

THE SEMANTICS OF DETERMINERS: DOMAIN RESTRICTION IN SK̲W̲X̲W̲Ú7MESH

by

Carrie Samantha Gillon

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 1998

M.A., The University of Toronto, 1999

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Linguistics)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

June 2006

© Carrie Samantha Gillon, 2006

## Abstract

In this thesis, I investigate the properties of determiners in Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish) Salish. Determiners in Skwxwú7mesh behave significantly differently from the definite determiner *the* in English. Skwxwú7mesh lacks a definite/indefiniteness distinction; all DPs can be used in both familiar and novel contexts, and are not required to refer to a unique entity. Instead, Skwxwú7mesh determiners are split along deictic/non-deictic lines. I argue that deictic features on the determiners have consequences for the grammar in terms of (i) scope and (ii) implicature of uniqueness. If a DP is deictic, (i) it can take wide scope and (ii) any sentence containing it will carry an implicature of uniqueness. If a DP is non-deictic, (i) it *must* take narrow scope and (ii) any sentence containing it does not carry an implicature of uniqueness. I claim that non-deictic DPs are composed via Restrict and deictic DPs via Specify (cf. Chung and Ladusaw 2004). There is therefore no correlation between more structure and wide scope, but rather a correlation between features and wide scope. Deictic features allow DPs to take wide scope; the lack of features prevents DPs from taking wide scope.

Determiners in Skwxwú7mesh are quite different from determiners in better-known languages. Do determiners share anything in common cross-linguistically? I argue that Skwxwú7mesh determiners and English *the* are both associated with domain restriction (cf. von Stechow 1994). Both non-deictic and deictic DPs are sensitive to the context in which they are used; in familiar contexts, they (usually) refer to the set of entities under discussion. Non-deictic DPs, which in terms of scope behave like bare nouns, must differ from bare nouns in this respect. Bare nouns (in languages which use articles) cannot be used in familiar contexts. They can only introduce new discourse referents. Non-deictic DPs can introduce new discourse referents, but can also refer to previously introduced discourse referents, and can also be used partitively. Skwxwú7mesh determiners must be associated with domain restriction, whereas bare nouns cannot be. I propose there is a strict correlation between the syntax and semantics: if a determiner occupies D, it has domain restriction in its representation.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
Table of Contents .....	iii
List of Tables .....	vii
List of Figures .....	viii
Abbreviations .....	ix
Acknowledgements .....	xi
Dedication .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

### **Chapter One: Introduction.....1**

1 Introduction .....	1
2 The background .....	4
2.1 The problem in <u>Skwxwú7mesh</u> .....	4
2.2 The problem in English .....	8
2.3 Why are these two problems related? .....	8
3 Preview of the analysis .....	9
4 Outline of the thesis .....	11

### **Chapter Two: The Background on Skwxwú7mesh .....13**

1 Introduction .....	13
2 Methodology .....	15
3 Morphology .....	16
4 Syntax .....	18
5 D-determiners .....	23
5.1 Obligatory D-determiners .....	23
5.2 D-determiners and demonstratives do not co-occur .....	26
5.3 D-determiners and quantifiers or numerals do co-occur .....	27
5.4 Gender .....	31
6 Previous discussions of the determiner system .....	32
6.1 Kuipers' (1967) description of the <u>Skwxwú7mesh</u> determiner system .....	32
6.2 Jacobs' (1997) analysis .....	36
7 Deixis .....	38
7.1 Anchor .....	39
7.1.1 Anchor for the D-determiners .....	40
7.1.2 Anchor for the demonstratives .....	41
7.2 Spatial demarcation .....	42
7.2.1 Distal .....	42
7.2.1.1 The distal D-determiner .....	43
7.2.1.2 The distal demonstratives .....	44
7.2.2 Neutral .....	45
7.2.2.1 The neutral D-determiner .....	45
7.2.2.2 The neutral demonstrative .....	46
7.2.3 The medial demonstrative .....	46
7.2.4 Proximal .....	47

