

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	Error! Bookmark not defined.

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 Skwxwú7mesh13

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
Chapter Three: Theoretical Background.....		52
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
Chapter Four: The deictic D-determiners.....		80
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
Chapter Five: The non-deictic D-determiner <i>kwi</i>		117
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 does not presuppose familiarity/novelty</i>	127
3.1.2.2	<i>Kwi does not assert uniqueness</i>	128
3.2	No split DP domain in $S_{kwxw7}mesh$	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 $S_{kwxw7}mesh$ -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
Chapter Six: Typological Implications.....		176
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 Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	9
Table 2.1: The Salish language family.....	14
Table 2.2: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	15
Table 2.3: The demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	15
Table 2.4: The D-determiner and demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	32
Table 2.5: The D-determiner and demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	36
Table 2.6: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	36
Table 2.7: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	39
Table 2.8: The demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	39
Table 2.9: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	51
Table 2.10: The demonstrative system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	51
Table 4.1: The D-determiner system of Skw̄w̄wú7mesh.....	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 Nl̄eʔkepmxcín.....	199
Table 6.36: The D-determiner system of Nl̄eʔkepmxcín.....	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 Steriopolu, 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