CHAPTER FOUR

Pragmatics: Uses of the Bare Singular NPs

1. Introduction

Several works examining English count nouns that denote places have noted that when location nouns occur without a determiner, they are used to refer to institutions rather than physical spaces (Quirk et al. 1985, Cienki 1989, Soja 1994). These works all make note of one of the sets of bare singular NPs described in Chapter 3—the Social/Geographical Spaces. In this chapter I will show that bare singular NPs are used to convey a wider range of meanings than the nonphysical institution sense. In Section 2, I detail two types of inferences that can be produced by the use of PPs containing bare singular NPs: Activity Implicatures and Familiarity Implicatures. Then I contrast these two meanings with generic senses, which can also be conveyed by the use of bare singular forms in PPs. In Section 3, I examine the types of meanings produced when bare singular NPs occur in subject and direct object positions.

1. Earlier versions of parts of this chapter were presented at the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (see Stvan 1993) and the 1997 Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America (see Stvan 1997).
comparing them with their senses when they are prepositional objects.

Finally, in Section 4, I lay out some constraints on the domains or genres in which bare singular NPs are found and note how the use of bare singulars can take part in reinforcing mutual knowledge.

1.1 Traditional Schematic for Bare Form Uses

Articles are used in English NPs in a number of predictable ways to add information that helps a speaker clarify the referent of an NP, such as through indefinite, definite, or generic uses, as shown in (1)–(3).

(1) a. We generally meet at a restaurant—the Royal Pancake House. (indefinite, specific)
   b. They generally meet at a restaurant—whichever one is open. (indefinite, nonspecific)

(2) We met at the restaurant. (definite)
(3) The restaurant is a sit-down eating establishment. (generic)

When no overt article appears before a noun, the nouns tend to be either mass, abstract, proper, or plural, as in (4)–(7).

(4) Water filled the tunnel beneath the city.
(5) Silence filled the hall.
(6) Tom reported on the bill’s progress.
(7) Cats were sunning themselves in the front windows.

Christophersen (1939) groups the seven uses of English noun phrases shown in (1)-(7) along two intersecting continua of qualities. The first axis, described as “continuous to unital,” ranges from mass and plural forms to singular count forms. The other axis, described as “unfamiliar to familiar,” encompasses the shift from indefinite to definite, abstract to concrete, and generic to specific. According to Christophersen’s system, shown in Figure 1, zero and a contrast with the, with the zero-form used with more continuous concepts and a used with more unital ones. This means that zero-form NPs should be interpreted as less familiar and less unital than NPs with articles. While this accounts for some actual uses of bare singular location forms, I will show that in other cases, just the opposite holds true: some bare singular NPs are used to identify a definite, specific place.

2. Christophersen’s system conflates information from different linguistic components: syntactic markers of definiteness and number, semantic qualities of abstract/concrete, cognitively determined but syntactically marked categories of mass/count, and pragmatically influenced distinctions of generic and specific reference.
1.2 Three Special Uses

As predicted by Christophersen's model, it is common for the three more "continuous" noun types to occur with the zero-form after a preposition, namely, mass nouns, abstract nouns, and plurals, as in examples (8)-(10):

(8) In space no one can hear you scream. (ad for the film *Aliens*, 1979)
(9) in sickness and in health
(10) I feel sick when I read in cars.

In addition, however, as was shown in the groupings in Chapter 3, count-like bare singular NPs also occur quite frequently following a locative preposition. Examples of such forms are shown in (11a-d):
(11) a. The sermon is about Saint Jeremy, who like Mr. Mazowiecki was in prison and "needed to be rescued." (Amity Shlaes, “Solidarity Assumes Awesome Task of Reviving Poland,” Wall Street Journal, Aug. 21, 1989)


c. As long as Columbus remains at sea aboard the Santa María, one can almost imagine him to be the mythic Renaissance navigator one formerly supposed him to be: full of the new Florentine science, exhorting his men to ignore superstition and homesickness, cutting a brilliant route—a real find—across an unfamiliar ocean. (Verlyn Klinkenborg, The New Yorker, Nov. 11, 1991, p.120)

d. Look out, America, the world’s smallest con artist is in town. (Billboard for the movie Curly Sue, 1991)

Christophersen (1939:81) notes that it is often believed that “the shifting between zero-form, a-form, and the-form is as regular as a case-distinction.” This approach would seem to indicate that a simple semantic or referential determination is required in deciding among article forms. In the case of locative PPs such as those in (11), however, I suggest that neither a truth-functional semantics nor existing the typology of definite referring expressions adequately captures the full meaning conveyed by the

3. The fact that sentences used without full speaker-hearer feedback provide inadequate information by which to choose just one correct article form is seen by studies such as Wachtler (1988) in which native speakers of English were asked to fill in the spaces before nouns with either the, an or ø from the text of a Time magazine article from which all determiners had been removed. None of the 24 informants chose all the same words that had been deleted from the original passage.
expressions. Information conveyed by these NPs through their lack of
determiner is not purely semantic, but is also the result of one of three
pragmatically distinct interpretations. The following section presents a
more formal analysis of the three bare form uses.

2 Three Pragmatic Inferences

2.1 Introduction

Lyons (1977:648) notes that speakers refer to objects in two ways—on
the one hand we describe or name objects, as shown in (12a), and on the
other hand we locate objects, as shown in (12b):

(12) a. my computer, Josephine, that book about goldfish
b. in the doorway, over here, next to the blender

As I will show, however, when concrete English nouns denoting locations
occur with the zero form of the article, they are used to convey three ver-
sions of location-related information: instead of merely naming a loca-
tion, these NPs are used either to evoke an activity that is associated
with that place, to specify the particular location which is relevant to ei-
ther the speaker, hearer, or locatum, or to refer generically to an entire
class of places. So in addition to Lyons’ dichotomy between naming and
locating, I will show that objects expressed as bare singular forms can be
used to predicate a state of the locatum, as well to name a specific place,
and a kind of place.

I show three types of pragmatic inferences that are licenced by a speaker’s use of a bare singular NP. With one bare NP use, which I call an Activity Implicature, the main purpose is not to locate the referent of the object NP, but to predicate the activity or state of the referent at such a location. In both (13a) and (13b), for example, the highlighted NPs are used to indicate the location of the Congressman, while in (13c), it is information about the activity of the locatum that is conveyed—i.e., the speaker of (12c) asserts that Rostenkowsky is serving time as a prisoner (which in itself presupposes that he spends some time located in a prison. Cf. Section 2.3.2).

(13)  

a. Congressman Rostenkowsky is in a prison.

b. Congressman Rostenkowsky is in the prison.

c. Congressman Rostenkowsky is in prison.

The second type of inference licensed by a speaker’s use of PPs containing location NPs without articles I shall refer to as a Familiarity Implicature. Not only does this use convey a sense of location, but it is used to pick out a specific location relevant to the locatum, speaker, or hearer. This type of implicature relies on the type of shared knowledge that
would occur if a possessive determiner or deictic determiner were included in the NP. For example in (14a) and (14b), where articles are used, the Johnsons can be interpreted as being located in some town, while in (14c) the town referred to is in particular the town of the speaker, of the hearer, or of the Johnsons themselves—that is, a town connected to one of the discourse participants:

(14)  
a. I just heard that the Johnsons are in a town.  
b. I just heard that the Johnsons are in the town.  
c. I just heard that the Johnsons are in town.

The PP in (14c), therefore, could be paraphrased as “in this town,” or “in our town,” or “in their town.”

The third use of the zero form is used to refer more broadly to all members of the class named by the NP. Thus in (15), campus is intended to stand for all campuses under the jurisdiction of the Senate’s law:

(15)  
An amendment to the Senate’s anti-drug bill would have barred alcohol companies from sponsoring any sort of event at all on campus.  

These three uses of the zero form are not wholly in agreement with the
properties expected from Christophersen’s chart in Figure 1. Activity Implicatures do create a more continuous or “less familiar” sense, thus the PP in prison is used to refer not to an actual prison, but to the main purpose or activity that such a place would typically involve. But the Activity sense is just as much like the unital meaning created by an indefinite article; it is used to create a non-specific sense, plus some conventionalized information about the noun’s function. Likewise, the Familiarity Implicature creates a sense different from that which the chart predicts—it creates a “more familiar” sense in the NP not merely as definite (as it would be with the article the) but as being the one location known to belong to one of the people involved in the discourse. The Familiarity sense, then, represents a kind of definite reference. Generic expressions, however, are truly less unital and less familiar, treating the NP as part of a larger mass so named. Since only Generic expressions fit the zero form behavior of Figure 1 adequately, the meanings conveyed by the zero form cannot be as simply categorized the chart suggests.

A better depiction of the functions of the zero form are shown in Figure 2.
Bare NPs are chosen to convey one of three meanings that run along a continuum of referentiality:

- **Familiarity sense** implicates definiteness via place deixis (this town, one’s home) or shared knowledge (e.g., our church, his school; or in town vs. in the country, or in town vs. out of state)

- **Generic sense** predicates something true of the whole class of such NPs. This use characterizes the kind, no individual member is referred to.

- **Activity sense** implicates that the locatum is taking part in typical activities of some such NP; not referential, though at least one such place is assumed to exist (i.e., non-specific NP).

**Fig. 2. Three Functions of Bare Singular NPs**

Of these three uses, the expressions cover a spectrum of referentiality, as shown in Figure 2. The Activity sense is a non-referential use, the Generic sense refers, but only to a whole class, while the Familiarity sense picks out a most precise referent. Reference grammars and ESL texts often give lists of PPs containing bare singular NPs, noting their marked syntax, and observing that in such constructions the nouns have a less concrete or more generic sense (e.g., Christophersen 1939, Quirk et al. 1985). To restate, the problem with such an approach is that the group of PPs containing bare singular NPs is heterogeneous, consisting instead of NPs that can be used in three distinct types of reference.
2.1.1 Diagnostics for Separating Activity and Familiarity Senses

In order to identify which type of inference is generated when a bare NP location is used, it should be possible to substitute different grammatical phrases which more overtly express each implicated meaning without losing the semantic meaning each bare NP location conveys. (Unlike the test of non-detachability in section 2.1.2.2 below, in which I substitute a paraphrase of what was said, in this test I will substitute a paraphrase of what is implicated.) For phrases used to generate Activity Implicature, either an adverbial phrase which explicitly states the action or situation of the locatum\(^4\) or a temporal PP in which the NP is interpreted as a durative event (\textit{before/during/after school}) can be substituted for the PP. On the other hand, felicitous substitution of a possessive or deictic deter-miner within the PP should verify that the phrase gives rise to a Familiar-ity Implicature. (Substitution tests for Generic expressions will be detailed in section 2.4.) Note that for Activity senses, the whole PP is involved in the meaning, while for Familiarity and Generic senses it is only the NP.

Examples of the Activity and Familiarity substitution diagnostics are shown below. For the example in (16), substitution of a VP maintains

\(^4\) Cf. Perez (1973), who she suggests that adnominal PPs following the verb \textit{be} should be considered cases of verb deletion.
the meaning conveyed by the phrase *in jail*, but including a possessive in the phrase does not.

(16) In September, she pleaded guilty and paid a $500 fine. Her alternative was 90 days in jail.

= serving as a prisoner in a jail
≠ in her jail

The substitutions show that the use of *in jail* creates an Activity Implicature.

In (17), on the other hand, *at home* functions to indicate whose home, so substitution of a possessive in the PP maintains the meaning, while replacing the PP with a VP does not. Thus, *at home* creates a Familiarity implicature.

(17) I work at home, and I have found that this arrangement has a tremendous potential for personal growth, because nobody will notice if you eat as many as 20 lunches per day.
(Dave Barry, usenet group clari.feature.dave_barry, May 9, 1992)

= in my home
≠ while being/ sitting/ working in a home

Some NPs allow both types of inferences, as shown in (18) and (19), where substitutions are possible for both Activity and Familiarity paraphrases:
"Did you notice Mr. Boldwood’s doings in church this morning, miss?" Liddy continued, adumbrating by the remark the track her thoughts had taken.

(Thomas Hardy, *Far from the Madding Crowd*, 1874, Gutenberg etext)

= in our church
= in a church as a worshiper/ during church services

During their first year at school, children become Octobrists and wear the badge of Baby Lenin.


