



On French *un même* and Antispecificity

Isabelle Charnavel

University of California, Los Angeles/Institut Jean Nicod, Paris

icharnavel@gmail.com

Abstract. In this paper, I examine the definiteness problem raised by sentence-internal *même* 'same' in French, as in this language (vs. English), *même* does not only combine with the definite determiner (*le même*), but also with the indefinite article (*un même*). Even if *le même*, like *the same*, does not behave like typical definite descriptions do, it contrasts with *un même* with respect to definiteness and distribution: *un même* is more indefinite than *le même* in that it does not trigger any presupposition at all; moreover, *un même* is more restricted in distribution than *le même* in that it only exhibits sentence-internal readings in antispecific contexts. I hypothesize that both *le même* and *un même* are quantifiers over a plural event that has been distributed, but also contain a domain variable: that of *un même* has to be quantificationally bound while that of *le même* can also be identified by the context.

1 Introduction

Sentence-internal *same* (like *different*) poses a problem of compositionality that aroused the interest of several linguists (Carlson 1987, Moltmann 1992, Barker 2007, Brasoveanu 2009, ...): due to its meaning involving comparison, the interpretation of *same* relies on the presence of a licenser (underlined in 1) that does not directly combine with the DP containing *same*. Under the sentence-internal reading, (1) means that there exists some book *x* such that Mike read *x* and Sue read *x* (while the sentence-external reading depends on identifying some contextually salient book).

(1) Mike and Sue read the **same** book.

But in this paper, I will focus on another related issue raised by sentence-internal *same*: even if DPs with sentence-internal *same* do not behave the way typical definite descriptions do, 'a *same*' is ungrammatical in English; C. Barker (2007: 428) formulates this definiteness puzzle as follows:

Why does *same* require the definite determiner? (Baker 2007: 428)

However, French equivalent of 'same' *même* interestingly combines either with the definite (*le/la/les même(s)*) or the indefinite (*un/une/de même(s)*)

article. Moreover, *le même* behaves like *the same* in that it also presents indefiniteness effects. *The same* can always be translated by *le même*, but also by *un même* in certain cases; in other cases, *un même* cannot be translated by *the same* without changing the meaning.

The main issue is thus to understand in which cases *un même* is licensed if *le même* already behaves like an indefinite. My goal is to describe the semantics and the distribution of *un même* and examine the theoretical implications with respect to definiteness and specificity. To this end, I will first compare *le même* and *un même* with respect to definiteness, then with respect to distribution, and I will finally suggest an hypothesis about the antispecificity of *un même*: I will propose that *un même* and *le même* are quantifiers containing a variable that gets interpreted in different ways.

2 *Le même, un même* and Definiteness

2.1 *Le même* and Indefiniteness Effects

Sentence-internal *même* differs from other terms expressing identity and difference with respect to determiner use.

- (2) a. Julie et Paul ont lu le même livre/#le livre différent/similaire.
 ‘Julie and Paul read the same/#the different/#the similar book.’
 b. Julie et Paul ont lu ??un même livre/un livre différent/similaire.
 ‘Julie and Paul read ??a same/a different/a similar book.’

Moreover, *le même* exhibits indefiniteness effects. First, it does not trigger a presupposition of unique existence as typical definite descriptions do (cf. Barker 2007: 428). This is shown in (3) presenting basic tests for presuppositions: even if the sentence is negated or questioned, the existence of a unique book that Luc and Flore read is not presupposed, but this is precisely what is at issue here.

- (3) a. Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre.
 ‘Luc and Flore read the same book.’
 b. Est-ce que Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre?
 ‘Did Luc and Flore read the same book?’
 c. Luc et Flore n'ont pas lu le même livre.
 ‘Luc and Flore did not read the same book.’

Also, *le même* can introduce a new discourse referent like indefinites (cf. Novelty Condition) as opposed to standard definites.

- (4) A: Pourquoi tu penses que Luc et Flore ont des goûts similaires?
 B: Pendant les vacances, ils ont lu le même livre.
 ‘A: Why do you think Luc and Flore have similar tastes?’
 B: They read the same book during the holidays.’

