as identifying the contextually salient type of jumper whenever definite type reference is intended. Unless marked otherwise (see section 4), all articles should be taken not to bear focal stress so that, in the case of definites, Bisle-Müller's (1991) *easy reference* ('problemlose Referenz') is ensured. Now consider the examples in (6).

(6)   a. DEFINITE TOKEN & DEFINITE TYPE
      (While talking about a particular green jumper (token) in a shop)
      Kaufst du mir den Pullover?
      'Will you buy me the jumper?'
   b. INDEFINITE TOKEN & DEFINITE TYPE
      (While talking about green jumpers in a shop)
      ??Kaufst du mir einen Pullover?
      '??Will you buy me a jumper?'
   c. INDEFINITE TOKEN & INDEFINITE TYPE
      (while talking about jumpers in a shop)
      Kaufst du mir einen Pullover?
      'Will you buy me a jumper?'

This time the two articles do not suffice. The use of the indefinite article in (6b.) is slightly inappropriate if the context has it that the class of green jumpers among other possible types is relevant. If it is uttered in the context given for it it remains unclear whether the desired jumper should be green or not. We would like to suggest now that colloquial varieties of (Northern) German have a fully grammaticalized third article which figures precisely in contexts like (6b.), i.e. in contexts in which an indefinite token of a salient type is referred to. This article is *son, sone, son,* (simply referred to as *son* in the following) which is diachronically probably a contraction of *so ein, so eine, so ein* 'such a'. Its inflectional endings are identical to those of *ein, eine, ein,* with the exception of the plural (cf. also Duden Grammatik 1995: 276 on *so(lch) ein(e),* but there no plural forms are acknowlegded; Henn-Memmesheimer 1986: 199f. does not distinguish the levels of type vs. token reference in her discussion of forms like *so'n* or *son*). The whole paradigm is given in table 5.

Table 5

	masculine singular	feminine singular	neuter singular	plural
nominative	*son*	*sone*	*son*	*so(ne)*
genitive	*(sones)*	*(soner)*	*(sones)*	*so(ner)*
dative	*sonem*	*soner*	*sonem*	*so(nen)*
accusative	*son*	*sone*	*son*	*so(ne)*

The optional inflected plural forms do not conform to the paradigm of *ein* because there are no plural forms of the indefinite article, as can be seen in table 2 (cf. also the brief discussion in Henn-Memmesheimer 1986: 194ff., 198; Henn-Memmesheimer does not acknowledge the existence of an article *son*, though). Instead, the paradigm conforms to a general regularity in German pronominal paradigms by using forms for the plural that are built upon a form identical with the nominative feminine singular. Eisenberg (1994) assumes German to have four articles. Apart from the definite and the indefinite article he also identifies the adnominal possessive pronouns *mein, dein, sein* and the adnominal negation word *kein* as articles in a narrow sense. These additional articles do have plural forms, and they are entirely parallel to the plural forms of *son*: first, their nominative plural is identical to the nominative feminine singular and, secondly, they have the same plural endings as *son*. The genitive row of *son*, with the possible exception of uninflected *so* in the genitive plural, is probably an artifact: the varieties of German that have *son* as an article make no productive use of the genitive case at all, except with proper names. The genitival paraphrase will usually involve the preposition *von* plus a dative complement.[2] Another argument to support the claim that *son* is not just a contraction of *so ein*, which would only be of phonological relevance, comes from the asymmetry with pronominal *so einer* 'one like that'. If *son* were just an optional contraction of *so ein*, then we would expect to find optional pronominal **soner* (< pronominal *so einer*) in colloquial German as well. This form does not exist, though. This fact is even more striking as *soner* does occur as a regular form in the paradigm of *son*; cf., for instance, the feminine dative singular form in *auf soner Straße* 'on a street like that'.

3 Contextual appropriateness

Now let us check how *son* fares in each of the contexts delineated above.