= at their school / at this school
= at a school as students/ while attending school

The results of these diagnostics on representative Social/Geographical Spaces in the corpus are shown in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>Activity OR Familiarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>court</td>
<td>campus</td>
<td>bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jail</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prison</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
<td>college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because their referents are not the kinds of places people assume a loca-tum would want to lay a personal claim to, the nouns in the fist column of Table 14 are not used to create Familiarity readings. That is, while
there may be a town that is *his town* or a school (or two) that is *her school*, the people involved in the typical activities of the locations in the first column, perhaps because the activities are unpleasant or not as intentionally habitual (*jail, prison, court*), or the place is too public to personally claim (e.g., *sea*), are not referred to as having their own sea, jail, etc.⁵ All the words in The words that are used in the familiarity sense, however, are more personally connected in a long-term way to the possessing locatum.

2.1.2 Conversational and Conventional Implicature

Pragmatics provides a vocabulary for discussing the different uses of bare constructions. A number of works, notably Grice (1967), have attempted to characterize the distinction between the way utterances can sometimes be used to convey only a constant literal meaning and sometimes be used to successfully communicate other less transparent information as well. Grice divided these meanings into ‘what is said’ and ‘what is implicated,’ respectively. ‘What is said,’ or the ‘conventional force’ of an utterance, can be determined by examining the truth conditions that hold for it, while what is implicated must be inferred by

---

⁵ This holds true for the *in court* data in the corpus, which were all presented from the perspective of either the prosecuting or accused parties in a trial; I found no tokens of judges using *in court* to mean ‘my court’, though this usage may well occur.
assuming that one’s interlocutor is attempting to communicate cooperatively.

The examples in (13), repeated hear as (20), all convey some of the same information: that is, they can all be used at some point to talk about Rostenkowsky when he is located inside some prison.

(20)  a. Congressman Rostenkowksy is in a prison.
     b. Congressman Rostenkowksy is in the prison.
     c. Congressman Rostenkowksy is in prison.

The three utterances, however, do not share the same truth conditions, since (in addition to the definiteness variation in the (a) and (b) examples) if Rostenkowsky happens to be a visitor touring a prison, (20c) would not be true, while (20a) and (20b) still would be. Likewise, in (14), repeated here as (21), there is some set of semantic information shared by the three sentences: each is true some time when the Johnsons are located in some town.

(21)  a. I just heard that the Johnsons are in a town.
     b. I just heard that the Johnsons are in the town.
     c. I just heard that the Johnsons are in town.

Here, however, the difference is that only the speaker of utterance (21c) is conveying whose town the Johnsons are visiting. Thus (21c) is the most specific in picking out a town, and also the most context-depen-
dent; it would be false, for example, if the Johnsons are in some random city unknown to both speaker and hearer.

However, while the truth conditions are not the same within each set, the meaning differences for each group are not calculable merely by examining the semantic content contributed by each of the utterance’s elements. Pragmatic information is necessary to capture the additional meaning conveyed by the lack of article, since this meaning depends on the discourse context as well as on shared knowledge assumed by the speaker and hearer.

So, what kind of implicature is generated when no article is used? Grice subdivides what is implicated into either conventional or conversational implicature. Conventional implicatures result in “non-truth-conditional inferences that are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention” to particular words or phrases (Levinson 1983:127). Traditional examples include the conjunctions but and however, which not only convey the semantic sense of conjunctivity which they share with and, but are also used to implicate contrast. Similarly, discourse-deictic terms such as still and although are used conventionally, but non-truth-conditionally to indicate
the relationship of ideas expressed in different parts of a discourse (that is, their felicitous use does not require altering what holds true if and were used instead). To summarize, conventional implicatures are non-truth-functional, but are context-independent. Conversational implicatures, on the other hand, involve arriving at a meaning beyond what is expressed by the truth conditions by assuming the use of Grice’s conversational maxims in a given instance. Grice suggests a number of necessary criteria for distinguishing the two types of implicature. Hirschberg (1991) modifies Grice’s diagnostics and comes up with three tests for distinguishing conventional from conversational implicature: cancelability, nondetachability, and reinforceability.

2.1.2.1 Cancelability
The ability to cancel or deny the content of an implicatum without a sense of contradiction (as opposed to merely calling it into question, a difference noted by Horn (1972)) is evidence of conversational implicature. In (22) and (23), the (a) sentences contain a locative expression.

6. Relevance theorists (e.g., Sperber and Wilson 1986, Blakemore 1987, Carston 1993) disagree with Grice about conventionalized forms being implicature at all, but rather see such uses as decoding of explicit content (i.e., explication) which can be both linguistically encoded and contextually inferred. Thus words or constructions that a Gricean theory sees as being used for conventional implicature, within relevance theory would be considered examples of enrichment of semantic representations.
without an article, the information it conveys appears in (b), and in (c) this implicatum is overtly denied:

(22)  
    a. My husband is in prison—I visit him every day.  
        (Ken Follet, Pillars of the Earth, 1989, p. 370)  
    b. being held as a prisoner in a prison  
    c. # My husband is in prison, not being held there as a prisoner.

(23)  
    a. A union spokesman said, ‘We’ll discuss the matters in court.’  
    b. as part of a trial  
    c. #We’ll discuss the matters in court, but not as part of a trial.

Both (22) and (23) are examples of Activity Implicatures. The oddness of the (c) examples here indicates that the implicata created by uttering (22a) and (23a) cannot be felicitously canceled. This result indicates that these inferences are not conversational implicatures.

The sentences in (24) and (25) contain examples of Familiarity Implicature:

(24)  
    a. And even the bride is torn between the desire not to have bags under her eyes the next day and the feeling that it’s stupid to do nothing, especially if there is anyone in town involved in a form of entertainment that does not feature her at its center.  
        (Miss Manners, usenet group clari.feature.miss_manners, May 16, 1992)
b. in this town, where the wedding is being held

c. # It’s stupid to do nothing, especially if there is anyone in
town—although not this town where the wedding will be ...

(25) a Years ago, he had a back problem and was stuck at home
for a while.
(Mike Royko, usenet group clari.feature.mike_royko,
May 11, 1992)
b. at his home.
c. # He had a back problem and was stuck at home for a while,
but he did not remain in his own home.

For this second type of inference, cancellation again does not seem possi-
ble, since canceling the implicated information in (24c) and (25c) creates
anomalous utterances.

2.1.2.2 Nondetachability

The ability to felicitously substitute one truth-conditionally equivalent
utterance for another is another test for conversational (vs. conventional)
implicature. Obviously a difficulty with this test is determining the exact
conventional force of an utterance, as well as finding a synonymous
phrase for that meaning. In (26) and (27) when the prepositional phrase
with the location, shown in (a), is replaced with a presumably synony-
mous phrase, shown in (c), the implicated meaning of (b) is no longer
conveyed:

(26) a. My husband is in prison.
    b. being held as a prisoner in a prison.
    c. My husband is inside [some] building for holding criminals. [c≠b]
(27)  a. There was scarcely a family in town that was not represented in the confirmation class, by a cousin, at least. 
(Willa Cather, *O Pioneers!,* 1913, Gutenberg etext)
b. in our town / in that town  
c. There was scarcely a family within [some] small metropolis. [c≠b]

The implicated Activity meaning in (26b) is not necessarily conveyed by (26c). For the Familiarity meaning in (27) the same is true; in (26) and (27) the implicature disappears when the wording of the utterance is changed. Thus the implicatures of these bare singular NPs are not non-detachable, and therefore they are not conversational.

### 2.1.2.3 Reinforceability

The third key test for conversational implicatures is based on observations by Horn (1972) and Sadock (1978). This test relies on the fact that, since conversational implicatures are not a part of the conventional force of an utterance (but are instead part of each particular context), it should be possible to make them explicit without being redundant. This means it should be possible to overtly conjoin the information implicated in (28a)-(30a) to what is said without producing a redundant utterance.\(^7\)

The results of reinforcing the implicata in this way are shown in (28c)-(30c):

\(^7\) Again, note that this is different than substituting the implicated information for the bare form, as I did with the earlier diagnostics; instead, this test is meant to see if giving both forms together is infelicitously redundant.
Here the addition of information making the implicata more explicit creates less felicitous sentences. This test is particularly difficult for the Activity Implicatures since, as I will show, it is less clear what the separate conventional force is for these phrases. However, bare singular NP inferences for both Activity and Familiarity Implicatures fail the test for reinforcement without redundancy and do not qualify, therefore, as conversational implicatures by this third diagnostic.

Notice, however, that it is possible for the implicated information to be conveyed along with the PPs containing bare forms if the PP is not simply conjoined as equal information, but is instead added at a different level, explicitly as clarification. This is shown in (31), where the underlined phrase does not just restate that the locatum was in bed due to illness,
but relates the kind of sickness from which he suffered.

(31) While his sons have been on the acquisition path, the elder Mr. Sada has been in bed recovering from a coronary bypass operation three weeks ago.

Likewise, in (32) the underlined phrase does not merely restate that the locatum was held in jail for committing a crime, but instead specifies the crime:

(32) And in a case filed in federal court in August, a lawyer is arguing that Missouri authorities are wrongfully imprisoning the fetus of a pregnant woman who is in jail for theft and forgery.

For some PPs, non-redundant restating of information can also occur if the activity is stated before the PP, in which case the PP is interpreted in the locational, Familiarity sense. This is illustrated in (33) where, since the activity of falling asleep is already spelled out, in bed is used to convey that Ryan was in his own bed:

(33) a. One night in late September, I looked in his room as he was falling asleep in bed and said, "I love you, Ryan."
In summary, neither Activity nor Familiarity Implicatures withstand cancellation, nor are they non-detachable, and both seem at least mildly odd when the implicatum is explicitly reinforced through conjunction. Thus, it seems that the additional meaning of NPs without articles is conveyed by conventional rather than conversational implicature.

2.1.2.4 Introducing Q vs. R Implicatures

While Grice’s distinction between conversational and conventional implicature captures an important distinction within these inferences, this division can be approached in another way. Horn (1984) rearranges these categories, proposing that all implicatures where the implicatum consists of information in addition to what is said fall into the category of R-Implicature, while implicatures which convey that the semantic meaning is the most that can be said are categorized as Q-Implicature. Under this system, NPs that trigger Activity Implicature, which convey not only location information, but also information about what the locatum is doing there, would seem to fall clearly into the category of R-Implicatures; NPs that trigger Familiarity Implicature, giving more specific detail about a location, are likely candidates for R-Implicature as well.

In the case of the Q-Principle, the hearer assumes that what is said is
the most that can be truthfully be claimed. With the R-Principle, the hearer assumes whatever additional information is needed to fill out the stereotypical case if the speaker did not indicate otherwise. The ability of a speaker to successfully use this latter, more indirect form is based on the idea that there are certain circumstances that will be assumed by the hearer to be the unmarked case. This understating technique is similar to Atlas and Levinson’s (1981) Principle of Informativeness, which also puts the burden of filling in the details on the hearer.

2.1.2.5 Testing for Q and R Implicatures

Horn (1984) suggests that Q and R implicatures can be distinguished by their ability to be canceled by negation. Specifically, an utterance conveying a Q-based implicatum can be metalinguistically negated or questioned without affecting what is said, while an R-based implicatum cannot be canceled by negating what is said. This accounts for the difference between the negated (c) examples in (34) and (35).

(34) Q-based Implicature

- a. He ate some of the cookies.
- b. He didn’t, however, eat all of the cookies.
- c. He didn’t eat some of the cookies...
- d. [Not just “some” of the cookies] In fact he ate all of them.
R-based Implicature

a. She was able to solve the problem.
b. And she did, in fact, solve the problem.
c. She was not able to solve the problem.
d. She was able to solve it, but, in fact, she did not.

In (34), the implicated information brought about by the use of *some* in (34a) is stated fully in (34b). What was said in (34a) is negated in (34c). If reinterpreted metalinguistically via a special intonation emphasizing *some*, the implicata in (34b) can be cancelled. Otherwise, it is what is said in (34a) that is negated. The example in (35), however, does not work the same way. Here again the implicated information is shown in (35b). The negation of what is said is shown in (35c). However, in this case, regardless of prosodic prominence, negating what is said does not cancel the implicated information in (35b), so that the negative form in (35c) does not convey the cancelled form in (35d). This contrast is due to the different types of implicatures associated with *some* in (35a) and *be able to* in (35a).

Additionally, Horn notes that when an R-based implicatum has become conventionalized as part of the literal meaning, negation of an utterance can cancel the conventionalized meaning, but may still leave intact the original sense of “what is said”. As an example, he cites the socially narrowed meaning of “drink” (Horn 1984:22), illustrated in (36).
The word *drink* has become conventionalized to mean an alcoholic drink, so that uttering (36a) implicates (36b). However, negating what is said, as in (36c), still allows the more general reading in (36d) to be true, while cancelling the implicated sense in (36b).

Another general predicate which is used to implicate a more particular stereotypical instance is shown in (37), but this time not involving a conventionalized implicatum:

(37) a. The surgeon saved the patient’s life.
    b. The male surgeon saved the patient’s life.
    c. The surgeon didn’t save the patient’s life.
    d. A woman saved the patient’s life.