7.2.4.1	The proximal D-determiner .....	48
7.2.4.2	The proximal demonstrative .....	48
7.3	Region configuration: (in)visibility .....	49
7.3.1	The invisible D-determiner .....	49
7.3.2	The invisible demonstratives .....	50
7.4	Summary .....	51
<b>Chapter Three: Theoretical Background.....</b>		<b>52</b>
1	Introduction .....	52
2	Presuppositions vs. implicatures .....	53
2.1	Presuppositions .....	53
2.2	Conversational implicatures .....	54
3	The DP hypothesis.....	56
4	Background on definiteness .....	57
4.1	Definiteness in English: uniqueness or familiarity? .....	58
4.2	Evidence for uniqueness .....	58
4.2.1	Assertion versus presupposition of existence .....	58
4.2.2	Presupposition of uniqueness .....	60
4.2.3	Assertion of uniqueness.....	63
4.3	Evidence for familiarity .....	64
4.4	Deriving uniqueness from familiarity .....	66
4.5	Deriving familiarity from uniqueness .....	67
4.6	Summary .....	68
5	Domain restriction .....	68
5.1	Why domain restriction? .....	69
5.2	Quantifiers and domain restriction .....	69
5.3	Bare nouns and (the lack of) domain restriction .....	70
6	Foreshadowing the analysis .....	72
6.1	Deriving familiarity .....	72
6.2	Specify and Restrict .....	76
6.2.1	Specify .....	76
6.2.2	Restrict.....	77
6.3	The Skwxwú7mesh D-determiners .....	78
7	Conclusion .....	79
<b>Chapter Four: The deictic D-determiners.....</b>		<b>80</b>
1	Introduction .....	80
2	No novelty/familiarity distinction in Skwxwú7mesh .....	82
2.1	Discourse new vs. discourse old.....	82
2.2	Hearer new vs. hearer old.....	84
3	Uniqueness in Skwxwú7mesh.....	87
3.1	No assertion of uniqueness.....	87
3.2	Implicature of uniqueness .....	88
3.3	Implicature of maximality .....	89
3.4	Summary .....	93
4	Domain restriction and the deictic D-determiners .....	93

4.1	Why choice functions?.....	93
4.2	Domain restriction and implicature of uniqueness .....	95
4.3	Domain restriction and quantifiers .....	99
4.4	Domain restriction and demonstratives.....	100
5	Co-reference effects.....	104
5.1	Cross-sentential co-reference .....	104
5.2	Co-reference and the effect of transitivizers .....	108
6	Deictic features.....	110
7	Summary .....	115
<b>Chapter Five: The non-deictic D-determiner <i>kwi</i> .....</b>		<b>117</b>
1	Introduction .....	117
2	Structure and scope.....	119
2.1	Structure = wide scope? .....	119
2.2	Semantic features = wide scope .....	121
3	The position of <i>kwi</i> .....	123
3.1	<i>Kwi</i> is a D-determiner .....	124
3.1.1	Syntactic evidence that <i>kwi</i> is a D-determiner .....	124
3.1.2	Semantic evidence that <i>kwi</i> is a D-determiner .....	126
3.1.2.1	<i>Kwi</i> does not presuppose familiarity/novelty.....	127
3.1.2.2	<i>Kwi</i> does not assert uniqueness .....	128
3.2	No split DP domain in <i>Skwxwú7mesh</i> .....	129
4	The analysis: <i>kwi</i> as a non-deictic D-determiner .....	134
4.1	The non-deictic D-determiner <i>kwi</i> .....	134
4.2	Narrow scope and <i>kwi</i> .....	141
4.3	Non-deictic D-determiners: composition via Restrict .....	143
4.4	Predictions .....	145
4.4.1	Restrict and word order .....	145
4.4.2	Contexts for non-deictic D-determiners .....	146
4.4.3	Proper names .....	148
4.4.4	Individuation, subordinating, and non-deictic D-determiners.....	148
4.4.5	Non-deictic D-determiners as complementizers.....	149
4.5	Summary .....	150
5	Featureless D-determiners and the context.....	151
5.1	D-determiners matter .....	152
5.2	Bare nouns.....	156
5.2.1	Bare nouns, narrow scope and Restrict .....	156
5.2.2	Bare nouns and the lack of context .....	158
5.3	The contribution of D-determiners to DPs.....	160
5.4	Implications .....	162
6	Alternative analyses?.....	167
6.1	<i>Kwi</i> is not like <i>ku</i> in St'át'imcets.....	168
6.2	<i>Kwi</i> is not Longobardi's existential D .....	170
6.3	<i>Kwi</i> is not an expletive D-determiner .....	171
6.4	<i>Kwi</i> is not a <i>Skwxwú7mesh</i> -type quantifier.....	172
6.5	<i>Kwi</i> and <i>ta</i> are not different kinds of definite determiners.....	173