(7)   a. DEFINITE TOKEN & DEFINITE TYPE
          (While talking about a particular green jumper (token) in a shop)
          Kaufst du mir sonen Pullover?
          'Will you buy me a jumper like this?'
          (lit. 'Will you buy me such a jumper?')

       b. INDEFINITE TOKEN & DEFINITE TYPE
          (While talking about green jumpers in a shop)
          Kaufst du mir sonen Pullover?
          'Will you buy me a jumper like this?'
       c. INDEFINITE TOKEN & INDEFINITE TYPE
          (while talking about jumpers in a shop)
          Kaufst du mir sonen Pullover?
          'Will you buy me a jumper like this?'

The question in (7b.) is perfect in the context given for it. In the contexts given in (7a.) and (7c.), the questions are only appropriate with some accomodation or deictic action. If (7a.) is asked in the given context, the question abstracts away from the particular jumper at hand and shifts to any jumper belonging to the same class as the salient jumper. The case of (7c.) is similar, i.e. the speaker also abstracts away from a particular item. But in order to do so in (7c.), the token must first be identified; this can be done by pointing at the item whose type is referred to. The conclusion is that in each non-prototypical case in which *son* is used felicitously, accomodation or deictic action will have to support the act of reference. These examples are evidence in favour of our analysis because we are able to predict what kind of accomodation or deictic action is necessary to make the use of *son* fit in each case. It is always those means that ensure reference to a particular type, whereas the exact token does not matter.

4 Focusing and definiteness

For further support of our analysis let us investigate intonational contrasts more closely.

(8)   a. DEFINITE TOKEN & DEFINITE TYPE
          (While talking about different salient jumpers in a shop)
          Kaufst du mir DEN Pullover?
          'Will you buy me THAT jumper?'
          (lit. 'Will you buy me THE jumper?')
       b. INDEFINITE TOKEN & DEFINITE TYPE
          (While talking about different salient types of jumpers in a shop window)
          Kaufst du mir Sonen Pullover?
          'Will you buy me a jumper like THIS?'
          (lit. 'Will you buy me SUCH a jumper?')
       c. INDEFINITE TOKEN & INDEFINITE TYPE
          (While talking about jumpers in a shop)
          Kaufst du mir EInen Pullover?
          'Will you buy me ONE jumper?'
          (lit. 'Will you buy me A jumper?')

The focused articles in (8) have information structural effects on the questions in which they occur. A simplistic way of stating these effects is to say that by focusing something, alternatives to the focus are considered at the same time. In order to come up with relevant alternatives to a focus, the focus must be identifiable. Definiteness ensures identifiability, whereas indefiniteness does not presuppose unequivocal identification. Against this minimal focus-semantic background let us investigate the import of focusing on the sentences in (8). In (8a.) only a particular jumper token will do. Both the definite type specification and the definite token specification are singled out among other possible specifications in the domain of alternatives. In (8b.) only the type is singled out as fixed, whereas the token does not really matter: the definite part of the reference is contrasted with other definite possibilities of type, whereas the indefinite token reference cannot be considered against the background of alternatives, simply because if the token reference is not unequivocal there can be no unequivocal alternatives either. So in (8a.) and (8b.) it is only the definite part of the reference specification which is involved in the information structural effects of focusing. Now consider (8c.). Here both type and token are specified as indefinite. The only alternatives that are possible in (8c.) are other numbers, and that is another way of saying that *EInen* as in (8c.) is not used as an article, but as a numeral. Thus *son* conforms perfectly to the focusing pattern of articles: definite reference specifications are considered with regard to alternative values, and indefinite reference specifications do not influence the calculation of alternatives.

5 Co-occurence restrictions and variation in adjectival inflection

For another argument in favour of the article system proposed here consider what happens if we try to combine *son* with the other articles. (9a.) and (9b.) give the possibilities with the sequence *son* + second article, whereas (9a'.) and (9b'.) illustrate the sequences made up of article + *son*.

(9)   a. *son der grüne(r) Pullover
        '*such a the green jumper'

        a'. *der son grüne(r) Pullover
        '*the such a green jumper'

       b. *son ein grüner Pullover
        '*such a a green jumper'

        b'. ein son grüner Pullover
        'one such a green jumper'

It is impossible to combine *son* with the other articles, except in the case of (9b'.) where *ein* and *son* may combine. This is exactly the string in which *ein* again has its numeral reading. Accordingly, other numerals would be possible in (9b'.) provided we change the agreement endings as in (10).