Here the information some hearers might infer from (37a) is that the surgeon is male, as shown in (37b). However, negating (37a)—as shown in (37c)—does not cancel the implicatum (the surgeon’s sex); only what is said is negated.

To see whether Activity and Familiarity implicatures are examples of R-
Implicature, I apply Horn’s negation diagnostic, as shown in (38)-(41).

(38)  
   a. My husband is in prison.  
   b. being held as a prisoner in a prison  
   c. My husband is not in prison—he’s just cleaning it.

(39)  
   a. A union spokesman said, “We’ll discuss the matters in court.”  
   b. as part of a trial  
   c. We won’t discuss the matters in court—we’ll discuss it over lunch.

Examples (38) and (39) show PPs that give rise to Activity Implicatures. (38a) contains the implicature trigger, the bare singular NP and (38b) gives the implicated information. Negating (38a) produces the first clause of (38c), which cancels the implicatures connected to the phrase in prison. In other words, a speaker uttering (38c) would be taken to deny that the husband is being held as a prisoner. Similarly, the speaker who utters (39c) would be saying that the discussion is not to be part of a trial. Given Horn’s claim that only conventionalized R-based implicata can be canceled by negation, the examples in (38) and (39), which both involve Activity Implicature, must be conventionalized R-Implicatures.

Familiarity Implicatures behave similarly, as illustrated in (40)-(41):
    b. here in this town
    c. We don’t pay more than other people in town.

(41)  a. After delivery I have visited students in the hospital or at home to keep their work current. (Marion E. Kabaker, “Double Life Keeps Pregnant Students and a Comedy on Track,” Chicago Tribune, Monday Dec. 21, 1992, Tempo, p. 3)
    b. in their homes
    c. I have not visited students at home.

Examples (40) and (41) show PPs used to convey Familiarity Implications. The example in (40a) can be used to implicate the information shown in (40b). Negating the (40a) utterance produces (40c), by which the speaker denies the aspect that is implicated. That is, a speaker uttering (40c) would be denying that they paid more than people in the designated town. Likewise, in the negated utterance shown in (41c) the speaker is denying a visit to the students’ homes.

With a conventionalized form, when the implicatum is denied, what is said can still be true. This means that the conventional force of (40)—that the locatum is in a location—can still be true. That is, a person can still be “in some town” even if she is not “in (her/this) town.” The extra Familiarity sense has become a conventionalized meaning in
these NPs, just as the meaning of “alcoholic beverage” has become conventionalized as the meaning of *drink*. For Familiarity Implicatures this works just fine. The problem is that “what is said” is not always clear for Activity Implicatures. That is, while we still have an idea that being “in X” entails being located in the denoted place, in fact that may not always be true—at times, no location is being asserted. For example, in uttering “When I was in school I used to go to the Wednesday matinees” speakers would not be talking about being in a school building, but about the stretch of time the time during which they attended college classes. This might be compared to what could happen if people began to ingest powdered alcohol: we might continue to say they had a drink, meaning that they had some alcohol, even when they might not have had what was the original semantic sense of a drink—that is, a liquid.

For Familiarity Implicatures, however, the results of negation are clear. In (40) the speaker is still speaking of one designated town, whether his brother is in it or not. In (41) the speaker will visit or not visit the students in their own homes; either way *at home* refers to the same place—it refers deictically to the student’s homes.\footnote{Negating what’s implicated is demonstrated in the following joke:}

\begin{quote}
Salesman: Young man, is your mother home?  
Boy: She sure is.  
Salesman: Could you get her please.
\end{quote}
what is said is not affected while the implicated deictic sense is negated, these implicatures qualify as conventionalized R-Implicatures.

It is interesting that the lack of article seems to create a conventional type of implicature since Grice (1967) describes the use of the English indefinite article as a typical example of generalized conversational implicature. Grice suggests that the indefinite article is used to implicate that the referent of a direct object does not belong to or is not associated with the referent of the subject NP. Hence a speaker uttering (42a) can implicate (42b):

(42)  a. I walked into a house.
    b. The house was not my house.
        [=Levinson (1983:126) ex. 103/104]

Grice suggests that “an X” means ‘not [the] one connected to the speaker’. This only applies for a small set of nouns, however (perhaps

Boy: I can’t--she’s not here.
Salesman: I thought you said she was at home!
Boy: I did, but this is not my home.

I will show in Section 2.2.1 that part of this ambiguity is due to the boy anchoring the meaning of home off of himself and the salesman anchoring it off of the house he is currently at. But, cancelation features are illustrated here, too. If the boy claims his mother is not at home, he would be canceling the implicated information that she is in his home. (Or from the salesman’s point of view the boy would be canceling the information that she is in this home) because at home conventionally implicates the specification of the location. This is not limited to the word home, but, in the appropriate setting, would also apply e.g. to
overlapping with the Familiarity NPs), since, for example, it is quite possible to “pick up a glove,” and have it be one of your own gloves. Birner (1988) explores this choice of indefinite article and points out that John broke his finger yesterday should not be felicitous since it does not provide more information than John broke a finger today and therefore would be expected to be avoided under Horn’s R-Principle. Birner proposes that the choice of the determiner (a vs. his) “appears to be a function of syntactic construction, extralinguistic context, and number of the relevant body parts” (1988:138). Thus, following Herskovits (1985) it might be more accurate to call this construction a ‘use type’ for the indefinite article, along the lines of “a + noun for which a single token is owned by a person.” This use type, involving the “can’t say more” nature of the Q-principle, would come into play in contexts involving certain NP referents, rather than requiring a separate class of implicatures or a separate lexical item for a.

2.2 Familiarity Implicature

This section looks more closely at the NPs involved in Familiarity Implicature and the aspects of deixis and definiteness that influence this use. The inference that I am calling Familiarity Implicature is licensed when a bare singular NP is used to pick out a location which is not just the cur-

at work, and at campus.
rently most relevant place named by the noun, but is the particular one made salient due to its being connected to the speaker, hearer, or locatum. I suggest here that this connection is due to the NP’s serving as a deictic anchor. Levinson (1983) notes that “place or space deixis concerns the specification of locations relative to anchorage points in the speech event” (1983:79). Bare singular NPs which can generate Familiarity Implicature have this anchor built in. Because they are a type of deixis, they therefore involve a type of definite reference as well since, as Levinson notes, there are “fairly close connections between deictic determiners, third person pronouns and the definite article ... All three categories are definite, and definiteness may perhaps be an essentially deictic notion” (1983:83). More specifically, as I will show in the next section, these bare forms qualify as the type of place deixis that Fillmore (1975) calls ‘symbolic’.

In the examples of Familiarity Implicature listed in (43)-(49), note that locative PPs that contain bare forms are not restricted to any particular syntactic positions—they may be complements of be (as in 43a), adjuncts to another verb (as in 44a), or modifiers of nouns, as in (45a).9 The

---

9. As in (43b), 18 of the 53 tokens of in town in the corpus occurred following a noun that was modified with a superlative adjective, indicating that “the Xest Y in town” is a set construction (but not a use type, since it provides no variation in meaning for in or town).
examples include *work, home, town, campus,* and *state*—the NPs that were found to create only a Familiarity, not an Activity sense—as well as such NPs as *school* and *camp*, which can be used to convey either meaning.

(43) a. Look out America, the world’s smallest con artist is in town. (=11d))

b. Mr. Deaver is trying to reclaim his reputation as one of the savviest image makers in town. (Jill Abramson, “In Nation’s Capital, Scandal Needn’t Cut One’s Speaking Fee,” *Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 26, 1989)

(44) a. I work at home, and I have found that this arrangement has a tremendous potential for personal growth, because nobody will notice if you eat as many as 20 lunches per day. (=17))

b. He likes watching TV at his grandmother’s. “We don’t got cable or a remote control at home,” he says, hopscotching the channels from “Family Challenge” to “Let’s Make a Deal” and on to “Rugrats.” (Susan Sheehan, “Kid, Twelve,” *The New Yorker*, Aug.19, 1996, p. 53)

(45) a. My father, partly to avoid having to answer my questions, spent most of his time in his book-lined office on campus, joining my mother and me only at mealtimes, so that we could speak of dogs as a family. (Richard Russo, “Dog,” *The New Yorker*, Dec. 23 and 30, 1996, p. 75)

b. The following week should work. Which days will you be on campus? (G. Ward, email correspondence, Aug. 25, 1996)
(46) a. Bailiffs claimed they were required to chauffeur him to and from work, mow his lawn, chop his wood, fix his car and even drop by his house to feed his two grown mutts, Dixie and Husky.  

b. Stephen Young, a self-employed piano technician, had just returned from work and was looking forward to taking a nap when Sam called with the news that Andrew had been shot.  
(Tori Marlan, “Dealing Death,” The Chicago Reader, June 6, 1997, Section 1, p. 24)

c. I brought a portable radio in to work.  
(Radio talk show transcript)

(47) a. At the same time, tens of thousands supposedly are moving out of state to escape the hubbub.  

b. He called Singer first, finding him finally downstate at the Seventh Division construction office.  

(48) It was the end of her first year teaching, and since she wasn’t going to be returning to school in the fall my parents had invited her to spend the long holiday weekend with us at our summer house, about two hours from school.  

(49) a. When, many years later, I would return to camp for a quick, anxious visit, there she would be.  
b. You walk into camp just around dinner time tonight, ragged and emaciated after an epic trek, and tired of subsisting on moss and invertebrates, but alive, whole, and proud of yourself.

In all of the examples of Familiarity Implicature, the bare singular NP provides information that the location is the particular one mutually known by speaker and hearer—as if the NPs contained a possessive determiner or deictic determiner. In (43a), for example, town is understood as your town, used to refer to the hearer’s town; in (43b) town denotes his town, or at least the town picked out by both the speaker and hearer as the one that Deaver works in; while in (44a) home means my home, that is, the home of the speaker. These examples show that it can be any of the discourse participants—the speaker, hearer, or the locatum—who is the anchor for Familiarity Implicature.

2.2.1 Deixis
Because the meanings of expressions involving Familiarity Implicature often function like ones containing deictic determiners (e.g., in town = in this town), it is useful to examine which elements these PPs might share with other indexicals, that is, expressions which have a fixed sense but a reference that shifts depending on the context in which it is uttered (Bar-
Hillel 1954). In his talks contrasting different kinds of deixis, Fillmore (1975:44) contrasts expressions that are deictic because they contain personal pronouns (e.g., *in front of me*) with instances of the deictic use of an orientational expression itself; the area picked out by the phrase *to the left of the oak tree*, for example, varies in its reference depending on the orientation of the speaker and hearer relative to the tree. Fillmore identifies gestural, symbolic and anaphoric uses of place deixis. The three examples below, taken from Fillmore (1975:41), illustrate these different types by using the indexical *there*:

(50) I want you to put it there. [gestural use]

For (50), Fillmore notes that the hearer has to know where the speaker is pointing in order to know what place is being indicated.

(51) I drove the car to the parking lot and left it there. [anaphoric]

In (51) the word *there* refers to a place which has been identified earlier in the discourse, namely the parking lot.

(52) Is Johnny there? [symbolic use]

In (52), used while speaking on the telephone—where obviously the hearer can see no gesture—*there* is understood as ‘in the place where
you, the hearer, are.’ The last two uses also represent a division in the kinds of reference objects that speakers can use in locating something. Locata can be positioned relative to a reference object (one that is physically present or one named through the discourse) as in (51); reference objects can include discourse participants. Another aspect is that the anchoring can be attached to a place at the coding time (the time the speaker/writer utters the phrase), the decoding time (when the hearer/reader receives the utterance), as in (52), or a place continuously associated with the participant regardless of where they currently are. Not just deictic proforms such as here and there can be used in these ways. The examples contained in (53) provide additional examples of gestural and symbolic uses, which include nouns with deictic determiners:

(53) If during my lecture you hear me use a phrase like “this finger,” the chances are fairly good that you will look up to see what it is that I want you to see; you will expect the word to be accompanied by a gesture or demonstration of some sort. On the other hand, if you hear me use the phrase “this campus,” you do not need to look up, because you know my meaning to be “the campus in which I am now located,” and you happen to know where I am. The former is the gestural use, the latter the symbolic use.

