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Goals of the paper

1. Add the function of ‘domain restriction’ D_{DR} to the functions performed by definite heads (definite articles or demonstratives) crosslinguistically.

2. Show that the definite article performs D_{DR} in Greek, Basque (Giannakidou 2004, Etxeberria 2005, 2008, 2009, Giannakidou & Etxeberria 2010), and possibly also in Slavic (Schurcks et al 2009). In Korean, it is the demonstrative ‘ku’ (Kang 2012), and in Salish it is also a demonstrative. This is how we reinterpret the data in Matthewson (1998, 2001, 2008).

3. The domain restricting function D_{DR} is an unsaturating, a type-preserving function: a modifier. It supplies the contextual variable C, without creating a referential expression. Because of the presence of C, the domain of the quantifier becomes anaphoric (in the sense of Roberts 2010) to a discourse given property. This creates a presuppositional quantifier that comes with a non-empty domain.

4. D_{DR} is a function that can modify either the NP argument (Salish, Korean), or the Q itself (Greek, Basque), pace Stanley 2002, Stanley and Szabó 2000).

Implications

1. Contextual restriction is syntactically more real than one would have expected had the phenomenon been primarily pragmatic (as in Recanati 2002, or relevance theorizing).

2. Non-canonical D attachments allow D to not close the NP argument, and are systematic.

3. D_{DR}, as a function of definiteness is a manifestation of discourse anaphora, but not as a relation of referents (as in the ‘classical’ saturation case of a referential description). Rather, it is anaphora between properties.
1  Background: Ds, Qs, and contextual domain restriction

1.1  Saturation and arguments


(1)  a. \([\text{every woman}] = \lambda P. \forall x. \text{woman}(x) \rightarrow P(x)\)
b. \([\text{every}] = \lambda P. \lambda Q. \forall x. P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)\)
c. \(\lambda Q. \text{ett} \quad \lambda x. \text{woman}(x)\)

The D the –and its equivalents–, which is designated D, also creates nominal arguments (Abney 1987; cf. also Alexiadou, Haegeman, and Stavrou 2008). The DP is thought of as a referring expression of type e (Strawson 1950, 1952, Donnellan 1966; cf. also Elbourne 2007).

(2)  \(\lambda \text{e}. \lambda x. \text{boy}(x)\)

THE is a saturating function! It closes the NP argument and creates a referential expression:

(3)  a. \(\text{the/this boy} = \iota (\lambda x. \text{boy}_C(x))\)
b. \(\text{the/these boys} = \max (\lambda x. \text{boy}_C(x))\)

(4)  \(\max(P) = \text{the unique } x \text{ such that } P(x) = 1 \& \forall y[P(y) = 1 \rightarrow y \leq x]\)

1.2  Domain restriction


(5)  Many people came to the party last night; every student got drunk.

(6)  \(\forall x [\text{student}(x) \cap C(x)] \rightarrow \text{got drunk}(x)\)
    \(C = \text{the participants in the party last night. } C \text{ makes reference to that set.}\)

Westerståhl (1985): the definite article introduces a context set C.

Giannakidou (2004), Etxeberria & Giannakidou (2010): provide evidence that domain restriction can be syntactic, and indeed affecting the Q or the NP, at least in some cases.
2 Varieties of definites: Roberts’s theory of definiteness


Theory of definiteness of Roberts (2010: p.3-4):

(7) a. **English Definite NPs**: definite descriptions, personal pronouns, demonstrative descriptions, demonstrative pronouns, and proper names

b. **Definiteness**: We say that an NP is definite just in case it carries an anaphoric presupposition, i.e., it carries a presupposition of weak familiarity.

c. **Weak familiarity**: A presupposition of weak familiarity requires that the existence of the relevant entity be entailed by the interlocutors’ common ground. Such existence entailments by themselves are sufficient to license introduction of a discourse referent into the context of utterance. Weak familiarity does not mean previous mention. Previous mention is strong familiarity.

d. The **antecedent** of an anaphoric expression is the **discourse referent** which satisfies its anaphoric presupposition. A discourse referent is the identification of an existence entailment in the interlocutors’ Common Ground, modeled as a constraint on contextually admissible assignment functions.