7	Conclusions and Implications .....	175
<b>Chapter Six: Typological Implications.....</b>		<b>176</b>
1	Introduction.....	176
2	Implications for other Salish languages.....	177
2.1	Salish languages with potentially non-deictic D-determiners.....	179
2.1.1	St'át'imcets.....	179
2.1.2	Sechelt .....	183
2.1.3	Lushootseed .....	186
2.1.4	Musqueam .....	189
2.1.5	Upper Chehalis.....	192
2.1.6	Cowlitz .....	194
2.1.7	Secwepemctsin.....	196
2.1.8	Nuxalk .....	197
2.1.9	Nteʔkepmxcín.....	199
2.2	Salish languages lacking non-deictic D-determiners.....	201
2.2.1	Straits.....	201
2.2.2	Upriver Halkomelem.....	204
2.3	Summary .....	206
3	Implications for English.....	207
3.1	Distinguishing D-determiners from quantifiers in English.....	209
3.1.1	Evidence from the cardinal/proportional readings of weak quantifiers.....	210
3.1.2	Evidence from domain restriction.....	213
3.1.3	The (lack of) evidence for every.....	216
3.2	Distinguishing D-determiners from demonstratives.....	216
3.3	Distinguishing D-determiners from indefinite articles .....	210
3.3.1	The semantic contribution of indefinite articles .....	220
3.3.2	The syntactic position of indefinite articles.....	222
3.4	Summary .....	223
4	Implications for “articleless” languages .....	224
5	Implications for Māori.....	226
6	Conclusion .....	229
	References .....	231
	Appendix: Key to the Skwxwú7mesh Orthography .....	241