(Fillmore 1975:40-41)

Bare singular NPs can be used for the ‘symbolic’ use of deixis as well. In (53), Fillmore’s use of this campus pinpoints a location by referencing it
off of the place in which the speaker and hearer are both currently situated. In other words, it is deictically picked out relative to the speaker and hearer at coding time. This contrasts with the bare singular example in (45b) in which the campus referred to is not (necessarily) one that either interlocutor is on at the time of the utterance, but is instead the campus location continuously associated with the speaker and/or hearer across time. Thus some ambiguity is possible in using Familiarity Implicature, due to two possible deictic uses—*in town*, for example could be used to mean *this town* (anchored by time to the current location) or *our town* (anchored to the participants no matter where they are, across time).

It is useful to remember that for Familiarity Implicature expressions (e.g., *out of town, in town, in state, at work*) it is not the location named by the whole PP (whether that be a location point or a traversable location) which the bare form marks as known; it is just the referent of the NP that is made more precise. That is, if people move *out of state*, the point to which they move may not be precisely known by the hearer, but the state out of which they move is taken to be identified by knowing the location of the anchor.  

10. This is true even in cases where the anchor is a variable. For example, though (i) applies to people from any number of states, the state which one is ‘out of’ will only be an anchor to one state for each given
As an example of the possible interpretations of a single PP, consider again (48), repeated in (54).

(54) It was the end of her first year teaching, and since she wasn’t going to be returning to school in the fall my parents had invited her to spend the long holiday weekend with us at our summer house, about two hours from school.

Because the author mentions the distance between his home and school, the NP *school* can be taken to refer to a physical place and not a social institution; under traditional descriptions of bare noun uses—in which the bare form is only used to denote an institution—we would expect a concrete referent to have a determiner in the NP. We have seen, however, that several bare singular NP interpretations are possible. Since the referent of *school* in (54) is neither an institution, a generic class of buildings, or an activity (such as attending school), here the use of a bare form would indicate that it is the Familiarity sense that is intended rather than the Activity Sense, both of which are possible with the word *school*.

Most of the Social/Geographical Space NPs have human anchors, but in person.

(i) Out-of-state tuition is higher in the West than in the East.
a few cases, such as *deck*, the immediate deictic anchor is a location at the coding time. The NPs are indirectly connected to people, however, since the objects that are located on *deck* are located on the deck of a particular ship, one made salient by the presence of the discourse participants, as illustrated in (55):

(55) a. Do you think they’re monitoring us, right now? Up on deck?  

b. Up on deck, thinking of spending five days on the Dolphin, I began to be seized by feelings of panic and pain I couldn’t explain.  

In (55), then, *deck* does not mean ‘my deck’ but rather ‘the deck of the ship I am on.’

The reflexive deictic qualities of a few NPs used to generate Familiarity Implicature have been previously studied. The use of *home*, in particular, has been examined in detail in Fillmore (1991). His corpus-based study shows that *home* has a core relational sense in which, in possessive forms, it tends to indicate the home’s residents, rather than its architects, brokers, etc. More to the point, he also claims that in its use as a PP with an empty preposition (cf. Ch. 1, footnote 16), *home* contains an anaphoric element, so that it must always mean the home of someone.
Jackendoff et al. (1993) elaborate on this point, showing that the someone is determined by Principle A of Government and Binding theory (Chomsky 1981); that is, when used in anaphora, the antecedent of home must (roughly speaking) occur in the same clause as the locatum who lives in there. They note that school, too, is anaphoric, though less locally; for other Familiarity bare nouns the possessor can be in a higher clause. This looser anaphoric sense that Fillmore and Jackendoff et al. describe correlates with the ability of home, school, town,\textsuperscript{11} work, state, and campus to serve as deictic anchors for Familiarity Implicature. Examples of the looser syntactic constraints mentioned by Jackendoff et al. are illustrated in (56):

\begin{itemize}
\item[(56) a.] I heard that Grace will be in town in July.
\item[(56) b.] Do you know if Jeff will bring the car to school?
\end{itemize}

In (56a) the anchor of town can be Grace, or it can be I, located in a higher clause. In (56b) school can be anchored off of Jeff, but also off of you, located in the higher clause. In addition to the entities mentioned in the discourse, the anchor in (56a) can be you, the unmentioned

\textsuperscript{11} Judgments show two possible meanings for in town: one uses it to establish a contrast with in the country or in the suburbs, that is, it is used to mean inside the town proper; the other is the Familiarity implicature reading of in my/your/his town. Since this does not seem to affect the division (i.e., both meanings are R-Implicated, but do not convey an Activity sense), I have not pursued this distinction here.
hearer, and in (56b) the anchor can be me, the unmentioned speaker. So not just syntactic constraints, but discourse elements determine the anchor.

Jackendoff et al. propose that the binding of ‘intransitive home’ could be accounted for with an empty preposition, though this does not specify when to rather than at should be interpreted. They also posit a bound pronoun or PRO in the determiner position. They note that such an empty determiner cannot freely occur in all determiner positions (they suggest it occurs only for home and school). As we have seen, not all bare nouns can be used to convey the Familiarity sense; likewise, they question "how particular nouns can license empty bound determiners" (Jackendoff et al. 1993:76). Leaving aside the empty preposition situations, we have seen that as the object of a preposition, home, like other NPs used in Familiarity Implicature, has special anchoring uses. The phenomenon is more widespread than just home and school, though still quite constrained. While it is not clear why only home, work, school, campus, state and district are used in this way (if it were solely a question of maximal relevance, for example, one would expect all habitable locations to be used in Familiarity Implicature, but #in dormitory, #at hotel), but between implicit possessor binding and symbolic deixis, we can
begin to see how this implicature works.

2.2.2 Definiteness

In considering how the speaker indicates which particular location is the one that should form the anchor of a Familiarity Implicature, it is useful to consider the workings of definiteness in discourse. Formal definiteness is marked on an NP to show that the speaker believes the hearer can identify the particular referent the speaker has in mind (Clark 1974, Halliday and Hasan 1976, Chafe 1987, Prince 1992, Gundel et al. 1993, Birner and Ward 1994, Ward and Birner 1995, Lambrecht 1994). Chafe (1976:39) suggests that “identifiable” would be a more accurate label than definite, while Lambrecht (1994) notes that cognitively, definiteness is a combination of identifiability and uniqueness. The following list shows ways in which a speaker is licensed to assume that the addressee is able to identify the referent:

(57) -- unique referent (e.g., the first atomic bomb detonation)  
-- uniquely salient one (e.g., the earth, the moon, the sky)  
-- identifiable in a physical context (cf. physical copresence)  
-- identifiable in a social group (cf. community, family)  
-- prior mention in the discourse (with indefinite article; using modifiers)  
-- entailment of one particular to another  
(sale » money; house » door)  
(Chafe 1976: 39-40)
Rochester and Martin (1977) suggest that a speaker marks an NP according to whether or not the hearer needs to look further for complete referent identification information; however, since the instructions encoded in the NP don’t say precisely where to locate referents within the context of the utterance, a really successful communicator would be one who assists the hearer by “placing referents for definite NPs in accessible locations” (Rochester and Martin 1977:249). 12 Rather, we might say that a speaker marks an NP in a way that allows a hearer to locate the most relevant referent or antecedent.

The definite article is one clue about what the speaker expects the hearer to know (or how far the hearer needs to look). Use of the bare form can indicate definiteness too, but it narrows the range of identifying contexts. When a speaker utters *in town*, the town referred to must be not just a town known to the speaker and hearer according to one of the criteria listed in (57), for example, but a town that is bound to one of the current discourse participants.

If we apply Rochester and Martin’s analysis to bare singular nouns, we see that using the bare singular form provides another way to lead the

12. Confusingly, Rochester and Martin use ‘referent’ to mean both antecedent in the discourse and real world referent.
hearer to the right referent—to indicate either that there is not an indi-
vidual referent meant (through Generic or Activity Implicature) or to lead 
the hearer deictically to the specific referent (through Familiarity Implica-
ture).

2.3 Activity Implicature
The second type of inference that bare singular NPs may be used to gen-
erate is the one in which the PP containing the NP is used to predicate 
the activity of the locatum. There are at least three constraints on an NP 
used to generate Activity Implicatures: it must be a Social/Geographical 
Space, it must have a stereotypical activity associated with it, and it 
must identify a location attended by people who typically do that activity 
for a set duration. These features will be addressed in Section 2.3.1. An 
analysis of “what is said” by a PP used in Activity Implicature is exam-
ined in Section 2.3.2. Models for assessing activity information from a 
lexical entry are discussed in Section 2.3.3.

2.3.1 Which Activities Are Involved
While a noun’s having an “associated activity” is necessary for it to be 
used in this type of implicature, this association is not sufficient. Many 
location nouns which seem to belong to the same semantic category as
Social/Geographical Spaces, e.g., those in (57), do not occur in the bare singular form, as illustrated in (58).

(58) clinic office stadium
    gymnasium park station
    library pool store
    museum resort theater

(59) a. # Pat was at library for six hours.
    b. # Lou just got back from gymnasium.
    c. # She spent the day at museum.

Likewise, not just any activity can be felicitously conveyed without an article, even though it might be one that is associated with the location. For example, a person who works at a jail, as a warden or janitor, could not be referred to as being “to jail.” This is illustrated in (60), where the located person is not being imprisoned, but is visiting her husband who is a prisoner.

(60) She went immediately to the jail, but it wasn’t a visiting day and she was put off until the next visiting day. (Alec Wilkinson, “Midwest Murder,” The New Yorker, June 8, 1992, p. 55)

Using no article here would be misleading. For the reader to find the correct interpretation, the prepositional phrase must contain an article.

However, for some bare NPs for which an Activity Implicature is possible,
more than one activity may be implicated for a single location. Both at school and in class, for example, may be used to convey that a person is either teaching or attending classes. Likewise in bed can convey that someone is sleeping, having sex, or suffering an illness—all of which are stereotypical in bed situations.

With Activity Implicature, the locative PP is used to predicate that the located entity is involved in some activity. These PPs may occur as complements to the be, as in (61a), or they may follow a verb that already specifies some action of the subject, as in (61b).

(61) a. “If Nicomedes Zuluaga with all his power has been in prison for months, who is going to cry for you?” asks Vincenzo D’Elia, general manager of a SmithKline Beckman Corp. Venezuela unit, who hasn’t been implicated. (Jose de Cordoba, “Illegal High Jinks at Recadi,” Wall Street Journal, Aug. 24, 1989)

b. Off and on since then, the companies have skirmished in court. (Jeffrey A. Tannenbaum, “Tiny Firm Faces Legal Might of Wrathful Multinational,” Wall Street Journal, Oct. 16, 1989)

The forms in (61) are used to assert information about the locatum, while not, necessarily, referring to any particular location. Thus, for example, in (61a) the reader infers not that Zuluaga is located in some particular prison, known or unknown, but rather that he is serving time as a pris-
oner (although this, of course, generally presupposes that he served that
time in some actual prison). Likewise, in (61b) what is asserted is not
that the skirmishing took place in a specific court room, but that this oc-
curred as part of a trial (although again, the process of a trial typically
occurs in a court room).

Many nouns which denote a place when used with spatial preposition,
have an event sense when used with temporal prepositions, so, not sur-
prisingly, many of the same Social/Geographical Space NPs that can be
used in Familiarity and Activity Implicature can also be found in PPs
with temporal prepositions:

(62) a. Did you brush your teeth before bed?
    b. That summer, before camp I bought a new compass.
    c. The teacher made him stay after class.
    d. What are you going to do after college?
    e. Did you stop at the store before school?
    f. We will meet in the basement for coffee after church.
    g. He stopped off for a drink after work.

2.3.2 Presupposed Information
So far, I have identified two distinct meanings that can be conveyed by
using a bare singular NP form in a locative PP. The Familiarity sense, to
use Christophersen’s (1939) terminology, produces a “more familiar”
sense and specifies, through symbolic deixis, that the location is the one most salient to the speaker, hearer or locatum; the Activity sense conveys the activity of the locatum, based on culturally determined stereotypes concerning certain locations, which are part of in the lexical entry for each noun. Although I have claimed that what is inferred by hearing an Activity Implicature is information that is in addition to what is said, in fact, sometimes denotation of a location is not part of the truth-conditional meaning at all. For example, during the time when people are “in college,” they may not be physically at a college location the whole time (or any of the time) that they are enrolled in courses. The bare singular NPs used in Activity Implicature are not used to refer directly to an actual location. This is demonstrated by the varying anaphoric possibilities shown in (63).

(63)  

a. Pat is in prison.  
It is a 3-story concrete building.

b. Pat is in a prison.  
It is a 3-story concrete building.

c. Pat is in the prison.  
It is a 3-story concrete building.

If the NP does not have a deictic sense of possession or time/place coding, then the zero-form of the article, as seen in (63a), functions to
mark the NP as non-referential. While NPs used in Familiarity Implicature are referring expressions, the PPs used in Activity Implicature are predicates. Although a person who is in prison or in college may in fact be in a building with that designation, this is understood via lexical presupposition, or some other subsequent inference, since among the things assumed by the in prison scenario, for example, is that there is some place typically used to contain the prisoner.