e. Anaphora (and hence, weak familiarity) does not presuppose a linguistic antecedent!

f. **Pronouns**, and demonstratives, unlike definite descriptions, carry the additional presupposition that the discourse referent which satisfies their familiarity presupposition is **maximally salient** at that point in the discourse. This difference will be used to explain the fact that **when uniqueness effects arise, they are generally triggered by definite descriptions, not pronouns.”**

Roberts (2003: 302) proposes the following taxonomy of familiarity:

(8) **Taxonomy of familiarity:**

(a) **strong familiarity**: the NP has as antecedent a discourse referent introduced via the utterance of a (usually) preceding sentence.

(b) **weak familiarity**:

i. the entity referred to is perceptually accessible to the interlocutors

ii. the entity referred to is globally familiar in the general culture or at least among the participants in the discourse, although not mentioned in the immediate discourse

iii. introduction of the NP’s discourse referent is licensed solely by contextual existence entailments

We propose that the domain restricting function of D can be added to Roberts’ system as a case of **property anaphora**.
3 Giannakidou and Etxeberria (2010): D as a domain restrictor


D functions not as an individual forming function \( et,e \), but as a function that preserves the type of its argument, and modifies it by supplying the contextual restriction \( C \).

3.1 Non-canonical uses of D: D on the quantificational determiner

\(^\ominus\) Crosslinguistically, D doesn’t always appear with the nominal. It may appear with the Q!

(9)  a. o kathe fititis  
     D.sg every student  
     *the every student  
  b. *kathe o fititis  
     every D student  

(10) a. mutil guzti-ak  
     boy all-D.pl  
  b. *mutil guzti; *mutil-ak guzti

(11) a. i tákem-a smúlhs  
     D.pl all-D woman  
     ‘all of the women’  
  b. i zi7zeg’-a sk’wemk’úk’wm’it  
     D.pl each-D child(pl)  
     ‘each of the children’

(12) a. minden diák  
     every student  
  b. az összes diák  
     the all student  
  c. * összes az diák  
     all the student

(13) a. vsjako momče  
     ‘every boy’  
  b. vsički-te momčeta  
     every-the-pl boy-pl  
     ‘each boy’  
  c. *vsički momčeta-te  
     every boy-pl-the.pl

\(^\ominus\) D attaches syntactically to the Q. In this position, D can’t function ‘canonically’, because it doesn’t have the proper input (et).

\(\odot\) Etxeberria and Giannakidou: new, type preserving function!
Option 1: D as a Q-det modifier

(14) \([D_{DR}] = \lambda Z_{et, en} \lambda P_{et} \lambda Q_{et} Z (P \cap C) (Q)\); where Z is the relation denoted by Q

(15) a. \([Qp \circ D + kathe \ Q \ [NP \ fititis]]\)
    b. o kathe fititis = [kathe (C)] (student) ‘each student’

Option 2: D_{DR} applying to NP (Salish, Korean)

(17) \([D_{DR}] = \lambda P_{et} \lambda x P(x) \cap C(x)\)

(18) Contextual Restrict \(\langle [\lambda x \ NP(x)], C = \lambda x \ NP(x) \land C(x)\rangle\)
    (Giannakidou 2004: (31), following Cheng and Ladusaw 2003)

Important: the D does NOT saturate the NP argument, does not create a referential expression.

**Typological predictions:**

- **D_{DR}** is a manifestation of definiteness:
  - **D_{DR}** is an additional function that D can have in a given language; **D_{DR}** does not replace the referential function (or the generic use of D).
  - Greek and Basque: DR is performed by a morphologically definite D; these languages exhibit a ‘classical’ morphological distinction of (in)definiteness.
  - Salish, Korean: languages that have a D but no article distinction; the single available D is **demonstrative**, thus definite, thus able to do DR.
  - Chinese: a language that lacks determiners; **dou**, which is not morphologically definite, takes up the **D_{DR}** function (Cheng 2009)
4 Why $D_{DR}$ does not saturate: no DP in Greek and Basque

Consider the structures below where a D appears to precede a numeral or a (weak) quantifier:

(19)  
  a. Greek:
    I tris fitites pu irthan sto parti, itan endelos methismeni.
    [The [three students that came to the party]] were completely drunk
  b. Basque:
    Festara etorri ziren hiru ikasle-ak erabat mozkortuta zeuden.
    [to the party came aux.pl three student][D.pl] completely drunk were

These structures are referring DPs of type e, and are interpreted like regular definite descriptions.