## List of Tables

Table 1.1: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	9
Table 2.1: The Salish language family.....	14
Table 2.2: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	15
Table 2.3: The demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	15
Table 2.4: The D-determiner and demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	32
Table 2.5: The D-determiner and demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	36
Table 2.6: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	36
Table 2.7: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	39
Table 2.8: The demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	39
Table 2.9: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	51
Table 2.10: The demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	51
Table 4.1: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄w̄7mesh.....	111
Table 5.1: Number of occurrences of D-determiners in the texts collected by Kuipers (1967)..	147
Table 5.2: Number of occurrences of demonstratives in the texts collected by Kuipers (1967).	147
Table 5.3: The article system of Fering.....	173
Table 6.1: The St'át'imets D-determiner system.....	181
Table 6.2: The St'át'imets D-determiner system.....	182
Table 6.3: The D-determiner system of Sechelt.....	183
Table 6.4: The D-determiner system of Sechelt.....	186
Table 6.5: The D-determiner system of Lushootseed.....	186
Table 6.6: The D-determiner system of Lushootseed.....	188
Table 6.7: The Musqueam D-determiner system.....	189
Table 6.8: The Musqueam D-determiner system.....	192
Table 6.9: The D-determiner system of Upper Chehalis.....	192
Table 6.10: The D-determiner system of Upper Chehalis.....	193
Table 6.11: The D-determiner system of Upper Chehalis.....	194
Table 6.12: The D-determiner system of Upper Chehalis.....	195
Table 6.13: The D-determiner system of Secwepemctsin.....	196
Table 6.14: The D-determiner system of Secwepemctsin.....	197
Table 6.15: The "a-type" D-determiner system of Nuxalk.....	198
Table 6.16: The "the-type" D-determiner system of Nuxalk.....	198
Table 6.17: The D-determiner system of Nuxalk.....	198
Table 6.33: The "a-type" D-determiner system of Nuxalk.....	199
Table 6.34: The "the-type" D-determiner system of Nuxalk.....	199
Table 6.35: The D-determiner system of Nłeʔkepmxcín.....	199
Table 6.36: The D-determiner system of Nłeʔkepmxcín.....	201
Table 6.37: The determiner system of Lummi.....	201
Table 6.38: The determiner system of Saanich.....	202
Table 6.39: The D-determiner system of Upriver Halkomelem.....	204
Table 6.40: The D-determiner system of Upriver Halkomelem.....	206
Table 6.41: Salish languages and non-deictic D-determiners.....	207
Table 6.42: The article system of of Māori.....	226

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1 : Speaker and relative distances from objects .....	39
Figure 2.2 : Distal object .....	43
Figure 2.3 : Medial object .....	46
Figure 2.4 : Proximal object .....	48
Figure 2.5 : Relative distances between distal, medial and proximal objects .....	51

## Abbreviations

### **Skwxwú7mesh**

1 = first person  
2 = second person  
3 = third person  
abs = absolutive agreement  
act = active  
appl = applicative  
caus = causativizer  
comp = complementizer  
conj = conjunction  
dem = demonstrative  
det = determiner  
dir = directed towards  
emph = emphatic  
erg = ergative agreement  
f = female  
foc = focus particle  
fut = future  
imper = imperative  
impf = imperfective  
inch = inchoative  
indep = independent pronoun  
intr = intransitivizer  
instr = instrument  
irr = irrealis  
lc = limited control  
loc = locative predicate  
neg = negation  
nom = nominalizer  
o = object  
obl = oblique  
pass = passive  
pl = plural  
poss = possessive agreement  
prog = progressive  
prox = proximal auxiliary  
pst = past  
Q = yes/no question particle  
redup = reduplicant  
refl = reflexive  
rl = realis auxiliary  
s = subject  
sbj = subjunctive/conjunctive agreement

sg = singular  
tr = transitivizer

### **Blackfoot**

3' = third person obviative  
nonaffirm = non-affirmative mood

### **Cowlitz**

imperf = imperfective  
stat = stative aspect

### **Fering**

A = A-article  
D = D-article  
m = masculine

### **Inuktitut**

abl = ablative case  
ind = indicative mood  
inst = instrumental case  
inter = interrogative mood  
loc = locative case  
part = participial mood

### **Lummi**

link = linking particle

### **Lushootseed**

hab = habitual  
perf = perfective  
prog = progressive  
sbj = subjunctive prefix  
stat = stative aspect

### **Mandarin**

sfp = sentence final particle

### **Māori**

A = aspect  
art = article  
du = dual  
gen = genitive  
Ident = identity copula

Pred = predicate  
T = tense

### **Norwegian**

def = definite

### **Saanich**

accom = accompany  
conjec = conjecture  
prob = probably  
real = realized

### **Secwepemctsin**

aor = aortive  
evid = evidential

### **St'át'imcets**

appar = apparently  
compl = completive particle  
conj = conjunctive morphology  
deic = deictic  
dimin = diminutive reduplicant  
exis = existence  
hyp = hypothetical  
prog = progressive  
quot = quotative  
wh = wh-morphology

### **Thompson**

cnj = conjunctive particle  
instr = instrument  
rprt = reportative

### **Upper Chehalis**

part = particle

### **Upriver Halkomelem**

aux = auxiliary

## Acknowledgements

There are so many people to thank I don't even know where to begin. When I first began looking at the determiners of Skwú7mesh, Peter Jacobs said, "You're *brave*." How right he was. It's a good thing I didn't realize *how* brave until it was too late to turn back, or I may never have discovered the beauty of the Skwú7mesh system.