In keeping with this piece of shared information, bare singular NPs can sometimes be used in talking about a place, but only through a chain of related inferences. In (64), a child asks about the status of workers in a detention center car wash:

(64)    Child: Are these people in jail?
        Parent: Yes, this is sort of a jail.
        (M. Schub in conversation, 10/24/92)

If the people referred to in (64) are in jail (i.e., serving time), then there must be a jail, and so the parent can answer yes, even if the car wash is not a stereotypical jail location.

Lexical presupposition could also account for the temporal sense of some activity-evoking NPs. One of the things presupposed by being in school is that the experience lasts for a set length of time (e.g., from 9 a.m. to 3:15
p.m.; Monday through Friday; from September to June; until graduation/retirement). The asserted aspect of this predication, however, is that the locatum is directly involved in the activity; any other information (including the location) is inferred, through presupposition, and depends both on how detailed the mutual stereotyped scenario is for being in a school and on the context of the utterance. Thus it is possible to imagine a situation such as (65) in which the locatum is in prison, although he is not at the moment inside a prison:

(65) The new employee at the grocery store can’t work the night shift since he’s really still in prison—till the end of August; he’s on a work furlough and has to go back at 5:00.

2.3.3 Activity: Duration at the Location

One aspect of the pragmatics of bare nouns used to convey the activity sense has to do with the duration of time spent in the relevant location. Not just regular attendance at a location is required but, crucially, a set duration of time must be applicable to the activity in question. Also, this schedule is assumed to be not unique to a single person, but is regarded as holding true for any person who would attend the location. The relevant interval depends on the particular community, i.e., the length of time spent at the location would be different for church, school, and
prison, but people who attend those places do so for a set time each time they attend. With library, store, or park, however, while people may go there every weekend, there is no fixed time that one typically stays in these places.\textsuperscript{13} The perception of the stereotypical activity of a location seems to be based on the viewpoint of an off-the-street patron of the location, since libraries, stores, and parks all have employees who work at those places for regular hours; their activities, however, do not seem part of our perceived use of the location.

This generalization, fits at least the core examples contrasting in church, in school, in prison with *at store, *in library, *in garden. This would lead one to expect that workplaces such as offices would also be likely to be associated with Activity Implicature since a typical office seems like a place with a most predictable schedule. And indeed such usages are attested. Consider, first, (66):

\begin{quote}
(66) “Why did you call me out of office, then?” enquired Martha sullenly.
(Doris Lessing, Martha Quest, New York: Signet Books, 1952, p. 141)
\end{quote}

The first office token concerns a young woman who has been called away

\textsuperscript{13} For in hospital, which occurs in British English usage, the hours of the hospitalization activity may not be set, but I suspect that some minimum time, say an over-night stay, is required to qualify a person as being in hospital.
from her job as a legal secretary to spend the day helping her sick father.

Another example of *office* used as a bare singular NP involves a temporal rather than locational sense:

(67) By now Martha was nearly hysterical, for she had been sent a letter, by office boy, from Donovan, saying she must meet him at McGrath’s immediately after office, because it was very urgent. (Doris Lessing, *Martha Quest*, New York: Signet Books, 1952, p. 143)

While *office* does not show up without an article very often (and (66) in particular, sounds odd in American dialects unless office refers to an elected office), it is clearly the same kind of stereotypical action associated with a location that is found in other instances of Activity Implication. However, in American dialects, (66) and (67) are infelicitous. One possible explanation for this is that the bare form use of *work* blocks more specific subtypes of work spaces (cf. *Why did you call me away from work; she must meet him at McGrath’s immediately after work*).

2.3.4 Models for Accessing Stereotypes

Several models have been suggested to describe the ways in which hearers make the connection to information that is conveyed implicitly. In their work on definite reference and mutual knowledge, Clark and
Marshall (1981) touch briefly on the connection a hearer makes between a referent that is copresent with the speaker and hearer and something that is already mutually known:

To understand Ann’s *I wonder where the city hall is*, Bob doesn’t need to believe that the city hall is mutually known, but merely that he and she mutually know about that town (the anchor) and that they mutually know that towns of that size ordinarily have a single city hall (the anchor cable). (Clark & Marshall 1981:26)

In other words, Bob must check what is stereotypical of towns and make the connection to the town he is presently in; that connection is the cable leading from the anchor. In another model for knowledge based on community membership, Clark and Marshall discuss a way of cross-referencing information from an ‘encyclopedia’ of mutual knowledge which is divided into sections for each person with whom a speaker shares a subcommunity.

Both the anchor cable and the encyclopedia models attempt to describe how related information about a particular object can be successfully communicated without being actually said. Accessing such information relies on the intersection of the lexicon and real world knowledge. Pustejovsky (1991) posits an additional model for storing such associated aspects of a noun’s denotation in what he calls the noun’s ‘qualia
structure’. In this model, each noun’s entry in the mental lexicon contains different types of information about the referent of the noun and its use in the world, which would be available for synecdoche, implicature, and other non-literal uses. This qualia structure, Pustejovsky suggests, captures the “system of relations that characterizes the semantics of nominals, very much like the argument structure of a verb” (1991:22). Under this system, verbs would no longer be the main determiners of meaning. Instead of simply treating arguments as input to a verb’s function, where they are limited to being affected by the verb, arguments can be seen as taking an active role in the semantics of the predication, allowing what Pustejovsky calls “co-compositionality” in meaning determination. Thus, just as a verb can select for an argument type, Pustejovsky suggests that an argument is in turn able to select the predicates that govern it.

In setting up his model, Pustejovsky provides a set of slots within each noun’s lexical entry filled with information concerning different aspects of our basic knowledge about the entity in question, i.e., information about the noun’s meaning that is taken to be stereotypical in a discourse community. The four basic roles that he suggests should make up the qualia structure for a lexical item are the following: 1) the constitutive role—this
tells the form and components of the referent; 2) the formal role—this
tells the entity’s placement in a larger hierarchy of categorization, i.e.,
how it differs from co-hyponyms and what its own hyponyms might be;
3) the telic\textsuperscript{14} role—the purpose and function of the object in the world,
i.e., who uses it and for what; and 4) the agentive role—how the object is
brought about, i.e., whether it is an artifact, a natural kind, part of a
causal chain, etc. These four roles cover a number of things speakers
are expected to know about the referents of nouns, although it could cer-
tainly be argued that additional roles might come into play. For the pur-
poses of capturing the stereotypical or prototypical use of Activity Impli-
cature, however, it seems like the most appropriate role would be Pusteu-
ovsky’s telic role, since this would be where information on the usual
use of the noun’s referent is stored.

Pustejovsky uses a person’s ability to access information in a noun’s
qualia structure as an alternative to positing a number of polysemous
verb entries in the lexicon. For example, instead of suggesting two differ-
ent structures for a verb such as \textit{begin}, one of which takes a complement
which is semantically an activity (as in (68a)) and one of which takes a
different complement type, as seen in (68b), Pustejovsky suggests a case

\textsuperscript{14} This is a separate meaning than the use of “telic” to mean ‘having an
endpoint,’ as in the work on aspect by Vendler (1967), inter alia.
of what he calls “type coercion”: a verb may coerce the meaning of an NP into the semantic type it requires of its arguments if it can find the required event type among the attributes of the noun listed in its qualia structure.

(68) a. Tom began eating at 6:00.
    b. Tom began dinner at 6:00.

Thus one can say begin dinner even though begin usually requires an activity as its complement, because the verb begin is able to access the qualia structure of dinner and find the activity eat listed as its telic attribute. Since eat satisfies the semantic type required by begin, and dinner satisfies the complement type required by eat, then to begin dinner can felicitously be interpreted as to begin to eat dinner.

A similar kind of process can be said to underlie the different meanings available for PPs containing bare singular NPs. A qualia structure would again allow us to avoid multiple entries for the same word, but this time for prepositions that occur with location nouns. For example, rather than positing multiple entries for the word at, one that requires a location for its complement, another that takes a complement conveying an activity meaning, and a third whose complement indicates to whom the
location belongs, we can use the qualia structure as a place to search for more information until we have found a felicitous match.

We saw in Chapter 3 that one preposition can be interpreted differently depending on the semantic domains to which its complement belongs, as in (69):

\[(69) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. & \text{ at the train station} \\
    b. & \text{ at 6:00 o’clock} \\
    c. & \text{ at her wit’s end}
\end{align*}
\]

But to interpret a complement with a bare singular NP is a different task. In this case, as shown in (70), the complements are all NPs containing the same noun; thus, all have complements from the same domain:

\[(70) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. & \text{ Mike is at school.} \\
    b. & \text{ Mike is at a school.} \\
    c. & \text{ Mike is at the school.}
\end{align*}
\]

The presence of an article in the NP, therefore, might indicate that the noun was to be interpreted as naming a concrete location. If there is no article, a hearer may need to delve into the noun’s qualia structure to satisfy the need for a location, since a locative preposition, such as \textit{in}, \textit{on}, or \textit{at}, normally requires a locative NP complement. With bare singular NPs, while the noun does denote an entity which in some uses is
identified with a place, without an article to point out the entity as a particular instance of an entity at the denoted place, other information about the noun’s referent might also be asserted. Further information can be found in the qualia structure so that the requirements of the preposition are met. In other words, the inclusion of an article indicates that the NP is to be interpreted foremost as a location; but the absence of an article indicates that location information may need to be searched for. In a sentence such as (71), what is said fulfills the need for a location, while in (72), without an article to clarify the assumption of a unique referent, no denoted location is immediately picked out:

(71) John was at the school.
(concrete referent, spatial at is satisfied)

(72) a. John was at school.
(more information needed-->
  b. school allows a familiarity anchor, school = ‘his school’
  c. school is used for habitual activity, PP gets reanalyzed as a predicate, at school = ‘attending school’

In the case of (72), where the complement of the preposition is a bare singular NP, although the noun appears to be of the category “location,” the NP is not treated as a location unless it is marked in some way, such
as with an article. However, further information is available in the qualia structure. As indicated above, the most relevant section of the qualia structure is the telic attribute: here information about the use of school is listed, including the fact that school is a place stereotypically used for both teaching and learning, and that one typically attends a school on a regular basis.

2.3.5 Putting the Implicatures to Work

With many bare NPs, it is possible to contrast pairs and triplets of forms that do or do not have articles, in order to demonstrate the range of meaning bare NP implicature will convey for a speaker. Below, I illustrate ways in which a speaker exploits the two inferences created by the bare form.

The first example involves the hearer’s expectations of the use of the Familiarity Implicature. Often the use of the word home with an article in English has the separate euphemistic meaning of an institution (which is in fact not the person’s own house), so that to “put someone in a home,” means in a nursing home, a home for the elderly, etc. An example that plays with our expectations of the Familiarity Implicature comes from an ad for the United Way/Crusade of Mercy. The billboard features
a photograph of an old woman, underneath which appears the text in (73):

(73) Like most people her age she belongs in a home. Her own.

The reason (73) makes the reader do a double take is because the presence of an article leads one to expect it will be the euphemistic reading rather than the Familiarity-evoked reading one would get without the article. However, the second sentence of the text emphasizes that the Familiarity reading is intended and is truth-conditionally still possible. The ad exploits the fact that both at home and in a home are possible ways to refer to a location; the writers intend the reader to believe at first that they do not mean the woman’s own home since they did not choose the available construction that would implicate that (i.e., at home).

An example of avoiding Activity Implicature is provided in (74):

(74) “I guess like every human being for a fleeting moment as you walk into the prison, as you glance down death row, you pause to think about the faces you see,” Dole remarked after visiting the gas chamber at San Quentin. After this little reverie, as Routers reported, Dole quickly went on to reaffirm his support of the death penalty. (Bob Dole, In These Times, April 15-28, 1996, p. 7)

In (74), the use of prison in the bare singular NP form could convey that Senator Dole was commenting on what it was like to walk into prison as
a prisoner. Instead, he is a visitor talking about visiting a particular prison which contains death row prisoners; use of the article avoids the unintended interpretation.