**Question:** since the [D [Q NP]] is generated by the grammar and yields a referential expression, what are the arguments that our $D_{DR}$-ed structure is not a DP of this kind?

**Argument 1:** non-quantity denoting weak Qs are not easily compatible with D in Greek, while in Basque a non-numeral weak Q cannot combine with the D at all (cf. Etxeberria 2005, 2009):

(20)  
  a. [I {poli/liji/ *kapjii} fitites pu irthan sto parti], ekanan poli fasaria.
    [The [many/few/*some students]] that came to the party made a lot of noise.
  b. [Festara etorri ziren ikasle {*asko/*batzuk/*zenbait}-ak] zarata haundia egin zuten
    to the party come aux.student many/some/some-D.pl noise big make aux

**Argument 2:** [o-kathe NP] cannot co-occur with the demonstrative pronouns (aftos ‘this’, ekinos ‘that’), which in Greek, like in many other languages, must embed DPs (Stavrou 1983; Stavrou and Horrocks 1989, Alexiadou et al. 2008):

(21)  
  aftos/ekinos *(o) fititis
  this/that the student

(22)  
  a. {afti/ekini} i tris fititis         b. {aftos/ekinos} o enas fititis
      these/those the three students     this/that one student

(23)  
  *{aftos/ekinos} o kathe fititis
  this/that the every student

**Argument 3:** DP reduplication in Greek (Alexiadou & Wilder 1998, Campos & Stavrou 2004, Kolliakou 2004):

(24)  
  o kokinos       o tixos
  the red.nom      the wall.nom
  ‘the wall that is red’

Such structures are NOT possible with o kathe, but are possible with D followed by a numeral:

(25)  
  a. * o kathe o fititis         b. o enas o fititis         c. i tris i fitites
      the one    the students     the three the students
Argument 4. In Basque, it is possible to conjoin two NPs or two APs under the same single D:

(26) \[[\text{DP} \ [\text{NP} \text{Ikasle}] \text{ eta } [\text{NP} \text{ irakasle}-ak] \text{ azterket- a garai-a-n daude.} \]

\[[\text{student and teacher}-\text{D.pl.abs} \text{ exam-D.sg period-D.sg-in aux.pl} \text{ ‘The students and teachers are in exams period.’} \]

(27) Maia\text{-erg} \[[\text{DP} \ [\text{AdjP} \text{zaldi haundi}] \text{ eta } [\text{AdjP} \text{elefante txiki}-ak] \text{ ikusi ditu.} \]

\text{Maia-erg} \[[\text{horse big and elephant small}-\text{D.pl.abs} \text{ see aux.pl} \text{ ‘Maia has seen the big horses and small elephants.’} \]

But we cannot co-ordinate two Q-dets under D!

(28) a. \* \[[\text{DP} \ [\text{QP} \text{Ikasle gehien}] \text{ eta } [\text{QP irakasle guzti}-ak] \text{ goiz iritsi ziren.} \]

\[[\text{student most and teacher all}-\text{D.pl.abs} \text{ early arrive aux.pl} \text{ ‘Most of the students and all of the teachers arrived early (intended.’} \]

b. \* \[[\text{DP} \ [\text{QP} \text{Neska bakoitz}] \text{ eta } [\text{QP mutil guzti}-ek] \text{ sari bat irabazi zuten.} \]

\[[\text{girl each and boy all-D.pl.erg prize one win aux.pl} \text{ ‘Each girl and all of the boys won a prize (intended.)’} \]

- D\text{-DR-ed Qs do not create referential DPs, but a QP where D adjoins to the Q.}
- Both D and Q end up in the same position.
- From this coexistence, we will suggest, D loses its referential (e-forming) ability