Furthermore, *le même* can occur in existential constructions unlike typical definites.

- (5) a. Il existe le même problème dans ces trois pays.
 ‘There exists the same problem in these three countries.’
 b. * Il existe le/ce problème dans ces trois pays.
 ‘*There exists the/this problem in these three countries.’

Finally, *le même* can be non specific as exemplified in (6). This is not predicted based on Enç (1991) who argues that specificity corresponds to an inclusion relation in a contextually determined set; since the linking relevant for definite DPs is the identity relation and identity of referents entails inclusion, all definites are expected to be specific.

- (6) Claire et Anne ont acheté la même robe.
 ‘Claire and Anne bought the same dress.’
 a. Specific: there is a particular dress that the speaker has in mind that Claire and Anne each bought.
 b. Non specific: there exists a unique dress – whatever it is, the speaker does not know which one – that Claire and Anne each bought.¹

So *le même* behaves like an indefinite in several respects.

2.2 *Un même* more Indefinite than *le même*?

If *le même* has the properties of an indefinite, how can *un même* contrast with *le même*?

First, *le même* unlike *un même* triggers what I call a global presupposition of unique existence. As seen above, (3) does not presuppose the existence of a unique book that Luc and Flore read (usual presupposition of existence), but it presupposes that Luc and Flore each read a unique book (global presupposition of existence), as shown by Solomon (2009) for *same*. This idea is corroborated by the following examples: the infelicity of (7) points to a global existence presupposition, while that of (8) indicates the existence of a global uniqueness presupposition.

¹ Note that specificity cannot be determined by scope when *same* is involved: because of its meaning, narrow scope of *same* does not entail covariation.

- (7) Est-ce que Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre? #Non, Luc n'a pas lu de livre.
 'Did Luc and Flore read the same book? #No, Luc didn't read any book.'
- (8) ??Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre pendant les vacances, et Luc a également lu *les Misérables* et *Madame Bovary*.
 '??Luc and Flore read the same book during the holidays, and Luc also read *les Misérables* and *Madame Bovary*.'

On the other hand, *un même* does not trigger any presuppositions at all: when *un 'a'* is used, (9) does not presuppose that the children eat round a table, and (10) does not presuppose that each country only has one enemy.

- (9) Dans la plupart des familles nombreuses, les enfants ne mangent pas autour de la/une même table.
 'In most large families, the children do not eat round the/UN same table.'
- (10) Quand deux pays ont le/un même ennemi, ils s'allient.
 'When two countries have the/UN same enemy, they form an alliance.'

Furthermore, *un même* has to be non specific (what I call antispecificity) while *le même* can be either specific or non specific. (11) illustrates that *un même* unlike *le même* cannot be used when the referent can be identified by the context.

- (11) a. Dans chaque système planétaire, toutes les planètes tournent autour de la/une même étoile.
 'In each planetary system, every planet revolves around the/UN same star.'
- b. Dans le système solaire, toutes les planètes tournent autour de la/*une même étoile.
 'In the solar system, every planet revolves around the/*UN same star.'

So the semantic difference between *un même* and *le même* pertains to presuppositions and specificity.

3 *Le même, un même* and Distribution

It appears that *un même* can always be replaced by *le même*, but the reverse does not hold. What is then the contrast between *un même* and *le même* with respect to distribution?

3.1 DP-internal Distribution of *même*

First, let's note that *même* does not exhibit the DP-internal distribution of standard adjectives, which supports the hypothesis that *le même* and *un même* are actually complex determiners.

In fact, *même* cannot be used predicatively.

- (12) a. Ces livres sont *(les) mêmes.
 'These books are *(the) same.'
 b. *Je ne le trouve pas même aujourd'hui.
 '*I don't find him same today.'

Secondly, the only determiners compatible with sentence-internal *même* are the definite determiner *le/la/les*, and the indefinite one *un/une/de*.

- (13) a. lire *quelques/*divers/*certains/*plusieurs/*trois/de/les même livres.
 'to read *some/*various/*certain/*several /*three/ø/the same books.'
 b. lire un/*leur/#ce/le même livre.
 'to read a/*their/#this/the same book.'²

Thirdly, *même* cannot be modified by adverbs.

