Definite referential expressions (the so-and-so) are often thought of as referring to unique instances of the kind denoted by the NP.

*The current German President is a lawyer.*

would thus refer to Christian Wulff, implying that there is currently exactly one German President.

But when I say

*The microphone is black.*

I am not assuming that there is exactly one microphone in the whole world. Rather, it seems that the discourse context restricts the uniqueness condition to the limited domain of our picture, and that, within that domain, there is exactly one microphone.
Discourse context may mean

- the situational context, as in the microphone example, or
- the linguistic context, as in cases of anaphora:

  *John has a son and a daughter. The boy is eight.*

In both cases the uniqueness condition holds, even though in a limited domain.

---

If the uniqueness condition is not satisfied, the use of the definite determiner leads to incoherence:

*John has two sons. #The boy is eight.*

Cf. also

*His failure to meet the target was not a reason for his dismissal; it was the reason.*

meaning that there were no other reasons for his dismissal.

**In sum:** definite reference is based on uniqueness within an appropriate domain of reference.
In some situations, though, there is clearly more than one referent that satisfies the descriptive content of the NP, but the use of the definite determiner is still entirely appropriate.

Consider somebody talking about the family dog, saying (perfectly acceptably and comprehensibly):

*The dog got in a fight with another dog. – I'll have to see to it that the dog doesn't get near that other dog again.*

(McCawley 1979)

Here the discourse domain would seem to contain two dogs.

How does the uniqueness condition apply here?

Perhaps the idea of “*uniqueness within a restricted domain*” may, after all, not be feasible, and another idea may be required.

David Lewis (1979:178) proposed the notion of *salience* to replace the uniqueness idea:

*It is not true that a definite description "the F" denotes x if and only if x is the one and only F in existence.*

*Neither is it true that "the F" denotes x if and only if x is the one and only F in some contextually determined domain of discourse.*

*The proper treatment of descriptions must be more like this: "the F" denotes x if and only if x is the most salient F in the domain of discourse, according to some contextually determined salience ranking.*
A fair number of theories have been developed in linguistics (e.g., Ariel 1985, Gundel et al. 1993, Grosz et al.1995, von Heusinger 1996, Roberts 2003) that provide parameters or algorithms for the ranking of discourse referents for their salience or prominence.

But although there is the clear intention to cover also situational uses, there is no explicit theory except for narrowly linguistic parameters.

It is therefore unclear if the overall reduction of definite reference to salience, as proposed by Lewis, can succeed. It is at least conceivable that definiteness may have more than one source, salience (in whatever exact sense) being just one of them.

We wanted to know about the role salience plays in the process of identifying the referent of a definite NP – independently of, and in comparison with, anaphora and situational uniqueness.

We designed an eye-tracking experiment to compare the role of these three factors for short spoken texts vis-a-vis a visually represented situation.
Subjects were viewing photographs of Playmobil\textsuperscript{®} sceneries on a computer screen and simultaneously listened to short narratives related to the pictured scenery.

The narratives consisted of

- a headline-type introduction, followed by
- a sentence starting with an NP that introduced an animate referent and, later on, another NP introducing a further animate referent.
- The final sentence started with a definite NP (the target), followed by further material.

---

**experiment: modified visual world / materials**

- 27 participants, University of Osnabrück students, paid or course credits, age 22 average
- 32 stimulus sets, 4 per condition
- visual stimuli presented via 30' Apple Cinema HD display
- auditory stimuli via ER-4B Earphones
- eye movements recorded (Eye Link II, head-mounted) at 250 Hz
- randomized presentation
- ROI defined manually
- time course of fixations in slots of 100 ms
- stimulus validity controlled
In the wood.

A stag is standing at the bank of the river and is carefully watching the snake on the other side.

The stag is frightened because the snake is dangerous.

Im Wald.

Ein Hirsch steht am Flußufer und beobachtet gespannt die Schlange auf der anderen Seite.

Der Hirsch hat Angst, weil die Schlange gefährlich ist.
In the wood.

**A stag is standing at the bank of the river and is carefully watching the snake on the other side.**

**The stag is frightened because the snake is dangerous.**

design: the parameters

apart from previous mention of the target, we varied the following parameters:

**uniqueness :**
(a) target unique
(b) target one of several competitors

**visual salience :**
(c) target isolated, competitors grouped
(d) target close to previously mentioned object
**Condition 2c:**

In the park.

A park keeper has just checked the pond and has been watched by the grandmother.

*The child* is getting ready to go home with its grandmother.

---

**Condition 2d:**

In the classroom.

There is an exercise on the blackboard that the teacher wrote up there.

*The child* has quickly found the solution and is glad about the praise.
### Design: Combination of Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unique referent</td>
<td>non-unique refer.</td>
<td>non-unique refer.</td>
<td>non-unique refer.</td>
<td>anaphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prev. mention</td>
<td>prev. mention</td>
<td>prev. mention</td>
<td>prev. mention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>salience by isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td>salience by closeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unique referent</td>
<td>non-unique refer.</td>
<td>non-unique refer.</td>
<td>non-unique refer.</td>
<td>1st mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st mention</td>
<td>1st mention</td>
<td>1st mention</td>
<td>1st mention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>salience by isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td>salience by closeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uniqueness**  | **Salience**

---

**Bosch et al.**  | Definite reference is not always based on salience

---

### Results for Anaphora Conditions 1 a,b,c,d

- **Anaphora Conditions (1 a,b,c,d):**
  - Steep rise of focussing frequency for the target, starting at about 200ms, and peaking at about 1200-1300ms
  - **Conditions 1**: a. anaphoric, unique  
    b. anaphoric  
    c. anaphoric, salient  
    d. anaphoric, salient
uniqueness condition (2a) behaves like anaphora conditions (1 a,b,c,d): steep rise of focussing frequency for the target, starting at about 200ms, and peaking at about 1200-1300ms

salience conditions (2 c,d) slow rise, starting later, at about 500ms and peaking at 2100-2300ms

ambiguous condition (2 b) no significant rise at all

Bosch et al.  Definite reference is not always based on salience

results: significant differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison between conditions, using ANOVA</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a - 1b</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a - 1c</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a - 1d</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all anaphoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b - 1c</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b - 1d</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c - 1d</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a - 2a</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b - 2b</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c - 2c</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d - 2d</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anaph/unique vs unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anaph vs ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anaph vs salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anaph vs salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a - 2b</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a - 2c</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a - 2d</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b - 2c</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b - 2d</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c - 2d</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unique vs. ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unique vs. salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unique vs. salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ambiguous vs. salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ambiguous vs. salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>salient vs. salient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focussing behaviour shows that

- the uniqueness of a referent and its previous mention each on their own effect the same ease of comprehension of a definite NP in the situation of the experiment.

- No significant enhancement was found, where these conditions are supplemented by visual salience.

- Where neither previous mention nor uniqueness support the comprehension, salience factors still support the comprehension process, although in a degraded fashion.

**Conclusions**

**Two distinct cognitive processes involved**

A Discourse anaphora and unique reference in the discourse domain, where the discourse domain is fixed by preceding discourse and visual information.

B Visual salience (visually isolated position or visual closeness to an already salient object)

**Definiteness is not primarily based on salience:**

Degraded results for B in conditions 2 c,d where only B operates, compared to conditions 1 a,b,c,d and 2a, where A operates: later and slower rise in focussing, later and and lower peaks.

No facilitation through B in conditions 1 c,d where both A and B operate, compared to conditions 1 a,b, where only A operates.
Thanks