5 The result of DR: the Q created via D presupposes a non-empty domain

(29) Presuppositionality of determiners

A determiner/quantifier \(\delta\) is presuppositional iff for all A, B \(\subseteq\) D, if \(A = \emptyset\) then, <A,B> \(\notin\) Dom(\(\delta\)). (based on Heim and Kratzer 1998:163)

(30) (Non)veridicality of determiners and quantifiers (Giannakidou 1999)

A determiner/quantifier \(\delta\) is veridical iff it holds that:

\[[\delta \text{ NP VP}], = 1 \rightarrow \exists x \text{ NP (x)} ; \text{ otherwise, } \delta \text{ is nonveridical.} \]

\(\rightarrow\) means “presupposes” or “entails”

(31) If you find every mistake, I’ll give you a bonus; but there may be no mistakes at all.
(32) An vris kathe lathos tha sou doso bonus; alla bori na min iparxoun katholu lathi.

\(\checkmark\) Each and both come out as veridical (Giannakidou 1999)!

(33) An vris to kathe lathos, tha sou doso bonus; # ala bori ke na min iparxoun katholu lathi.
If you find each mistake, I’ll give you a bonus; # but there may be no mistakes at all.
(34) An vris ke ta dhio lathi, tha sou doso bonus; # ala bori ke na min iparxoun katholu lathi.
If you find both mistakes, I’ll give you a bonus; # but there may be no mistakes ay all.

\(\checkmark\) Notice Greek: both “ke i dhio” lit. ‘and the two’: again D is used!
Basque (examples from Etxeberria 2009):

(35) Akats **guzti-ak/gehien-ak** aurkitzen badituzu, sari bat emango dizut. mistake all-D.pl.abs/most-D.pl.abs find if-aux. reward one give aux
# Bainak gerta liteke bat-ere akats-ik ez egotea.
   but happen aux one-too mistake-part no be-nom
‘If you find all of the/most of the mistakes, I’ll give you a reward. # But there may be no mistakes at all.’

**Consequence:** If D-attachment to Qs is systematic, this means that some Qs come as “inherently” domain restricted and veridical.

**Consequence:** No kind-generic use!

(36) a. **Kathe monokeros** exi ena kerato.
   Every unicorn has one horn.
   b. # **O kathe** monokeros exi ena kerato.
   Each unicorn has one horn.
   c. # **Adarbakar bakoitz-a-k** adar bat dauka.
      unicorn each-D.sg-erg horn one has
      Good: only as a claim about a specific set of unicorns, e.g. in an illustration that is present physically at the time of conversation.

(37) a. Greek: Sto programa mas, **o kathe fititis** prepi na epileksi dio mathimata simasiologias.
   b. Basque: Gure programan, **ikasle bakoitz-ak** bi semantika eskola aukeratu behar ditu.
   c. English: In our program, **each student** must choose two semantics classes.

**Interim conclusions:**
- **D_{DR}** is a manifestation of definiteness: D functions as a modifier that adds the C variable to the domain of Q, **thereby rendering the domain anaphoric to a weakly familiar property in the context.**
- When the **D_{DR}** applies to Q, the created Q will only be able to quantify over a non-empty domain.
- We believe that this analysis characterizes **all** Qs that are labelled presuppositional in the literature, including **each** which does not exhibit an overt D.

6 Qs and DPs in St’át’ímcets (Matthewson 1998, 2001)

6.1 Matthewson’s analysis

(38) a. Léxlex [tá kem i smelhmúl hats-a]
   intelligent [all D.pl woman(pl)-D]
   ‘all of the women are intelligent.’
   b. * léxlex [tá kem smelhmúl hats]
      intelligent [all woman(pl)]
(39) a. Úm’-en-lhkan [zi7zeg’ i sk’wemk’úk’wm’it-a] [ku kándi]
give-tr-1sg.subj [each D.pl child(pl)-D] [D candy]
‘I gave each of the children candy.’
b. * Úm’-en-lhkan [zi7zeg’ sk’wemk’úk’wm’it] [ku kándi]
give-tr-1sg.subj [each child(pl)] [D candy]

Matthewson (2001: 3): The D consists of “two discontinuous parts, a proclitic ($ti$ for singulars; $i$ for plurals), which encodes deictic [emphasis ours] and number morphology, and an enclitic …$a$ which attaches to the first lexical element in the phrase”.