- (14) Luc et Flore ont lu le (*vraiment/*très/*presque/*tout) même livre.
 'Luc and Flore read the (?really/very/?almost/very) same book.'

Finally, *même* cannot be coordinated with any adjective.

- (15) Luc et Flore ont acheté le (*petit et/*premier et/*seul et) même livre.
 'Luc and Flore bought the (*small and/*first and/*only and) same book.'

Based on these data, I hypothesize that *le même* and *un même* are complex determiners. This is supported by crosslinguistic evidence: Braseovanu (2009) shows that in Romanian, while singular and plural 'different' are adjectival in nature (*alt* and *diferit*, respectively), 'same' is a determiner – the so-called demonstrative article (or pronoun) of identity *același* (agreeing in gender and number), which is the counterpart of the English 'the+same' rather than just 'same'.

3.2 Only one Reading for *un même*

But there are several distributional differences between *un même* and *le même*. First, *un même* unlike *le même* only has sentence-internal readings.

² # indicates that the sentence-external reading is possible, but not the sentence-internal reading that concerns us here.

In fact, *le même* appears in three kinds of contexts: it can have sentence-internal readings (cf. 3); but it can also exhibit sentence-external-readings that depend on identifying some contextually salient book, whether deictically (16) or anaphorically (17); and it can occur in comparative constructions (18).

- (16) Regarde! Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre.
‘Look! Luc and Flore read the same book.’
- (17) J’ai lu *Germinal* pendant les vacances. Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre.
‘I read *Germinal* during the holidays. Luc and Flore read the same book.’
- (18) Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre que toi/l’année dernière/celui que tu as emprunté à la bibliothèque.
‘Luc and Flore read the same book as you/last year/the one you borrowed from the library.’

On the other hand, *un même* only presents sentence-internal readings (19): it cannot appear in comparative constructions (20) and cannot have sentence-external readings whether anaphorically (21) or deictically (22) constructed.

- (19) Une même expression peut avoir plusieurs sens.
‘UN same phrase may have several senses.’
- (20) On ne peut jamais employer *une/la même expression que Paul.
‘One can never use *UN/the same phrase as Paul.’
- (21) Paul a choqué l’assistance en employant une expression très familière. Ses collègues ne pourraient pas employer *une/la même expression.
‘Paul shocked the audience by using a very colloquial phrase. His colleagues could never use *UN/the same phrase.’
- (22) Ecoute ça! On employait *une/la même expression il y a dix ans.
‘Listen to that! One used *UN/the same phrase ten years ago.’

So *un même* is more constrained than *le même* in that it only presents sentence-internal readings.

3.3 The Distributional Constraints on *un même*

Furthermore, the sentence-internal reading of *un même* is itself more constrained. To realize that, we need to first identify the distributional constraints common to *le même* and *un même*.

Le/un même requires distributive licensors, whether obligatorily distributive (some quantifiers, cf. 23a) or optionally distributive (plurals and conjunctions, cf. 23b).

- (23) a. Chaque enfant doit lire le/un même livre.
 ‘Each child has to read the/UN same book.’
 b. Ces enfants/Luc and Flore doivent lire le/un même livre.
 ‘These children/Luc and Flore have to read the/UN same book.’

Conversely, elements that cannot be distributive (singulars or collectives cf. 24a, mass nouns cf. 24b) cannot license *le/un même*.

- (24) a. Luc/la classe doit lire #le/*un même livre.
 ‘Luc/the class has to read #the/*UN same book.’
 b. Le riz coûte #le/*un même prix.
 ‘Rice costs #the/*UN same prize.’

Moreover, the relation between the licensor and *le/un même* resembles the relation between two scope-taking quantifiers. Thus, *le/un même* does not need to be c-commanded by its licensor as opposed to anaphors.

- (25) *Le/un même* joueur peut remporter tous les tournois.
 ‘The/UN same player may win every tournament.’