A triplet of tokens involving Activity Implicature appears within twelve pages of each other in a novel about the building of a cathedral. In (75), the speaker (who has just received a kiss) is on the construction site of a cathedral, and is therefore not taking part in a regular church service; hence the use of an indefinite article in the NP:

(75) He pulled away from her and said, “We’re in a church!”
(Ken Follet, *Pillars of the Earth*, p. 437)

Likewise, in (76) the locatum is again not in the church building for a religious service, so an article here, a definite article, is appropriate:

(76) King Stephen was holding court in the church, for there was no castle or guildhall here.
(Ken Follet, *Pillars of the Earth*, p. 449)

In (77), on the other hand, the speaker is actually attending a mass—the stereotypical activity of a cathedral—thus his use of the bare NP is felicitous:
(77) He wondered if it was a sin to have an erection in church. 
(Ken Follet, Pillars of the Earth, p. 439)

In fact, the construction of the utterance requires the reader of (77) to interpret the locatum as taking part in the stereotypical activity of a church, thus adding to the irony of the sentence.

2.4 Generics

Previous work examining bare singular NP forms has usually suggested that PPs containing these bare NPs are only interpreted generically—that is, the NP can be used only to refer to a whole class rather than a specific entity. (Cf. Christophersen 1939, and Hall & Hall 1969.) While the existence of Familiarity Implicature argues against bare forms having only non-referential uses, and the Activity Implicature represents a non-referential use, I propose that there is also a generic sense that can be conveyed by the use of certain PPs containing bare singular NPs. This third sense is distinct from the Activity sense since it does not predicate an activity of the locatum, yet it is also distinct from the Familiarity sense in not linking the location to a specific discourse anchor. Examples of this generic use are provided in (78).
(78) a. The contrast is apparent on campus, too. Unlike their predecessors in the Vietnam era, many ROTC students today can be seen wearing their uniforms and boots—not just to military classes, but all day long.
(Jill M. Bullock, “ROTC Regains Respect on Campuses As Graduates Fare Well in Workplace,” Wall Street Journal, Sept. 11, 1989)

b. These joint ventures suggest that there are opportunities in prison for many kinds of companies.

Krifka et al. (1995) distinguish generic NPs (kind-referring NPs, as opposed to individual-referring NPs)\(^\text{15}\) from generic sentences (characterizing sentences, rather than particular sentences) and detail diagnostics for identifying generic NP uses. This division allows them to reject earlier generalizations about generic uses, e.g., that indefinite singular forms are per se generic uses (they show that this is so only in characterizing sentences). Their approach provides a way to pinpoint when genericity is due to the sentence form and when it is due to the form of the NP.

As the verbs found in the corpus represent many different kinds of predicates, and since I will show that a generic reading of a locative PP depends on qualities of the locatum, it appears that bare singular NPs

---

\(^{15}\) When considering bare NPs as possible kind-referring generics, however, their examples use only plurals or mass-noun materials such as gold or bronze, or count nouns in plural forms, and do not specifically include the kinds of singular count nouns examined here.
themselves are the source of genericness, rather than their occurrence in characterizing sentence types. In short, while the NPs used in Familiarity Implicature are individual-referring expressions, Generic uses of bare singular forms are kind-referring NPs.

Previous analyses of kind-referring NPs have identified generic uses associated with a number of distinct nominal forms: bare plural count nouns (*cats*), bare mass nouns (*furniture*), definite singular count nouns (*the cat*), indefinite singular nouns (*a cat*), proper names (*Felis catus*) and NPs with demonstrative determiners (*those alley cats*). Each of these types of kind-referring NPs has been shown to be sensitive to distinct constraints of semantics, pragmatics, and syntactic distribution (Burton-Roberts 1976; Carlson 1977a,b; Declerck 1991; Langacker 1991, Krifka et al. 1995, Bowdle & Ward 1995, inter alia). The bare singular count noun as another type of kind-referring NP has received much less scrutiny.

One notable difference between the kind-referring Generic sense and the individual-referring Familiarity sense of bare singular NPs concerns the deictic link between the location and the speaker, hearer, or locatum. In the Generic sense, this link is not available. As illustration, I will exam-
ine two different uses of on campus found in my corpus. These two uses, however, do not divide into Activity and Familiarity; rather, one use represents a generic expression, while the second exemplifies the Familiarity sense. For the generic use, campus is used to refer more broadly, to indicate the set of all college campuses. This use is typical of news reports that describe trends on campuses across the country, as illustrated in (79):

(79)  

a. An amendment to the Senate’s anti-drug bill would have barred alcohol companies from sponsoring any sort of event at all on campus. [=15]

b. ’Free speech,’ ’Question authority,’ and ’Leave us alone’ are now conservative and libertarian battle-cries on campus. (Alan Charles Kors, “It’s Speech, Not Sex, the Dean Bans Now,” Wall Street Journal, October 12, 1989)

c. The contrast is apparent on campus, too. Unlike their predecessors in the Vietnam era, many ROTC students today can be seen wearing their uniforms and boots — not just to military classes, but all day long. [=78a]

Evidence that the use in (79) is generic can be seen by the way that the meaning of these examples would remain the same even when we replace the bare singular forms with another NP form that is often used in generic reference, such as the bare plural form campuses:
An amendment to the Senate's anti-drug bill would have barred alcohol companies from sponsoring any sort of event at all on campuses.

"Free speech," "Question authority," and "Leave us alone" are now conservative and libertarian battle-cries on campuses.

The contrast is apparent on campuses, too. Unlike their predecessors in the Vietnam era, many ROTC students today can be seen wearing their uniforms and boots — not just to military classes, but all day long.

In contrast, the Familiarity sense of on campus is used to indicate a particular campus. It is only used in situations where the speaker expects the hearer to identify which campus is meant; in particular, the campus indicated is made salient by being the one attended by (at least) one of the discourse participants. Examples of this use are shown in (81).

Have you been back to campus lately?
(UIC Alumni Association membership flyer)

If you are interested in the game, are in a group, are looking for someone on campus to play with, or know someone who is... give me a call.
(Ad recruiting people to play Magic, posted in a university student union building)

The following week should work. Which days will you be on campus?
(G. Ward, email correspondence, Aug. 25, 1996)

For the examples in (81), the bare plural form would not work, as shown
by the infelicitous substitutions in (82) below:

(82) a. #Have you been back to campuses lately?

b. #If you are interested in the game, are in a group, are looking for someone on campuses to play with, or know someone who is... give me a call.

c. #The following week should work. Which days will you be on campuses?

When bare singular NP locations are used generically, the stated locatum is an abstract non-human referent, as in (79), where event, battle-cry and contrast are the located entities. Further, no particular speaker or hearer is designated in the text, as opposed to the Familiarity examples in (81), where the pronouns you and me are used to pick out the speaker and hearer. In generic uses of the bare singular form, neither a human locatum, a speaker, or a hearer is available for anchoring an indexical bare singular NP, leaving it to be used to refer more broadly to the whole class of entities.

Notice that even though campus (in its academic, not corporate sense) might seem to have a particular activity associated with it, perhaps studying, the phrase she’s on campus is not used to convey what the locatum is doing, but where she is, including which campus she is on.
Thus, as noted in the Section 2.3, the association of a Social/Geographical Space with an activity is not sufficient to license an Activity Implication.

The distinction between Activity, Familiarity, and Generic senses—showing that the Familiarity sense requires a salient human onto whom the location can be attached—is illustrated with another NP in (83).

(83)  a. Sitting in class as another student discusses the life of Justin Martyr, Jason Malave is framed by a floor-to-ceiling portrait of Cardinal George Mundelein that hangs behind him.  

b. Previously the rivalry had been rather onesided, but there was no longer any doubt that Gilbert was as determined to be first in class as Anne was.  
(Lucy Maud Montgomery, Anne of Green Gables, 1908, Gutenberg etext)

c. English teachers have long used printed advertising when they teach argumentative writing. Ads provide a catalog of persuasive techniques that can be analyzed in class—an exercise increasingly valuable as advertisements, especially TV commercials, play an ever more prominent role in politics.  

In (83a) the locatum is named and the location is inferred to be his classroom, i.e., the Familiarity sense is conveyed; in addition, the PP could be
replaced by a temporal PP such as *during class*, making the Activity
sense more explicit. Thus (83a) could be an example of either the Famili-
arity or the Activity sense. In (83b), the bare form can be replaced by an
NP with a possessive determiner, such as *their class*; also, two humans
located in the class are specifically named. Further, substituting *in class*
with such temporal PPs as *before class*, *during class* or *after class* does
not keep the same meaning; (83b), therefore, is an example of only the
Familiarity use. In (83c), no particular human locatum is men-
tioned—only the analysis of ads is located in the class. Further, a bare
plural location such as *classrooms* can be felicitously substituted here
for the word *class*. Example (83c), then, shows a kind-referring generic
use of *in class*.

We have seen, then, that three distinct uses of bare singular NPs in PPs
are found in a corpus of naturally occurring data: Activity, Familiarity,
and Generic senses. Some of the nouns, however, are used in only one
of these uses, while others work in two, or all three of the uses. While
only some of the PPs in the corpus are found in contexts that indicated a
generic use, a sentence with an abstract locatum, such as that in (84),
serves as a tool for trying out the bare singular NPs to see if they can be
used generically:
The examples in (85) show such generic uses (with other generic NP instantiations shown in parentheses):

(85)  a. A federal law exempts transactions which occur at work.  
      (cf. at the workplace)  
  b. A federal law exempts transactions which occur on campus.  
      (cf. on campuses)  
  c. A federal law exempts transactions which occur at college.  
      (cf. at colleges)  
  d. A federal law exempts transactions which occur in jail.  
      (cf. in jails)

Below, I update the division of PPs to show some examples of words of each of these types; Table 15 shows the three uses to which PPs containing bare singular NPs can be put for representative nouns of the Social/Geographical Space class.
As seen in groups C and D, words that give rise to Activity Implicatures can also be used in a kind-referring Generic sense. This is not surprising since both the Activity sense and Generic sense are uses that refer to aspects shared by the whole class of locations rather than to a trait specific to one particular referent. For those NPs not used in Activity senses, however, the scope of the template sentence affects our interpretation of their kind-referring abilities, as shown in (86):
(86)  a. ? A federal law exempts transactions which occur in state.
     (? in states)

     b. A local law exempts transactions which occur in state.

     c. ? A county law exempts transactions which occur in district.
        (? in districts)

     d. A district ruling exempts transactions which occur in district.

     e. ? A city ordinance exempts transactions which occur at camp.
        (? at camps)

     f. A boy scout council ruling exempts transactions which occur at camp.

What accounts for the less felicitous examples in (86) is that the location must be presented as a member of a kind with distinct subtypes, rather than simply being part of a space physically divided into subunits. When the division is into units of only one kind of place—as seen in (87b) and (87c)—a generic use is infelicitous.

(87)  a. Institutions
       Churches Prisons Camps

     b. City
        District 1 District 2 District 3

     c. USA
        State (Iowa) State (Georgia) State (Idaho)
In the template sentence in (84a), the words *state* and *district* do not allow a generic reading since any area within a federal jurisdiction would be a state. Yet (86a) and (86c) cannot be interpreted as Familiarity readings, either, since as we saw, to be used in a Familiarity sense a bare form must be used in an utterance involving a human anchor. In the case of states and districts (and presumably other words such as *ward*, *parish*, and *borough*), since those units divide a larger region completely into the same kind of units, one cannot specify a location in that larger region that is not in one subunit or the other. For the sentences of (86a), for example, a federal law would apply to the country as a whole, yet no location within a country would not be within some state. (86b), however, is felicitous since at a local level, if the locatum is in another state (i.e., not the anchored one) the jurisdiction is appropriate; thus, (86b) is felicitous, but as a Familiarity reading. That is, for words which denote a subordinate category that is one of a complete heterogeneous divisions, as in (87b) and (87c), the Generic sense cannot be used in the domain of the superordinate category. In other words, it is possible to refer generically to an event that occurs on all campuses, and as long as there are also potential locations that are not on any campus; but reference to a location within a state is not possible unless there is some contrasted location assumed that is not in a state (such as a territory or commonwealth,
for example). The words state, camp, and district in (86a) (86c) and (86e), then, are infelicitous in a generic reading because of their position in a taxonomy of fully complementary municipal units, yet also infelicitous in the template sentence as a Familiarity reading, due to the requirement that there be an anchoring human. However, in a setting that covers a range of location types, generic readings for all bare singular NP locations are possible.

For the relationship described by (85c), for example, in state is a felicitous phrasing to convey the Familiarity sense, but infelicitous for the Generic sense. For contexts affecting bare singular forms as generics, it is not the hierarchical level per se that matters, but whether the denoted NP unit is the only kind into which its superordinate is divided.

In the right context, most bare singular NPs can be used generically to refer to a kind, but not all can be used to generate Activity or Familiarity implicatures; these require more specific contexts and have more semantic constraints on the NP type.