Matthewson (2001): Quantification in natural languages proceeds in two steps (≠ the standard analysis of GQs):

(i) the D combines with the NP predicate to create a DP (type $e$);
(ii) the Q of type $\langle e, \langle\langle e, t\rangle, t\rangle\rangle$ combines with the DP to yield a GQ $\langle\langle e, t\rangle, t\rangle$.

(40) a. [QP takem i smelhmúlhat-a]
    [all D.pl woman (pl)-D]
b. QP ett
    Q $e,ett$
takem
    deictic D $et,e$
    NP et
    i
    smelhmúlhat-a

D, in Matthewson’s account is an $et,e$ function, in particular a choice function:

(41) $[[smelhmúlhat (pl.)]] = [[*]] ([[smúlhat (sg.)]])$ ‘women’
(42) $[[X \ldots a_k]]^g = \lambda f \in D_et (g(k)) (f)$ (Matthewson 2001: (18))

Important:
1. The structure of [Q DP] is proposed by Matthewson as universal!
2. The DP is a choice function, thus an indefinite.

Problems:

(43) a. * every the boy
c. * many the boys
f. all the boys
b. * most the boys
d. * three the boys
g. only the boys

(44) a. * cada los chicos
c. * muchos los chicos
f. todos los chicos
b. * la mayoría los chicos
d. * tres los chicos
g. sólo los chicos

Also, the correlation with the partitive is missed! In our account, the partitive is the equivalent to $D_{DR}$ on the NP.
6.2 Etxeberria and Giannakidou: D does NOT saturate the NP argument

(45) \[
[D_{DR}] = \lambda P_{et} \lambda x P(x) \cap C(x)
\]

(46) Modifier semantics for \(i...a\)
\[
[i...a] = \lambda P_{et} \lambda x P(x) \cap C(x)
\]

(47) Contextual \textit{Restrict} ((\lambda x \text{NP}(x), C) = \lambda x \text{NP}(x) \land C(x)

(Giannakidou 2004: (31), following Cheng and Ladusaw 2003)

So, Salish simply illustrates the other option. However, if \(D_{DR}\) is a manifestation of definiteness, as we argue, how is this consistent with Matthewson’s analysis of D as indefinite?

We show that the indefiniteness analysis is not justified. The Salish D behaves like a demonstrative. This is consistent with Matthewson’s own claims (Matthewson 2008: 543): “The deictic features of the DP force reference to the discourse situation”.

7 Salish DPs are demonstratives

Don’t forget: D is morphologically ‘deictic’!

\textbf{Question:} is the generalized use of D as \(D_{DR}\) in Salish expected from the point of view of definiteness? Matthewson says NO, but we say YES!!

\textbf{Arguments for the demonstrative nature of the Salish DP:}

\textit{Argument 1:} No Individual Concept Reading

(48) a. s\'écsec [ti kelʔåqsten-s-a ti United.States-a] (Demirdache 1997: (9))
fool D leader-3sg.poss-D D United.States-D

‘The chief of the US is a fool.’

‘This chief of the US is a fool.’ No individual concept reading.

b. √Clinton is a fool, *Carter is a fool.

Demonstratives also do not receive individual concept readings!

\textit{Argument 2:} No generic constructions

Matthewson (1998: 332): no real generic constructions in StS and “DP-adjointed universal quantifiers are used as the closest approximant, but since the quantifiers always co-occurs with a deictic, […] there is no way of quantifying over a group which is not contextually specified”.

Demonstratives are never used generically!
Argument 3: StS DPs always take the widest scope:

(a) with negation (Matthewson 1999: (21)):

(49) \text{cw7aoz kw-s áz’-en-as [ti sts’úqwaz’-a] kw-s Sophie neg D-nom buy-tr-3erg [D fish-D] D-nom Sophie}

‘Sophie didn’t buy a fish.’ (= ‘There is a fish which Sophie didn’t buy.’)