(10)   zwei/drei/fünf... so(ne) grüne(n) Pullover
        'two/three/five ... of such green jumpers.'

So (9b'.) is not a counterexample to the generalization that *son* may not combine with another article. Note also that the optional *-ne*-ending in the plural form in (10) interacts with the adjectival agreement patterns. If *-ne* is present, the adjective displays the weak inflection pattern (*grünen*) just like in those cases in which the definite or the indefinite article precedes the adjective. If *-ne* is dropped, the agreement pattern conforms to the strong adjectival type (*grüne*) just like in the cases in which we are dealing with indefinite plural reference. The whole rows of inflectional endings for both agreement patterns in the plural are shown in table 6.

Table 6

'such green jumpers'	*sone* + adjective + noun (weak adjectival inflection)	*so* + adjective + noun (strong adjectival inflection)
nominative	*son-e grün-en Pullover*	*so grün-e Pullover*
genitive	*son-er grün-en Pullover*	*so grün-er Pullover*
dative	*son-en grün-en Pullovern*	*so grün-en Pullovern*
accusative	*son-e grün-en Pullover*	*so grün-e Pullover*

The facts in (9) and (10) fall neatly into place if we assume that *son* is an article. With *son* being an article itself, it cannot combine with a second article because there is only one structural position for an article per DP/NP, unless other DPs/NPs are embedded. In the plural, the choice of the agreement pattern of adjectives is determined by the choice between *so* and *sone*, thereby following a fully systematic pattern of German case marking in DPs/NPs: the case endings appear only once in the string *article + adjective*. If there is an inflected article preceding the adjective, the article will have the case endings. If no article is present, the adjective will have the respective endings. *Sone* and the other plural forms of *son* are case-inflected, so the adjectival endings are not distinguished. If *so* is used as an invariable article in the plural, the adjective bears the required case ending. Thus we can maintain the generalization that inflecting articles in German inflect for case, whereas adjectives only do so fully if no inflected article is present. Since *son* may inflect in the plural or not, the adjectival agreement pattern may also vary accordingly. What we have to give up, though, is the generalization that all articles inflect in the plural.

6 Some possible objections

One might object that the fact that colloquial German fuses *so ein* into a single article word does not reflect anything substantial. In the end, the distribution of *so ein* does not seem to differ even minimally from the distribution of *son*, if we

disregard variants of style, register etc. for the moment. Therefore we might simply be dealing with a case of attrition which may be observed all over the place. Moreover, other function words in nominals or adjacent to them may also display fusional tendencies with regard to the indefinite article, or at least they may turn into virtually grammaticalized collocations. Examples of these two cases are given in (11) and (12).

(11)   Ich seh' da'n Haus. (colloquial)
       'I can see a house over there.'

(12)   Der Mann hier/da verkauft Zigaretten. (colloquial)
       'The man here/The man over there sells cigarettes.'

In (11) the indefinite article is shortened to *'n,* and it is cliticized to adverbial *da* 'there', yielding a structure which looks similar to the fusion of *so ein* to *son.* However, since *da'n* is not a constituent it does, for instance, not appear as part of a nominal in the forefield. The article *son* being a constituent, the NPs/DPs in which it is used are not subject to any such restrictions. Therefore *son* and *da'n* are syntactically not comparable and the NP/DP-internal fusion remains special. Another objection may be illustrated by (12). In this sentence the definiteness of the subject is semantically augmented by information about deictic proximity: *der Mann hier* is the one close to the speaker, and *der Mann da* the one not close to the speaker. One might claim now that *der N hier/da* are grammaticalized discontinuous articles which, apart from definiteness, also signal deictic prox-imity. This analysis receives some support from the fact that the older German lexical distinction of the category of deictic proximity with demonstratives, i.e. *dieser* vs. *jener,* has, at least in less formal speech, completely been replaced by *d(ies)er hier* and *d(ies)er da.* Therefore, *hier* and *da* may be taken to renovate a stable category of German nominal expressions. Again, if *son* and *so ein* have the same distribution, what should be special about the fusion of *so ein* to *son* compared to the - incidentally discontinuous - articles *der N hier* and *der N da*? We think differences exist with respect to obligatorification on the side of lin-guistic expression, and with respect to vagueness vs. enforced decision among semantic categories on the side of the content. Note first that, although *der N hier* or *der N da* may be frequently used ways of ensuring correct reference, it is never inappropriate to use only the article and the noun; *hier* and *da* just add something to the meaning of the NP/DP, thereby narrowing down the domain to which the relevant referent belongs. On the other hand, *so ein* or *son* does not just narrow down the meaning of the indefinite article, it introduces a whole new dimension, namely that of a necessarily two-dimensional reference classifi-cation. Consider the following example: you want to buy a jumper, and the shop assistant shows you a selection of different jumpers for you to choose from. In order to say which jumper you have decided to buy, both (13a.) and (13b.) are good answers; (13c.), however, almost amounts to an insult (this point was, less explicitly, already made above with respect to example (6b.)).