Also, *le/un même* is sensitive to island constraints (adjunct constraint (26), coordination constraint (27), extraction constraints related to non-bridge verbs (28), wh-islands (29), subject islands (30)).

- (26) a. Aucune région n'est en colère parce que #le/*un même nombre de députés a démissionné.
 ‘No region is angry because #the/*UN same number of deputies resigned.’
 b. Aucune région ne peut élire le/un même nombre de députés.
 ‘No region can elect the/UN same number of deputies.’
- (27) a. Chaque électeur peut voter pour ce président et #le/*un même trésorier.
 ‘Each voter can vote for this president and #the/*UN same treasurer.’
 b. Chaque électeur peut voter pour le/un même trésorier.
 ‘Each voter can vote for the/UN same treasurer.’
- (28) a. Si tous les habitants chuchotent que #la/*une même personne a commis le crime, il n'y a pas d'espoir.

- ‘If every inhabitant whispers that #the/*UN same person committed the crime, there is no hope.’
- b. Si tous les habitants accusent la/une même personne, il n’y a pas d’espoir.
 ‘If every inhabitant accuses the/UN same person, there is no hope.’
- (29) a. Quand Anne et Flore se demandent où #la/*une même personne ira, elles finissent par le savoir.
 ‘When Anne and Flore wonder where #the/*UN same person will go, they end up finding it out.’
- b. Quand Anne et Flore critiquent la/une même personne, elles n’ont pas de pitié.
 ‘When Anne and Flore criticize the/UN same person, they have no pity.’
- (30) a. Qu’un individu commette #le/*un même acte peut constituer un crime contre l’humanité et un crime de guerre.
 ‘That an individual commits #the/*UN same act can constitute a crime against humanity and a war crime.’
- b. Le/un même acte peut constituer un crime contre l’humanité et un crime de guerre.
 ‘The/UN same act can constitute a crime against humanity and a war crime.’

Furthermore, *le/un même* is not only licensed by distributive DPs, but also by conjoined PPs, conjoined Ps, conjoined VPs, conjoined APs and possibly conjoined AdvS, as observed for *same* and *different* by Carlson (1987) and Moltmann (1992), who based on such data proposed an analysis of *same* in terms of events.

- (31) a. Le/un même homme peut composer des opéras et jouer au football.
 ‘The/UN same man may compose operas and play soccer.’
- b. Le/un même homme peut aimer peindre dans son atelier et à l’extérieur.
 ‘The/UN same man may like painting in his studio and outside.’
- c. Le/un même homme peut voter pour et contre un projet de loi.
 ‘The/UN same man voted for and against the bill.’
- d. On peut peindre le/un même jouet en rouge et en bleu.
 ‘One may paint the/UN same toy red and blue.’
- e. On peut cuisiner le/un même plat joyeusement et tristement.
 ‘Luc cooked the/UN same meal joyfully and sadly.’

I showed in Charnavel (2011) that moreover, *le/un même* is also licensed by several possible aspectual notions, such as frequentativity, iterativity (32, 33) or continuativity, durativity (34, 35), which can be expressed by several categories (verbs, adverbs, preverbs, nouns, adjectives).

- (32) Lire le/un même livre plusieurs fois est instructif.
‘Reading the/UN same book several times is instructive.’
- (33) La répétition de la/une même erreur n’est pas acceptable.
‘The repetition of the/UN same mistake is not acceptable.’
- (34) Il est difficile de continuer à travailler dans la/une même entreprise quand on aime le changement.
‘It is hard to keep working in the/UN same company when one likes changes.’
- (35) Une habitation prolongée dans le/un même logement peut poser problème.
‘Extended habitation in the/UN same housing may pose problems.’