[Equivalent to: Sophie didn’t buy \{the/this\} fish.] [equivalence provided by G&E]

(b) No scope interaction (Matthewson 1999: (29))

(50) \text{qus-en-itas [i n7án’was-a smém’lhat] [i kalhélhs-a mixalh] shoot-tr-3pl.erg [D.pl two(hum)-D woman] [D.pl three(anim)-D bear]}

‘Two girls shot three bears.’

[Equivalent to: \textbf{These} two girls shot \textbf{these} three bears.] [equivalence provided by G&E]

\checkmark ‘A total of two girls shot a total of three bears’

* ‘Each of two girls shot three bears, such that the total number of bears shot was six’

Demonstratives also take widest scope, since they are deictic!

Argument 4: No donkey anaphora (Matthewson 2009: (41))

(51) \# \text{tákem i=sqáycw=a wa7 s-tsúwa7 i=ts’qáx7=a all D.pl=man=exis impf stat-own D.pl=horse=exis ama-s-twitas ti=ts’qáx=a good-caus-3pl.erg D=horse=exis}

‘Every man who owns a horse \textit{loves this horse} [insertion of this by G&E]

Consultant’s comment: “No, because it’s only one horse”

Demonstratives are likewise never used as donkey pronouns.

\checkmark So, the StS DP looks like a demonstrative!

(52) \text{\[\text{ti...a}\]_{g,c}^{s,e} = \lambda f_{<<s,e>,<s,t>>}. \lambda s : \exists! x f ((\lambda s. x)(s_0) = 1 \text{ where } s_0 \text{ is proximal to the speaker in } c}.

tx f(x)(s_0) = 1 \text{ [Matthewson 2008: (47)]}

Hence, our claim that Salish D performs D_{DR} is totally consistent with our theory that D_{DR} is another manifestation of definiteness.

Matthewson’s arguments for indefiniteness: none of them convincing

Here we take the older arguments from Matthewson and show that they do not prove indefiniteness. Rather, they are all compatible with our idea that the DP is demonstrative.
(i) The DP can translate either as definite or indefinite in a default context.

(53)  q’wez-ilc [ti smúlhats-a]
dance-intr [D.sg woman-D]
‘The/a woman danced.’
‘This woman danced.’ [added by E&G]

Recall that StS lacks an indefinite article. Given the morphological specification of the DP as deictic and the absence of definite/indefinite article, the initial indeterminacy of the DP does not prove ambiguity. Rather, it must be taken to suggest that mere novelty-familiarity is not a guiding condition for the distribution of D in Salish, as one would expect from a language that lacks the morphological article distinction.

(ii) No anaphoric interpretation

(54)  wa7 lts7a pankúph-a [ti swúw’h-a] múta7
be here Vancouver-D [D cougar-D] and
wa7 láku7 lil’wat-a [ti swúw’h-a] t’it
be there Mount.Currie-D [D cougar-D] also
‘There is a cougar here in Vancouver and there is also a cougar there in Mt. Currie.’
Consultant’s comment: “There are two different cougars.”

But this again is no evidence for indefiniteness, since demonstrative and regular pronouns also allow disjoint reference:

(55)  a. This_1 boy came in. This_2 boy sat down.
b. He_1 came in. He_1/2 left right away.

Once again, what this comes to show is that the Salish DP is like a demonstrative pronoun.

(iii) No uniqueness

(56)  ka hál’h-a [ta nkakúsent-a]
ooc show-ooc [D star-D]
‘A star appeared’
‘This star appeared’ [added by E&G]

If, as Roberts argues, pronouns do not carry uniqueness, then the sentence above simply confirms that ta nkakúsent-a is like a demonstrative.

(iv) Existential there sentences

DPs are claimed to appear in the Salish equivalent of there-structures.

(57)  wa7 lts7a pankúph-a [ti swúw’h-a] múta7
be here Vancouver-D [D cougar-D] and
‘There’s D cougar in Vancouver’

(from Matthewson 1999: (56))
Is this evidence for indefiniteness? We are highly skeptical. The so-called definiteness effect appears to be from illusive to non-existent (McNally 1992, 2009, Francez 2007, 2009). Here are some examples with definites, D-restricted Qs, and a proper name in the English existential:

(58)  a. There is **Fred** in the garden.  
      b. There was the **table** in the garden.  
      c. There was each faculty member at the meeting.