(13)   a. (While pointing at the desired jumper)
          Ich möchte DEN Pullover.
          'I want THIS jumper.' (lit.: 'I want THE jumper.')
      b. (While pointing at a jumper which is a token of the type you want to buy)
          Ich möchte SOLCH einen/SOnen Pullover.
          'I want a jumper like THIS.' (more lit.: 'I want SUCH a jumper.')
      c. Ich möchte einen Pullover.
          'I want a jumper.'

Thus, *so ein* or *son* is not just a more specific, and thereby unequivocal, variant of the indefinite article, it is something different. We may also say that the si-tuations in which *so ein* or *son* may be used are not a subset of the situations in which the indefinite article may be used, otherwise (13c.) should be fine.

7   Evidence from some other languages

In this section we briefly survey translational equivalents of German *son* in other languages. The comparison with other Indo-European languages of Europe shows that some languages have article-like forms of comparable distri-bution and function. A look at the translational equivalent of *son* + *N* in Manda-rin Chinese directly supports our main claim concerning the meaning of *son.* The typical picture which emerges if we consider other Indo-European lan-guages is the following: the closest translational equivalents of German *son* come in cognate pairs with corresponding interrogative pronouns. The relevant pair in German is *welcher – solcher* 'which – such'.[3] In this section, we will refer to the class of cognates and/or functional (near-)equivalents of *so(lch)* as TALIS-operators. All of these Indo-European pairs are etymologically related, unless an old form has been replaced. This is, for instance, the case in Swedish, where the archaic TALIS-operator *slik,* corresponding to interrogative *vilk(et),* has to a large extent been replaced by *så(da)n.* Cognate pairs from other Euro-pean languages include Russian *kakoj – takoj,* Lithuanian *koks – toks,* Latin *qualis – talis,* French *quel – tel,* or Portuguese/Spanish *qual/cual – tal.* The exact distribution of these elements varies slightly from language to language,

---

[3] We will not discuss the meaning of interrogatives like *welcher* 'which' in this paper. For German and English, the semantic generalizations which are usually stated concerning these ques-tion words seem to support our hypothesis. Questions with *which* as a question word ask for a referent of some preestablished set or sort, i.e. for a token of a definite type (cf. Heidolph et al. 1981: 657 ff. for an analysis of German *welcher*). If more languages are taken into consideration the situation is getting more complex; in Latin, for instance, the function of *qualis* equals that of Ger-man *was für ein* 'what (N)'. The cognate forms of the TALIS-operator have a more constant mean-ing across Indo-European languages and we will not be concerned with the differences among the interrogative forms any further here.

with the major distinction being whether the non-interrogative member of each pair may be used in the syntactic position of the article if the language under consideration has articles at all. Russian, like most other Slavonic languages, does not have articles, so the question whether *takoj* is an article or not does not arise. Languages with a distribution of the TALIS-operator similar to German include at least Portuguese and Spanish. Although Portuguese and Spanish have an indefinite article, it does not appear in phrases that are translational equivalents of *son*-phrases; consider (14) (recall that *ein son Mann* as in (14a.) does have a good reading, but then *ein* is a numeral, and not an indefinite article).