3. Bare Singular NPs in Other Sentence Positions

So far I have been discussing the functions of PPs that contain bare sin-
cular NPs, but recall from Chapter 1 that these bare forms can appear as subjects and objects as well. In this section I will examine the different types of meanings that are conveyed when bare singular NPs appear in these positions. Using nouns from the category of Social/Geographical Spaces, I will investigate whether Activity, Familiarity, and Generic uses are found in these positions as well. In sections 3.1 and 3.2 I discuss Social/Geographical Spaces as subjects direct objects. Section 3.3 checks for syntactic differences that reflect the distinct pragmatic uses of bare singulars. Then Section 3.4 will look at Recording Media NPs in subject and direct object positions.

Just as most count nouns do not occur in the bare form in PPs, so too do they not serve in the bare singular form as subjects or direct objects. This is shown in (88).

(88) a. *Library was busy today.
b. *I dreaded going to store on Saturday afternoon.
c. *I always hated restaurant.
d. *They were friends from park.

Recall from the results of applying the diagnostics for genericity, shown in Table 15, that some bare NPs are used only in the Familiarity sense, while others are used only for Activity senses. Inserting members from these different sets of nouns into subject and object position, we find
that both types of bare NPs are possible. In (89) and (90) I show that some of the nouns which are used to produce a Familiarity sense when used as prepositional objects could easily serve in other positions:

(89)  
   a. Home is where the heart is.  
   b. Mike thought school was boring.  
   c. Karl left church early.

Other nouns, from the set showing only an Activity Sense in PPs, are unable to serve subject or direct object positions, as shown in (90).

(90)  
   a. #Prison was busy.  
   b. #She left sea and settled here.  
   c. #Stage was filled with ropes and boxes.

Examples such as those in (89) and (90) suggest a distinction between the nouns themselves — that there are separate classes of Familiarity nouns and Activity nouns, and that one of their distinguishing characteristics in their distribution. The sentences shown in (89) and (90), however, are constructed examples. To see if the possibility of Bare NPs occurring in subject or direct object position supports a distinction between Familiarity nouns and Activity nouns, I sought out naturally occurring tokens of bare singular nouns in these positions. For bare singular NPs in subject position I found 33 tokens, consisting of ten noun types; for direct object position I found 39 tokens, 14 noun types. These are listed in Table 16. (See Appendix A for type/token distribution.)
My goal was to explore how much of the Activity, Familiarity, or Generic sense is tied to PP position and how much is due to the bare noun form itself. In Section 2.1.2 I showed that the implicated meanings are conveyed via conventional and not conversational implicature, partly due to a speaker's inability to use an utterance having the same conventional force in place of the bare forms without losing the implicated information – that is, Grice's test of non-detachability. Since the implicatures of these bare singular NPs are not non-detachable, their ability to be used to create implicatures is clearly tied to their form. It is not clear, how-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as Subjects</th>
<th>as Direct Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bed</td>
<td>camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camp</td>
<td>campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>court</td>
<td>downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jail</td>
<td>jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prison</td>
<td>kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>town</td>
<td>(high) school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ever, whether these bare forms keep their implicated meaning in all NP positions.

3.1 Social/Geographical Spaces as Subjects

We have seen that as the object in a PP, a bare singular NP can be used to either indicate a specific familiar referent, to refer generically to a whole kind, or to be used in a non-referential Activity PP. In this section I will show that in subject position bares singular NPs are not used to convey the same range of meanings as that they do as prepositional objects. One major difference is that as subjects, bare nouns are not used to convey the deictically determined Familiarity sense; instead, they are used only in ways that don’t pick out an individual referent. Thus, they may be used to convey an activity done at the place, used as synecdoche (using a more inclusive term to refer to one aspect of the location), used generically —referring to an institutional type or natural kind, or used metalinguistically. These uses are shown in (91)-(94).

(91) Activity sense:

a. Church is a comfort, all right, but your water and your sewer, those are necessities.  
   = attending church
b. He didn't want to give the impression that “prison was only for those not socially advantaged.”
   = serving time for a crime

c. Home should have felt like a sanctuary after the night's events, but I hesitated outside the front door, key in hand, for something like a minute.
   = arriving home

d. It seems college isn't what it should be. I refer to the attire worn by the students.
   (Brown Corpus, Aug. 4, 1961)
   = attending college

(92) Generic subject:

a. I started going to church for the first time in my life about four years ago. Since then, church has become very important in my life.

b. Prison is much different than movies and TV portray it to be.
   (All Things Considered, Oct. 19, 1997)

(93) Synecdoche:

If only there were a way to connect air-conditioning to health or education... But school is out, and Mother thinks air-conditioning causes colds.
   (Garrison Keillor, Lake Wobegon Days, New York: Viking, 1985, p. 133)
   = the school year
(94) Metalinguistic use:

a. For many of us, school doesn’t summon up happy memories. (Roy Harvey, “Chicago Books Reviewed,” *Chicago Books in Review*, vol. 1, no. 4, Fall 1996, p.13) = the word “school”

b. Home becomes a hotel room, a trench, the arms of someone you don’t know, a bar, a taxi. Me, I made the clean break and accepted the fact years ago. (Ian R. MacLeod. “Swimmers Beneath the Skin,” *Asimov’s Science Fiction*, Oct/Nov. 1996, p. 89) = what serves the function of “home”

Because bare singular NPs (of both ‘Familiarity type and ‘Activity type’) appear in subject positions, but can’t pick out a concrete identifiable location, it becomes clear that two factors interact to prevent certain bare forms from appearing in subject position. On the one hand, the inability of certain predicates to pick out a concrete subject makes sentences such as (95) infelicitous, but allows the uses in (96).

(95) Predicates that take subjects with concrete referents

a. #Prison was busy.
b. #Stage was filled with ropes and boxes.
c. #Home is on fire!
d. #Work is looking very dusty.

(96) Predicates that take events or durations as subjects

a. Prison taught her self-reliance.
b. College brought out her tendency to procrastinate.
c. Work seemed to go on forever.
d. School doesn’t sound very good to me.
Then in addition, even if a predicate does allow a concrete referent, the subject cannot be instantiated as a bare singular form; when in subject position bare forms are interpreted non-spatially, as sense extensions of their location denotation.

The sentences in (95) require a concrete location sense for the subject, which is what would be provided with the Familiarity sense. In (96), on the other hand, the sentence allows subjects that name a period of time or an activity rather than a point in space, which being in prison and attending college both provide. What emerges, then, is that it is not subjecthood that is a barrier, but being the subject of a predicate with subcategorization requirements of naming a point in space. Other noun interpretations, however, with less concrete extensions from the location meaning, as in (96), may suffice.

3.2 Social/Geographical Spaces as Direct Objects

As a direct object, a bare singular NP can have the Familiarity, Activity, or Synecdoche uses shown in (97)-(99).
(97) Familiarity sense:

a. If you'd really rather have a Buick, don't leave home without the American Express card.
= your home

b. They—whover they is—think I've left town and I want to keep it that way.
= my town/this town

(98) Activity sense:

a. Before government regulations... children ruined their health in ghastly sweatshops, instead of attending school
= attending schools as students

b. The author deserves thanks for insureing that Manson will undoubtedly never leave jail, but the book that maintains his infamy also maintains his fame.
= stop being a prisoner

c. [X] believes that he may be able to leave hospital at the end of the week.
(BBC World News, broadcast, Oct. 8, 1996)
= stop being a patient

(99) Synecdoche:

a. He told everyone at the beginning he might cut church very short.
(D. Stvan, phone conversation, Nov. 28, 1994)
b. A long drive during which they all talked about college and how much harder it was than high school.


= college courses/college study

In being used to convey an Activity sense, the object is also generic; these constructions are similar to noun incorporation (cf. Mithun 1983, 1986; Di Sciullo & Williams 1987; Rosen 1989) in which the verb and object act like a morphologically complex verb. With *leave*, the activity done at the location is evoked; with other verbs that name their own activity (as in (98a), the noun is just a kind-referring generic.

After looking at the distribution of bare singular NPs, we see that, as subjects, these bare singular NPs are not used to convey the more specific Familiarity sense; instead, they are used to convey information about the kind of place denoted by the noun. However, as direct objects, these bare nouns can be used to convey either of the three senses (Familiarity, Activity, generic) that were found in PP uses. Again we see that the Familiarity forms are more restricted—earlier we saw that there are fewer Familiarity NP types, here we see that they are also used in fewer positions.
Originally, I had hoped to find either a syntactic test that would support the separation of bare singular NPs into Familiarity NPs and Activity NPs, or evidence that syntactic position itself reinforced these meaning differences. It turns out that both Familiarity-only nouns (such as town, home, and campus) and Activity-only nouns (e.g., college and prison) showed up in other NP positions. But they are not used to convey the same meanings in all of these cases. Bare singular NPs as subjects cannot be used to pick out both specific and non-specific referents. In this position bare singular NPs are not used to convey the Familiarity sense; instead, all the nouns found in this position are used only in ways that are non-specific. As for bare singular NPs serving as direct objects, these can be used to convey either the specific Familiarity sense, or one of the other non-specific senses (including Activity, kind referring generic, and synecdoche senses).

Krifka et al. (1995:73) show that bare plurals are interpreted as indefinite unless they appear as subjects in sentences where the subject acts as the topic, or as the object of a stative verb, so it would not be surprising if the bare singular forms showed a similar subject-object asymmetry for English. This chapter shows that indeed, the interpretation of a bare singular NP varies in referentiality depending on its position.
Looking for bare nouns that follow a spatial preposition, follow the verb *leave*, or serve as a subject has aided in identifying those location nouns that can serve as full NPs. The meaning a speaker intends to convey by using the bare singular form, however, reflects the speaker’s beliefs about community membership of the discourse participants and is reflected in the speaker’s placement of the NP within the sentence.

3.3 Determining the Status of Social/Geographical Space NPs
Because we have observed pragmatic distinctions conveyed by Social/Geographical Space nominals, we might wonder if there are syntactic differences that reflect this. We saw in Chapter 2 that N-bars, not nouns or NPs, are the unit assigned the feature +CT. Following distributional evidence such as that in chapter 2, we saw that bare singular nominals are not nouns, but some higher projection of nominal. At this point let us consider whether it is possible to determine whether bare forms are N-bars or NPs, and whether bare singulars with different pragmatic uses have different syntactic structures.

3.3.1 Nominal Constituent Distribution
For most nominals we could check the projection level by looking at co-occurrence with particular plural or singular forms of articles and modifi-
ers. The lack of such indicators makes these tests inapplicable in the case of bare singular nominals, however, since they are defined by their very lack of determiners, plural markers, and modifiers. Recall, however, that the diagnostics in (20)-(22) of Chapter 2 showed that these words had the distribution of a maximal projection. While I spoke earlier of Soja’s term ‘NP-type nouns’, to name words that had the distribution of noun phrases rather than nouns. We see from the examples in (100) that some bare forms have full NP distribution, since the bare form can take the place of a phrase containing a determiner or possessor:

(100) Subject position (Activity senses only)
   a. His time at the lake went by too quickly.
   b. The summer went by too quickly.
   c. Camp went by too quickly that year.
   d. # Car went by too quickly.

(101)   a. #His the time at the lake went by too quickly.
   b. # The/#his camp went by too quickly that year.
   c. The/his car went by too quickly.

In (100) bare nouns used as subjects fill the position of an expression containing a determiner or possessor (as seen in 101), and so must be considered NPs. As seen in (100d), regular count nominals cannot serve as subjects in bare form if they are nouns that allow an event reading.
However, not all bare singular nominals have this full NP distribution. The nominals used in Familiarity Implicature keep the same meaning when a determiner is added, indicating that those bare referring expressions used only in the Familiarity sense are N-bars:

(102) Familiarity only
   a. They would not be in town for Memorial Day.
   b. They would not be in this town for Memorial Day.
   c. They would not in their own town for Memorial Day.

Regular count nominals, which are also referring expressions, must have either an article or a possessor, (as seen in (103):

(103) a. #They would be at family picnic.
   b. They would be at the family picnic.
   c. They would be at that family picnic.

Both Activity and Familiarity forms of bare singular nominals should be distinguished from Ns, but they are not nominals of the same projection level. Looking at the trees in (104) we can see that the level at which a nominal is considered to be a mass or count form is as the complement to Det—as an N-bar. Some bare singular nominals act like N-bars, but others have the distribution of constituents containing determiners or possessors—that is, they are full NPs.
3.3.2 One Substitution

As we have seen, it is hard to show syntactically whether a bare singular nominal is in fact an N-bar or an NP because the bare form prohibits many syntactic tests involving modifiers. Another possibility, then, might be to check the meaning created when attempting to substitute one for a bare singular nominal since we know that one only felicitously substitutes for a count NP. As shown in the examples in (105), varying degrees of acceptability arise when substituting one for a bare singular form:

(105)a. * I was at school with him and Tom was at one with him too.
   b. I was at a school with him, and Tom was at one with him too.
   c. ?Tom attended church in Iowa and I attended one in Florida.
   d. Tom attended a church in Iowa and I attended one in Detroit.
   e. He was in prison for six years, then in another one for one year.
   f. There was no store in town, only in the one five miles away.
   g. The store is not far from campus, the one I attend, not Jeff's.
Several substitution issues are conflated in (105). First, we can see evidence of two different pro-form senses for one (cf. Halliday & Hassan 1976:88-104). One is a pro-NP and one is pro-N-bar, as seen in (106).