In all these cases, a plural event is involved, which is distributed over the overall running time in several ways depending on the aspect that is expressed. So I hypothesize that *le/un même* is an existential quantifier over a plural event (see Charnavel 2011 for more details); this event needs to have independently been distributed through participants or times as formalized below: *le/un même* takes two arguments, its restriction Y and the event predicate Z , and says that for every event e_n part of this (obligatorily) plural event, there is a corresponding individual x_n in e_n part of the restriction set, and all these individuals x_n are identical:

- (36) $\llbracket le/un\ même \rrbracket = \lambda Y_{\langle e,t \rangle} . \lambda Z_{\langle e,vt \rangle} . \exists x_1, x_2 \dots x_n \leq x (e_{n-1} \neq e_n; n \text{ is a positive integer and } n \geq 2)$ such that $Y(x_n)=1$ and $Z(x_n)(e_n)=1$, and $x_{n-1}=x_n$

This is illustrated in (37). In (a), the event has been distributed through participants (possibly through a silent distributive operator): for every subevent e_1 (Luc reading) and e_2 (Flore reading), there is a book x_1 and a book x_2 , such that x_1 is identical to x_2 . In (b), the event has been distributed through times by the adverbial quantifier: for every subevent e_1 (Flore reading at time t_1) and e_2 (Flore reading at time t_2), there is a book x_1 and a book x_2 , such that x_1 is identical to x_2 .

- (37) a. Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre.
‘Luc and Flore read the same book.’
b. Flore lit toujours le même livre.

‘Flore always reads the same book.’

Besides, *un même* has further distributional constraints (note that in the previous examples, these additional constraints were fulfilled so that the constraints common to *le même* and *un même* could be independently examined). The presence of a plural event is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for licensing sentence-internal *un même*, which is only licensed by the following contexts: inside a DP (38), in the context of modality and genericity (39), in the context of arbitrary PRO (40), or in the context of hypotheses (41).

- (38) a. Quatre générations sous un/le même toit
 ‘Four generations under UN/the same roof.’
 b. Ces quatre générations ont vécu sous ??un/le même toit.
 ‘These four generations lived under ??UN/the same roof.’
- (39) a. Un/le même mot peut avoir plusieurs sens.
 ‘UN/the same word may have several senses.’
 b. Un/le même mot a (généralement) plusieurs sens.
 ‘UN/the same word (generally) has several senses.’
 c. Dans ce texte, ??un/le même mot a plusieurs sens.
 ‘In this text, ??UN/the same word has several senses.’
- (40) a. Utiliser un/le même mot de passe pour différents services, ordinateurs et sites internet augmente les risques de se faire voler des informations personnelles.
 ‘Using UN/the same password for different services, computers and websites increases the risks of having personal informations stolen.’
 b. J’ai utilisé ??un/le même mot de passe pour différents services, ordinateurs et sites internet.
 ‘I used ??UN/the same password for different services, computers and websites.’
- (41) a. Si un/le même joueur fait plus de 5 fautes, il est disqualifié.
 ‘If UN/the same player makes more than 5 mistakes, he gets disqualified.’
 b. ??Un/Le même joueur a fait plus de 5 fautes.
 ‘??UN/The same player made more than 5 mistakes.’

So the intuition is that *un même* is licensed in contexts presenting a flavor of generality, i.e. when multiple situations are involved: it is unfelicitous as soon as a particular situation is at stake (antispecificity).

To sum up, I have proposed several hypotheses concerning both *le même* and *un même*: based on the fact that *même* does not exhibit the standard distribution of an adjective, I have hypothesized that *un même* and *le même* are complex determiners. Based on the observation that *un même* and *le même* require distributive licensers (individuals or times) and that they are sensitive to island constraints, I have proposed that *un même* and *le même* are quantifiers over a plural event. Furthermore, I have observed that *un même* has a more constrained distribution than *le même*: *un même* only exhibits sentence-internal readings in antispecific contexts. The question is now to know how to analyse the antispecificity of *un même*.

3 *Un même* and Antispecificity

Let's review in which sense *un même* is antispecific as opposed to *le même*.

First, *un même* cannot be used when the speaker has an individual in mind as its referent.

(42) Dans le système solaire, toutes les planètes tournent autour de la/*une même étoile.

‘In the solar system, every planet revolves around the/*UN same star.’

Secondly, *un même* is not licensed if the referent of its DP has a linking relation with an antecedent, as shown by the absence of sentence-external readings with *un même*. According to Enç (1991), nonspecifics require that their discourse referents not be linked to previously established discourse referents, while specifics exhibit an inclusion relation or any other association with an antecedent.