(14) a. coll. German   (*ein) son Mann   'a man like that'
      b. Portuguese   (*um) tal homem
      c. Spanish   (*un) tal hombre
      d. Italian   *(un) tale uomo
      e. French   *(un) tel homme

Colloquial German differs from French and Italian in the relevant respect, but it patterns with Spanish and Portuguese, so the fact that a language should have an article which combines the semantics of definite type and indefinite token is not completely unheard of. For an argument which immediately underpins our semantic generalization concerning the meaning of German *son* let us turn to Mandarin Chinese. Mandarin does not have European-style articles, but its demonstratives and the numeral *yi* –'one' are, at least in many contexts, used much the same way as articles in other languages. It is a well-known fact that Mandarin is a classifier language. This means that if numerals or demonstratives are to be combined with nouns, a special measure word or classifier must be inserted between the demonstrative/numeral and the noun, because all nouns in Mandarin are (lexically) either collective or mass nouns. The exact mechanisms of this system are highly controversial, but this discussion is irrelevant to the point we would like to make here. The examples in (15) illustrate two relevant uses of classifiers.

(15) a. yi-jian   maoyi
        1-CLASSIFIER   jumper
        'a/one jumper'
    b. zhei-zhong   maoyi
        this-CLASSIFIER:kind jumper
        'this kind of jumper'

(15a.) is a straightforward case which does not need much explanation apart from the note on the use of classifiers above. In (15b.) a special classifier for type reference is used. Using the demonstrative of (15b.) in (15a.) or using the

numeral of (15a.) in (15b.) would also yield grammatical results. Now see what happens when we translate *son* into Chinese:

(16) Wo   xiang yao   yi-jian   zhei-zhong   maoyi.[4]
      I   want   1-CLASSIFIER   this-CLASSIFIER:kind   jumper
      'I want a jumper like this/of this kind.' ('Ich will son Pullover.')

The type of object nominal in (16) is a merger of (15a.) and (15b.): reference to an indefinite token is made, just as in (15a.), and reference to a definite type is made just as in (15b.). What (16) shows is that in Chinese German *son* may be rendered by a complex expression which contains markers for definite type reference and indefinite token reference. This is exactly what our analysis of *son* predicts for a language in which no specialized article for this kind of reference exists.

8 Conclusion

We think that the points in sections 2 through 6 taken together constitute enough evidence for a treatment of the colloquial German article system in terms of a tripartite division, instead of the traditional bipartite one. The third article is *son*, and it characterizes the nominal in which it appears as making indefinite reference to a token of a definite type.

This, as depicted in table 7, yields a less redundant system in which three different articles cover the three common possibilities which result from having the dimension of (in)definiteness interact with the dimension of the type-token distinction.

Table 7

		TOKEN	
		DEFINITE	INDEFINITE
TYPE	DEFINITE	*der, die, das*	son, sone, son
	INDEFINITE		*ein, eine, ein*

We have remained neutral as to whether the fourth logical possibility, reference to a definite token of an indefinite kind, is also a possibility of real-language reference or whether the arrangement in table 7 should rather be changed into a hierarchy as alluded to in section 2.

---

[4] Another version of (16) preferred by some speakers is *We xiang yao yi-jian zhei-zhong-de maoyi*. The use of the attributive clitic *-de* renders this version structurally more complex and less comparable, so we have decided in favour of the simpler version.

References

Abney, S. P. (1987). The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

van der Auwera, J., ed. (1980). The Semantics of Determiners. London & Baltimore: Croom Helm/University Park Press.

Barwise, J. & R. Cooper (1981). „Generalized quantifiers and natural language". Linguistics & Philosophy 4, 159–219.

Bisle-Müller, H. (1991). Artikelwörter im Deutschen. Semantische und pragmatische Aspekte ihrer Verwendung. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Chesterman, A. (1991). On definiteness. A study with special reference to English and Finnish. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drosdowski, G., ed. (1995). Duden. Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 5., völlig neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. (Duden Band 4.) Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.

Eisenberg, P. (1994). Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik. 3., überarbeitete Auflage. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.

Hawkins, J. (1978). Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction. London: Croom Helm.