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to all of the elders who provided me with the judgments necessary to write this thesis in the first place (in the order I met them): the late Eva Lewis, the late Yvonne Joseph, the late Lawrence Baker, the late Tina Cole, Margaret Locke, Lena Jacobs and the late Frank Miranda. *Huy chap a*. All of you had an incredible sense of humour. Our tapes are full of laughter. Thanks also for sharing your stories with me. I learned a lot about the language, but also about the history and culture.

I also owe a huge debt of gratitude to everyone on my committee. Thanks to Lisa Matthewson, supervisor extraordinaire. I honestly doubt I'd have made it this far without your encouragement, comments, and incredible energy. Your commitment to linguistics and the St'át'imcets community is awe-inspiring. Thanks to Hamida Demirdache, for encouraging me to work on Skwú7mesh instead of St'át'imcets way back in 1997, for inviting me to visit Nantes last year, and for always providing encouragement, right from the beginning. Your energy is still missed here at UBC. Thanks to Hotze Rullmann, for forcing me to think about semantics more carefully. My thinking has greatly benefited from all of our discussions. Thanks to Martina Wiltschko, for trying to make a better writer out of me. I hope you succeeded. Thanks also for holding amazing parties, and for introducing me to real schnapps.

Thanks to my external examiner, Greg Carlson, for insightful comments on this work. If only I had the time to address them all here!

Nothing gets done in a department of our size without an incredible secretary (or two). Thanks especially to Edna Dharmaratne, for keeping things running and for helping all the graduate students out, whenever we ask. She really does make the department work, and keeps many of the graduate students from despair! Thanks also to Sarah Chen, for making all of our lives just that much easier.

Thanks to all my professors at UBC over the years. I especially want to thank the late M. Dale Kinkade, my very first linguistics professor. He introduced me to (Moses-Columbian) Salish, and I was hooked. I am truly sorry I didn't finish this before his death. Thanks to Henry Davis, who also encouraged me to work on Salish, and who keeps everyone on their toes. Rose-Marie Déchaine taught me that all data is interesting. Doug Pulleyblank kept me from drowning in my own paperwork. Thanks also to Laura Downing, Pat Shaw, Guy Carden and Bryan Gick who all taught me something important during my PhD.

Financially, I was supported by a Killam Predoctoral Fellowship; thanks to UBC for awarding me that. Thanks also to SSHRC, Henry Davis, Lisa Matthewson, and Martina Wiltschko for financially supporting some part of this research.

Thanks also to all my professors from the University of Toronto, especially Alana Johns, who taught me a lot about Inuktitut, and introduced me to Buffy. Thanks also to Diane Massam, Elizabeth Cowper, Elan Dresher, Bob Binnick, Jack Chambers, Keren Rice, and Ron Smyth. Thanks for making me welcome in big bad Toronto/teaching me new things about linguistics.