(43) Paul a choqué l'assistance en employant une expression très familière. Ses collègues ne pourraient pas employer *une/la même expression.

‘Paul shocked the audience by using a very colloquial phrase. His colleagues could never use *UN/the same phrase.’

Thirdly, *un même* does not trigger any presupposition of existence.

(44) Dans la plupart des familles nombreuses, les enfants ne mangent pas autour de la/une même table.

‘In most large families, the children do not eat round the/UN same table.’

Finally, *un même* requires variability of situations.

(45) Utiliser un/le même mot de passe pour différents services, ordinateurs et

sites Internet augmente les risques de se faire voler des informations personnelles.

‘Using UN/the same password for different services, computers and websites increases the risks of having personal informations stolen.’

- (46) Quatre générations sous un/le même toit
‘Four generations under UN/the same roof.’
- (47) Un/le même mot peut avoir plusieurs sens.
‘UN/the same word may have several senses.’
- (48) Si un/le même joueur fait plus de 5 fautes, il est disqualifié.
‘If UN/the same player makes more than 5 mistakes, he gets disqualified.’
- (49) a. Dans chaque système planétaire, toutes les planètes tournent autour de la/une même étoile.
‘In each planetary system, every planet revolves around the/UN same star.’
b. Dans le système solaire, toutes les planètes tournent autour de la/*une même étoile.
‘In the solar system, every planet revolves around the/*UN same star.’

Thus in (49), the plurality of planets illustrates the requirement for *même* that there be several events: *même* expresses uniqueness across multiple events; furthermore, the plurality of planetary systems in (a) illustrates the requirement for the indefinite article combined with *même* that there be several situations: *un même* requires a covarying interpretation and expresses uniqueness relativized to a situation.

Based on Von Stechow (2004)'s idea that quantifiers have a hidden domain argument, I propose that *un même* is not only a quantifier over a plural event, but also contains a domain variable (resource situation pronoun) whose value has to be quantificationally bound; it cannot be identified by a contextually supplied situation. That's why *un même* is licensed by contexts which contain a quantifier over situations or worlds.

- (50) [Dans chaque système planétaire]_i, toutes les planètes tournent autour d'une_i même étoile.
‘In each planetary system, every planet revolves around UN same star.’

On the other hand, the variable contained in *le même* can be either bound by the same operators (non specific reading) or identified by the context

(specific reading). This is formalized below. In the case of *un même* expressing uniqueness relativized to a situation, *s* needs to be quantificationally bound, but since *le même* expresses uniqueness either relativized to a situation or in a particular context, *s* is either quantificationally bound or contextually supplied in this case.

- (51) $\llbracket [e/un\ même] \rrbracket = \lambda s. \lambda Y_{\langle e \rangle}. \lambda Z_{\langle e, vt \rangle}. \exists x_1, x_2 \dots x_n \leq x (e_{n-1} \neq e_n; n \text{ is a positive integer and } n \geq 2) \text{ such that } Y(x_n)(s)=1 \text{ and } Z(x_n)(e_n)(s)=1, \text{ and } x_{n-1}=x_n \text{ in } s.$

The contrast between *un même* and *le même* is parallel to other phenomena.

First, it is reminiscent of Florian Schwarz's dissertation (2009) concerned with the description and analysis of two semantically different types of definite articles in German (weak and strong).

- (52) a. Hans ging zum Haus. (Schwarz 2009: 12)
Hans went to-the_{weak} house
 'Hans went to the house.'
 b. Hans ging zu dem Haus.
Hans went to-the_{strong} house
 'Hans went to the house.'

The weak article encodes uniqueness (relativized to a situation); the strong article is anaphoric in nature (dependent on a antecedent). The interpretation of the weak article definite depends on the interpretation of its situation pronoun, which can stand for the topic situation or a contextually supplied situation, or be quantificationally bound.

So, *le même* contrasts with *un même* like the strong article with the weak article in that it has an anaphoric capacity that *un même* lacks as shown in sentence-external readings. Like the weak article, *un même* expresses uniqueness relativized to a situation, which can be analyzed by use of a resource situation pronoun.