Heidolph, K. E., W. Fläming & W. Motsch (1981). Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Heim, I. (1982). The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases. Doctoral dissertation. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

Henn-Memmesheimer, B. (1986). Nonstandardmuster. Ihre Beschreibung und das Problem ihrer Arealität. Tübingen: Niemeyer

Vater, H. (1984). „Determinantien und Quantoren im Deutschen". Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 3, 19–42.

Berlin   Daniel Hole

Institut für Englische Philologie, Freie Universität Berlin, Goßlerstraße 2–4, 14195 Berlin

Berlin   Gerson Klumpp

Gartenstraße 109, 10115 Berlin

Rezensionen

Ingwer Paul, *Praktische Sprachreflexion.* Tübingen: Niemeyer 1999

Ursula Bredel

Bei der Transformation wissenschaftlich fundierter Einsichten in gebrauchsfähiges Wissen von Alltagshandelnden steht die Sprachdidaktik häufig vor unlösbaren Problemen. Nicht nur scheinen sich die teilweise recht formalen, abstrakten Beschreibungsapparate der Fachwissenschaft einer einfachen Umsetzung in praktisch verwertbares Wissen zu sperren; auch die Alltagshandelnden sperren sich den spezifisch sprachwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisformen: Wie u. a. Brekle (1985) und Antos (1996) gezeigt haben, werden in laienlinguistischen Sprachreflexionen sowohl andere Gegenstände fokussiert als auch andere Verarbeitungs- und Erkenntnismuster zur Beschreibung sprachlicher Phänomene und zur Lösung kommunikativer Probleme produktiv gemacht. Für die Sprachdidaktik hat Glinz (1993) nachweisen können, daß nicht nur linguistische Laien und SchülerInnen, sondern auch Lehrer und Lehrerinnen alltägliche Konzepte über Sprache fachwissenschaftlichen vorziehen.

Ausgehend von diesem Befund hat man bislang angenommen, daß die didaktischen Konzepte (noch) nicht ausgereift genug sind, um den Transfer von fachwissenschaftlichem in gebrauchsfähiges Wissen zu leisten; die sprachdidaktischen, insbesondere die grammatikdidaktischen Konzeptionen der vergangenen 20 Jahre (z. B. situativer Grammatikunterricht (Boettcher & Sitta 1978), Grammatik-Werkstatt (Eisenberg & Menzel 1995), funktionaler Grammatikunterricht (Köller 1997)) können wohl mit einigem Recht als Lösungsversuche der dilemmatischen Vermittlungssituation aufgefaßt werden. Bei den fachdidaktischen Um- und Neuorientierungen – jenseits aller Verschiedenheit der Ansätze – bleibt jedoch eine Auffassung verbindlich: Damit eine Transformation fachwissenschaftlich abgesicherter Erkenntnisse in das Wissensrepertoire von SchülerInnen gelingen könne, müsse an deren Erfahrungen angesetzt werden.

In seiner Arbeit „Praktische Sprachreflexion" lokalisiert Ingwer Paul eben in den „Erfahrungen der SchülerInnen" nicht den Schlüssel zur Lösung, sondern den Schlüssel des Problems fachdidaktischen Scheiterns. Denn – so die Annahme Pauls – die Erfahrungen, die die SchülerInnen ‚mitbringen', folgen als Resultat „autonome[r] situationsbezogene[r] Umgangsformen mit sprachbezogenem Wissen" (11) einem anderen erkenntnislogischen Modus, der sich nicht graduell, sondern der sich kategorisch vom Modus fachwissenschaftlicher Erkenntnis unterscheide. Eine Transposition der Resultate fachwissenschaftlicher Ergebnisse in handlungspraktisch verwertbares Wissen kann demnach solange nicht gelingen, wie die Bedingungen der Möglichkeit der alltäglichen Reflexionspraxis nicht hinreichend geklärt sind. Mit der Verabschiedung von der Vorstellung eines lediglich graduellen und durch eine Intensivierung fachdidaktischer Anstrengungen aufhebbaren Unterschieds zwischen wissenschaftlicher und alltäglicher Sprachreflexion sind für Paul die Erfahrungen der Alltagshandelnden nicht mehr ein Bedingungsfaktor in einem Gesamtgefüge von Wissen, Wissenstransfer und Wissendem, sondern sie werden zum zentralen Untersuchungsgegenstand.