Crosslinguistically too, we observe definites in the existential.

(59)  a. ..seit es **das Kind** gibts.  
      since there the child gives  
      ‘Since the child existed’  
      b. Exi **ta pedia** ston kipo.  
      has the children at-the garden  
      ‘There are the kids in the garden.’

Greek and German in fact appear to be more liberal than English with definites, so there is crosslinguistic variation in this respect. Pronouns and demonstratives are also possible:

(60)  a. There is **you** in my mind all the time.  
      b. Exi **afto to pedi** sto grafio ke se perimeni.  
      There is this boy in the office waiting for you.

The existential cannot be used as a reliable test for indefiniteness, and that the occurrence of StS DPs and pronouns follows the observed crosslinguistic pattern.


\textbf{(v) Sluicing}

\begin{verbatim}
Our criticism to this argument will be parallel to the one that we just gave for the existential: the premise that definites are excluded from sluicing is simply not true. In addition, it is not clear that we are dealing with sluicing in StS.
\end{verbatim}

Matthewson (1999: 107) offers the following sentence as sluicing with a DP antecedent:

(61) wa7 cwíl’en-as k Henry [ti púkw-a], ’tu7 aoz kw-en-s zwát-en stám’-as prog look.for-tr-3erg D Henry [D book-D] but neg D-1sg.poss-nom know-tr what-3conj  
    ‘Henry is looking for a book, but I don’t know which.’

Matthewson (2008) further gives examples with pronouns antecedents ((26), translated as \textit{I paid him, but I don’t know who}, and (27) \textit{When I was walking I saw them, but I don’t know who}). From these examples, Matthewson concludes “non-familiarity of the pronouns” (2008: 536).
Chung, Ladusaw and McCloskey (1994): only indefinites antecedents in sluicing. But:

(62)  a. John talked to the students, but I don’t know which ones exactly.
     b. Abby called Ben an idiot, but I don’t know who else.  (Merchant 2001: 23)

(for more examples see Romero 1998, Merchant 2001). Also: sluicing can be confused with so-called pseudo-sluice (Merchant 1998), which has a cleft structure [who it is/was]:

(63) Pseudosluice =_{def} An elliptical construction that resembles a sluice in having only a wh-XP as remnant, but has the structure of a cleft, not of a regular embedded question.  
     (Merchant 1998: (19))

Sluicing appears in Japanese (where we only see a wh-word, like in Salish) but not in English or Spanish where the cleft must be used:

(64) Bob saw those boys, but I don’t know {*who/who they were.}

We suspect that Matthewson’s examples are pseudosluices: “In StS, wh-words function as predicates, so it is impossible to prevent the structure from involving a full “who it was” clause (Henry Davis, p.c.)” (Matthewson 2008: 536). Pseudosluicing is different from sluicing and it is much more relaxed with respect to the type of antecedent: definites are perfect with it!

To sum up:
- The arguments for indefiniteness for StS DP are either inconclusive, or equally compatible with our idea that the StS DP is demonstrative-like.
- The DP is a referential, morphologically deictic nominal that exhibits the strictest form of definiteness: dependency to the utterance situation.
- Then, its ability to perform \(D_{DR}\) comes as no surprise given our theory.

9 Conclusions

1. \(D\) can perform domain restriction (\(D_{DR}\)), without without creating an individual e. In other words, \(D\) does not always saturate the NP argument.

2. When \(D\) functions as \(D_{DR}\) it can have “non-canonical” syntactic attachment as a modifier, preserving the type of the phrase it attaches to. In Greek and Basque it attaches to Q-det. But in Salish (and in some Slavic languages, cf. Giannakidou, Schürcks, and Etxeberria 2009) \(D_{DR}\) applies directly to the predicate. Likewise in Korean (Kang 2012).

3. Salish shows that in the absence of a definite article, the next vehicle of semantic definiteness—the demonstrative—will take the function of \(D_{DR}\). This is again predicted by what we proposed here.
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