Nevertheless, the empirical divisions between the weak/strong articles and *un/le même* are different: the resource situation pronoun of the weak article can also stand for the topic situation or a contextually supplied situation while that of *un même* cannot: it has to be quantificationally bound.

Moreover, the contrast between *le même* and *un même* is the reverse of the contrast observed by Beghelli and Stowell (1995) between *each* and *every*: the set variable of *each* must be identified by the context, while the set variable of *every* can also be bound by operators.

- (53) a. Every dog has a tail. (Beghelli and Stowell 1995: 32)
 b. Each dog has a tail.

(53a) can be construed as a claim about dogs in general, whereas (53b) must be construed as a claim about a particular set of dogs previously mentioned in the discourse. Thus, the sentence with *each* means that there is a particular situation *s*, a set *X* of all dogs in *s*, such that all the members of *X* have a tail, while the sentence with *every* means that in the default situation *s* where *X* is the set of all dogs in *s*, all members of *X* have a tail. When *every*-DPs occur in generic contexts, they are interpreted as though they were universal-generic quantifiers because they contain restricted variables (ranging over sets) bound by a silent generic quantifier. When *every* occurs in a context associated with reference to a single situation time, it acquires its contextualized universal-distributive reading because it is bound by a silent definite quantifier (existential quantifier ranging over situation-time (existential counterpart of GEN)).

Note that Beghelli and Stowell distinguish quantifiers ranging over situation-times from quantifiers ranging over events. This fits the present analysis since *un même* and *le même*, being quantifiers over events, could not be bound by quantifiers over events themselves, but can only be bound by hierarchically higher operators like quantifiers over situations.

	Domain variable bound by operators	Domain variable contextually supplied
<i>le même</i>	x	x
<i>un même</i>	x	
<i>every</i>	x	x
<i>each</i>		x

4 Conclusion

To summarize, *même* presents two main puzzles: a compositionality problem and a definiteness issue. Concerning the first one, I hypothesized that *le même* and *un même* are existential quantifiers over an event that has been distributed over participants or times. As for the second problem which was my main concern here, I observed that French *un même* documents the availability of the indefinite determiner with *same*, even if *le même* already presents indefiniteness effects. The distribution of *un même* shows its antispecificity and therefore questions the following generalization: definites are assumed to be specific while indefinites are specific or non specific; but

actually, *le même* is specific or non specific while *un même* is non specific (antispecificity). To account for that, I proposed that *un même* introduces a variable that has to be bound by operators over situations, while the variable introduced by *le même* can also be contextually supplied. I believe it would be worth further investigating this phenomenon and similar ones, as it may be fruitful to relate definiteness and specificity with the interpretation of domain variables in quantifiers.

References

- Barker, Chris. 2007. Parasitic Scope. *Linguistic and Philosophy* 30. 407–444.
- Beghelli, Filippo & Tim Stowell. 1997. Distributivity and Negation: the Syntax of *each* and *every*. In Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*. 71–109. Kluwer.
- Brasoveanu, Adrian. 2009. Sentence-internal *different* as Quantifier-internal Anaphora. In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. 72–80.
- Carlson, Greg. 1987. *Same* and *Different*: some Consequences for Syntax and Semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2011. On the Sentence-internal Reading of French *le même*. In *Proceedings of the 20th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The Semantics of Specificity. *Linguistics Inquiry* 22 (1). 1–25.
- Fintel, von, Kai. 2004. A Minimal Theory of Adverbial Quantification. In Barbara Partee & Hans Kamp (eds), *Context Dependence in the Analysis of Linguistic Meaning*, Volume 11 of *Current Research in the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface*. 137–175. Elsevier.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 1992. Reciprocals and *same/different*: towards a Semantic Analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15. 411–462.
- Solomon, Mike. 2009. Partitives and the Semantics of *same*. *Sinn und Bedeutung* 14 handout.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2009. *Two Types of Definites in Natural Language*: Umass PhD. Thesis.