(106)

a. I bought a car and she’s going to buy one too.  
   pro-NP  one=a car

b. I need a car, and that’s the one I want.  
   pro-N’  one=car

Thus, the proform one in (105b) and (105d) is a Pro-NP, while one in (105e), (105f) and (105g) is a Pro-N-bar.

In addition, while there seems to be a contrast between the ability of one to substitute for a bare singular nominal in (105a) and for an articulated noun in (105b), other semantic constraints on one may make the proform’s use inappropriate. Besides replacing two different kinds of nominal constituents, as seen in (106), there is a difference in the definiteness of the two ones. In (106a) one is an indefinite non-specific use, meaning any one item out of the category ‘car,’ just as the NP a car would be. With PPs used in Familiarity Implicature, the bare singular nominal is used in definite reference, so when one is used without a definite article, in the nonspecific indefinite sense (as seen in 106a), it is inappropriate to fill in for Familiarity uses. For example, in (107) the word campus is
used to mean \textit{my campus} and so \textit{one}, an indefinite non-specific form, is inappropriate because a particular campus has already been introduced, though substitution by other definite proforms, as seen in (107b), is grammatical.

(107) Familiarity Use

a. \textit{*I left campus} right after class, but he didn't leave \textit{one} till later.

b. I left campus right after class, but he didn't leave \textit{it/there} till later.

Moreover, other elements of anaphora may be demonstrated in (108) making a reading with \textit{one} felicitous for another reason.

(108) Activity Uses

a. Her father was in \underline{prison} for murdering her mother, [but now he is in \underline{one} for forgery.]

b. If a company is charged with doing wrong with the nation's money, that company's top executives can sit in \underline{prison} —[\underline{one} without a sauna]—while the case lumbers through an unwieldy legal system.

c. If the chimpanzees \underline{romped on stage}, [the toddlers wanted to \underline{romp on one} too.]

d. If your kids are in \underline{daycare}, make sure it's \underline{one} that stresses hand washing.

In (108a) the second underlined term makes sense because of the referential bridging triggered by an earlier predicate (cf. bridging in Halli-
day & Hasan 1976, Clark & Marshall 1981; and ‘inferrables’ in Prince 1981, Ward & Birner 1993, Birner & Ward 1994, Lambrecht 1994). That is, just as an NP like my house can set the stage for the felicitous use of the door, in (108a) the Activity sense of in prison, meaning to be imprisoned, makes relevant an actual prison location. Likewise in (108d), the mention of daycare service, triggered by the PP in daycare, makes accessible a daycare center referent.

The uses of one are summarized in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of antecedent</th>
<th>Type of one</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>activity sense</td>
<td>inferred definite</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiarity sense</td>
<td>definite one</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiarity sense</td>
<td>indefinite one</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiarity sense</td>
<td>inferred definite</td>
<td>? redundant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see, then, that the one diagnostic actually gives us evidence of several kinds of interacting information: whether the constituent contains a noun with a count sense, whether the constituent is an N-bar or
an NP (but not an N), whether the constituent has an indefinite reading, or whether the replaced constituent has a meaning created by referential bridging from an earlier predicate. In other words, because one is used in a number of senses, the judgments in (105) and (108) do not establish one syntactic constituent that is replaced by the word one. This reinforces our sense that Activity and Familiarity NPs are different; they are syntactically distinct just as we saw that they were pragmatically distinct. So, when referring to the whole group I will call then bare singular noun phrases, but we now know that some are N-bars while others are NPs.

3.4 Recording Media NPs as Subjects and Objects
While the bulk of the bare singular NPs in the corpus are Social/Geographical Spaces (55 out of 101 NP types), it is also worth noting the distributional behavior of another set of bare NPs, the Recording Media expressions. Since they do not have a human locatum (although sometimes the recorded image referent is the depiction of a human), it comes as no surprise that these PPs are not used to implicate information about the activity of the locatum. Although they name the place where information is stored or displayed, these bare singular forms also are not used deictically to specify the particular television, radio, or cassette on
which the information is located—as in the Familiarity sense. As noted in Chapter 3, however, an ambiguity can occur in PPs, concerning whether the locatum is the entity originally recorded or a depiction of it. Bare Recording Media NPs were also shown to refer to the apparatus and the means of broadcasting. None of the bare singular NPs found in subject position are used in an object-referring sense (which would be the apparatus sense, such as *television set). For this, an article is required with the noun, as seen in (109).

\(109\) Subject position—apparatus sense prohibited:

a. The television sat in the corner.

b. *Television sat in the corner.

However, bare NP subjects can be used to convey a sense of a professional field (i.e., the television industry) or to name the media/broadcast format, as seen in (110).


c. It’s time we recognized that television is educational, whether or not we like what it teaches. (David Hechler, “Whittle Foes Miss Medium’s Message,” Wall Street Journal, Aug. 1, 1989)

In direct object position, too, while the NP might generally name the means of listening (e.g., we heard the news on radio), or name the industry, the lack of article does not allow an object-referring sense:

(111) Direct object--media format:

a. It was taught by a teacher who shocked his colleagues by confessing right from the top that he actually likes (gasp) TV. (David Hechler, “Whittle Foes Miss Medium’s Message,” Wall Street Journal, Aug. 1, 1989)

b. A sizable portion of illiterate Indians now rely on television for news they used to hear third or fourth hand, if at all. (Ajay Singh, “Indian Government’s Use of Television Sparks Controversy As Elections Near,” Wall Street Journal, Oct. 13, 1989)

(112) Direct object—profession sense:

After stints in such diverse fields as mechanical engineering, computer programming, real estate and advertising, he was looking for a fast-growing business and settled on video. (Bob Hagerty, “Video Firm Fast-Forwards Into Ripening U.S. Market,” The Wall Street Journal, Sept. 25, 1989)
(113) Direct Object—object-referring sense prohibited:

a. She wanted a video to watch at home.
b. * She wanted video to watch at home.
c. She wanted cable (to watch) at home.

Table 18 shows which of the Recording Media NPs can be used in subject or object positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bare Token</th>
<th>Subject Position</th>
<th>DO Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cable</td>
<td>industry</td>
<td>industry/service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*cassette</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CD</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*disk</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*film</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*line</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio</td>
<td>media/industry</td>
<td>media/industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radar</td>
<td>media</td>
<td>media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*record</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*screen</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>media sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>television/TV</td>
<td>industry sense</td>
<td>media/industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video</td>
<td>industry sense</td>
<td>industry sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*videocassette</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videotape</td>
<td>media sense</td>
<td>media sense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we can conclude from examining the Recording Media data is that, as with Social/Geographical Spaces, in subject and direct object position these bare singular NP forms cannot be used to refer to a specified concrete object, but can only be used for more extended metaphoric senses of the nouns. (Cf. Table 8, count noun uses of media terms.)
One last point related to bare singular nominals and context concerns the pragmatic and perhaps also stylistic influence of the domain or genre within which an utterance occurs. While I showed in Chapter 3 that bare singular nouns can be grouped according to shared semantic features (religious building, educational building, nautical setting, etc.), the domain or genre in which the bare singular NPs are uttered also has an influence. Within subcommunities, use of the bare singular NPs can reinforce, or even create, shared world information. While many of the PPs (e.g., in school, at camp, at home) are quite widely used by most speakers, certain PPs are only found in particular domains. For example, in theater and in country, with the sense of being on assignment or on a tour of duty, are generally only spoken by members of the military (and militarily structured groups such as the Peace Corps). Examples specific to this domain are shown in (114), which relates a Viet Nam veteran’s recollection of the war:

(114) a. “And there was the Armed Forces Radio too.” He paused and gazed dreamily at a balloon hanging from the basketball hoop. “When you’re in country, there’s so little connection to the World, but those songs—that was as close as we came to a real connection.”
b. We expect to have 1400 police officers in theater.
   (All Things Considered, Jan. 29, 1996)

Two other PPs restricted to a certain genre are off world and off planet, typically found only in science fiction settings. Their use is attested in discourse communities that assume that interplanetary travel is an everyday event, making the particular world or planet referred to clear, by means of Familiarity Implicature:

(115) a. Inadvertently Ken had lengthened his stride in the Corridor and trodden on the heels of a citizen in front of him. “Your number?” the man rasped out indignantly. “I’ll be off-world before you can bring it to Court,” Ken replied in a loud, carefree voice. (Anne McCaffrey, Decision at Doona, New York: Ballantine Books, 1969, p. 10)

b. They’re going to try to blast their way off world. (Return of the Jedi, radio broadcast, WBEZ, Jan. 13, 1997)

c. Some of this I understand, but not the part about ice interfering with takeoffs. We’ve been offplanet nearly ten months. Has something unusual happened? (Suzette Haden Elgin, Earthsong: Native Tongue III, DAW Books: New York, 1994, p. 121)

d. She didn’t have much crystal, so every speck she had cut was precious to her. If she didn’t earn enough credit to get off-planet this time...Killashandra ground her teeth as she hurried her carton into the Sorting Shed. (Anne McCaffrey, Killashandra, New York: Del Rey, 1985, pp. 1-2)
Many real-life workplaces can also serve as subcommunities whose membership is partly marked by the use of Familiarity and Activity implicatures to designate certain work-related places. Consider the examples in (116):

(116) a. I've been in kitchen since I was sixteen years old.  
    (Chef! (c) 1993, PBS broadcast 1996)

b. Senator Paul Simon joins me in studio this morning.  
    (Mara Tapp, The Mara Tapp Show, WBEZ, May 6, 1996)

The example in (116a) is from a British sitcom; the character speaking is a professional chef. Here his profession and his hearer’s knowledge that it is his profession allows him to use the PP in kitchen to create an Activity Implicature conveying that he has been working as a cook (and not, for example, a plumber) in various kitchens. In (116b), in studio is often used by radio hosts to indicate that a guest is present live in the studio with them, rather than being interviewed by phone. While on the one hand in studio is a manner adverbial (e.g., contrasting with by phone), it is also a Familiarity use, indicating that the guest is in our studio/in this studio.

The examples in (117) are used by workers in the hospitality industries:

(117) a. Here's a package of things to do on property.  
    (Check in clerk at a resort in Cape Cod, overheard on July 28, 1996)
b. For Disney’s employees, however, this is only a rough distinction; their perception is that anyplace they might go “on property” is always a workplace, a stage, whether or not they are actually at work. (The Project on Disney, Inside the Mouse: Work and Play at Disney World, Durham: Duke University Press, 1995, p. 114)

In both examples in (117), the speaker is referring to the particular property maintained by their employer, not property that the speaker owns, but the entire park or resort complex in which the employees work, and in which guests might enjoy themselves.

In the military, among co-workers at a workplace, and within a science fiction story are three typical domains in which a smaller community sense is created—a shared world which includes the speaker and hearer. The speaker’s sense of the hearer’s Familiarity with the location plays a large part in determining what makes a good bare singular NP. The use of these phrases in certain domains may even coerce the expected meaning of shared community membership, even in the absence of actual past shared community membership. That is, it can be a signal that the speaker considers the hearer to share the same assumptions. It is likely that, as with on property, or in clinic, many workplace communities create special anchored senses of common words with more traditional uses.
5. Conclusion to Chapter 4

Bare singular NPs are used in all NP positions. In PPs, some of these NPs are used non-referentially to convey information about the locatum through Activity Implicature, while other PPs contain bare NPs used to particularize a location referent that is already known to the hearer, through Familiarity Implicature. These PPs can also be used as kind-referring generic expressions. In subject and object position, bare forms include more metaphoric senses than they have in PPs, but are restricted to uses with nonspecific referents. Because they are limited to non-referential senses when used as subjects, clearly some aspect of the subject position limits the referring ability of these NPs.

The pragmatic importance of bare singular NPs arises not from the detailing of a set of nouns in unexpected collocations, but rather in their connection to both deictically determined reference functions and types of non-referential information, which are signalled by the lack of an expected article. These types of information, which mark a location word as having a non-locating function, show up in other languages too, although the morphosyntactic markers of the functions vary. These cross-linguistic aspects will be explored in Chapter 5.