Thanks to all the graduate students who made my life more liveable. Thanks to Linda Tamburri (Lalitadevi), who I can always talk to, no matter how long it's been, and who was a

comrade from day 1. Thanks to Leora Bar-el for amazing parties and for sharing war stories with me. I think I was better-prepared for the thesis battle only because of your experience. Thanks to Rachel “Dub” Wojdak for nicknaming everyone, but also for your insane ideas about linguistic mascots. Thanks to Peter “Jacobos” Jacobs, for setting up most of my elicitation, for helping me in my work, and for your amazing sense of humour. Evil is the new good. Thanks also to Hurly Burly Adam Werle for the last minute discussion of the deictic distinctions. Thanks to Naomi Sawai, who worried too much, to Solveiga Armoskaite, who is the best officemate anyone could hope for, to James Thompson, who rides WAY too much, Jason “JCB” Brown, who is always the calm in the eye of the storm, to Tyler Peterson, for the sharing of stories, to Yunhee Chung, for your amazing optimism, to Sonja Thoma, for your energy, to Calisto Mudzingwa, for appreciating the eternal fight over science, to Michele Kalmar, for sharing my love of bellydance, to Ryan Waldie, for having an amazing t-shirt collection, to Masaru Kiyota, for being very kind to everyone, and to Karsten Koch, for the long discussions on Nłeʔkepmxcín. Thanks to everyone else who shared this experience with me: Noriko Yamane-Tanaka, Leszek Barczak, Marion Caldecott, Mario Chavez-Peon, Shujun Chin, Christie Christodoulou, Gene Chu, Clare Cook, Donald Derrick, Atsushi Fujimori, Fusheini Hudu, Yoko Ikegami, Kristin Johannsdottir, Susie Jones, Jeff Muehlbauer, Yumiko Nakamura, Nahal Namdaran, Martin Oberg, Dominique Quis, Randy Sharp, Amelia Silva, Olga Steriopolo, Oladiipo Ajiboye, Maxine Batiste, Fiona Campbell, Suzanne Gessner, Jennifer Glougie, Andrea Gormley, Eun-sook Kim, Ramona McDowell, Jeremy Perkins, Christine Ravinski, Ad Ruangjaroon, Scott Shank, Kayono Shiobara, and last, but not least, Ian Wilson, who beat me to the finish line. I can’t thank you all enough.

Thanks to all those outside of linguistics, who contributed to my sanity. Jose Soto, my one-time boss and good friend, thanks for the parties and the Venezuelan food. Joydeep Sengupta, the workaholic, thanks for the sari, and for feeding all of us wonderful food. Thanks to Brian de Alwis and Cheryl Wiramanaden for many drinks, dinners and discussions. Cheryl, finish already, so we can graduate together. Thanks to the brunch bunch: Deborah Bleakley, Desiree Sattler and April Wessel. April especially shares my love of thrift stores and nerdy obsessions. Thanks to Dave Tompkins, for hosting many tv/movie nights and for always driving me home. Thanks to Becky Solomon, for sharing my love of 6 Feet Under. Or, perhaps more accurately, for enjoying my enjoyment of 6 Feet Under. Thanks to Kirsten Baker-Williams, for adding a little bit of drama every week. You also should finish already so we can graduate together. Thanks to Erin Young, for long conversations on the nature of academic life. I hope we all find the balance. Thanks to Vighen Pacradouni, for making my PhD seem short, and for your words of wisdom on the thesis process. Thanks to Davor Cubranic and Nicole Dorphan for the games nights. Thanks to Joey Kish for the pasta nights.

Thanks to all of my family for financial and emotional support over the years. Everyone should have a roommate/sister as good as Bronwyn. Thanks to Tristan, for being the weird one (or else, I’m sure it would be me). Thanks to my parents, for a million things, but especially for letting us rent their retirement condo. (I’m moving out soon, I hope!) Thanks to my cousin Christie Laidlaw for sharing a love of Sha Lin noodle soup. Take care out there in Afghanistan.

Thanks to Kitty, aka Wheezy, aka Lemon, for being the cutest, crankiest half-hairless cat I’ll ever know.

To Suresh Pillai, aka Hash, aka The Scientist, thanks for being there at just the right time. I’m not sure I would have finished without your support these past two years. I also enjoyed our many arguments since I first began the PhD. Is linguistics a science yet?

for all the Skwxwú7mesh elders