

Matthewson (1998) “DP-quantification in Salish.”
(In *Determiner Systems and Quantification Strategies*, Chap. 5)

1. Paper Goal

• Propose that the D vs. A-quantification distinction be revised in favour of a three-way split, DP/D⁰/A-quantification. Salish lacks D⁰-quantification, but it has DP-quantification.

2. Salish possesses DP-quantifiers

2.1 Universal quantifiers adjoin to DP

(15b) qwetséts [xwexwéyt re sqélemc]
 leave [all DET man]
 ‘All the men left’

(Secwepemctsin; D et al. 94)

I. Constituency of [Q DP]

A. Non-adverbial Q always quantifies over *adjacent* DP

(16a) wik-t-s xwexwéyt [re stsmémelt] [re nuxwenxw]
 see-TR-3ERG all [DET children] [DET woman]
 ‘The woman saw all the children’
 * ‘All the women saw the children’

(Secwepemctsin; D et al. 94)

(16b) na ch’aw-at-as i7xw [ta siw’i7ka] [ta slhenlhanay’]
 REL help- TR-3ERG all [DET men] [DET women]
 ‘All the men helped the women’
 * ‘The men helped all the women’

(Squamish; D et al. 94)

(17) ʔačən-ítaš tákəm [ta šk’úk’wmit-a] [ʔi šmúlač-a]
 ats’x-en-ítas tákəm [ta sk’úkúwm’it-a] [i smúlhats-a]
 see-TR-3PL.ERG all [SG. DET child-EXIS] [PL. DET woman- EXIS]
 % ‘The women saw all of the child’
 * ‘All the women saw the child’

(St’át’imcets)

B. [Q DP] can coordinate with DP

(19b) [l nuxwnúxwenxw] ell [xwexwéyt l sqélqlemc] m-sxup
 [DET women] CONJ [all DET men] COMPL-left
 ‘The women and all the men left’

(Secwepemctsin; D et al. 94)

C. No predicates or adverbials between main verb and following DP

(20b) *qwetséts xyum [re sqélemc]
 leave big [DET man]
 ‘The big man left’

(Secwepemctsin; D et al. 94)

(21a) *q^wačáč papt [ʔi šyáqčʔ-a]
 *qwatsáts papt [i syáqtsʔ-a]
 leave always [PL. DET woman-EXIS]

‘The women always leave’

(St’át’imcets)

D. No scope ambiguity of Q with negation

(23a) **x^wʔaz** k^w-š **tákə̃m** ʔi šməlmúlač-a qwə́láw-ə̃m
cw7aɔz kw-s **tákem** i smelhmúlhats-a q’weláw’-em
 NEG DET-NMLZR [all PL.DET woman(RED)-EXIS] pick.berries-INTR
 ‘Not all of the women picked berries’

(St’át’imcets)

(23b) [**tákə̃m** ʔi šməlmúlač-a]_i **ʔaz** ʎuʔ k^w-š qwə́láw-ə̃m t_i
 [**tákem** i smelhmúlhats-a]_i **az** t’u7 kw-s q’weláw’-em t_i
 [all PL.DET woman(RED)-EXIS] NEG just DET-NMLZR pick.berries-INTR t_i
 ‘None of the women picked berries’

(St’át’imcets)

[Q DP] raises as a constituent, and takes scope at its surface position.

Morphological evidence of extraction:

(27a) [tákə̃m ʔi ščmált-š-a] ʔačx-ən-táli
 [tákem i stsmál’t-s-a] ats’x-en-táli
 [all PL.DET children-3SG.POSS-EXIS] see-TR-ERG.EXTR
 ‘All her children saw somebody’

(St’át’imcets)

II. Structure of [Q DP]

[Q DP]_{DP}

Q can appear before any DP:

- a. [D NP]_{DP}
- b. [D null-relative]_{DP}
- c. [pro]_{DP}
- d. [subject clitic]_{DP}
- e. [wh-word]_{DP}

For why Q is an adjunct and not a specifier, see Matthewson (1998) Ch. 4, Matthewson & Davis (1995).

III. What about [det Q NP] ?

(33a) q^wačáč [ʔi **tákə̃m**-a šmúlač]
 qwatsáts [i **tákem**-a smúlhats]
 leave [PL.DET all-EXIS woman]
 ‘All the women left’

(St’át’imcets)

Matthewson claims that St’át’imcets Q’s range over DPs not NPs. If so, how do we analyze (33a)?

2.2 Not all quantification is adverbial in Salish

- The universal quantifiers introduced above do not function semantically as adverbial quantifiers.
- A caveat: the semantic characteristics of D- and A-quantification are not clearly distinct (they are described as tendencies), so the semantic arguments serve to supplement the syntactic evidence above.

I. The range of *tákem* ‘all’ is over individuals, not over the predicate

- In the following English examples, the DP-internal universal quantifier does not range over the predicate, whereas the DP-external universal quantifier does.

- (37) DP-internal quantifier:
a. [All the flowers] are white. (\neq The flowers are completely white)

- DP-external quantifier:
b. The flowers are all white. (‘completely white’ reading is ok)

(i) St’át’imcets DP-internal universal quantifier *tákem* shows the same behavior as the DP-internal *all* in (37a).

- (39) a. pəq [tákəm ?i špáq-m-a]
peq [tákem i s-p’áq’-m-a]
white [all PL.DET NMLZR-bloom-INTR-EXIS]
‘All the flowers are white.’
* ‘The flowers are completely white.’ (St’át’imcets)

- b. caq^w-an-lkálap [tákəm ?i šcúq^waz-a]
ts’aqw-an’lhkál’ap [tákem i sts’úqwaz’-a]
eat-TR-2PL.SUB [all PL.DET fish- EXIS]
‘You guys ate all the fishes (PL).’
* ‘You guys ate the fish completely.’ (St’át’imcets)

(ii) Examples with a weak quantifier—the same behavior as (i):

- (41) a. čəq^wčiq^w [?i x^w?it-a čitx^w]
tseqwtsiqw [i cw7it-a tsitcw]
red [PL.DET many-EXIS house]
‘Many houses are red.’
* ‘The houses are mostly red.’ (St’át’imcets)

- b. [x^w?it ?i čitx^w-a] wa? čəq^wčiq^w
[cw7it i tsitcw-a] wa7 tseqwtsiqw
[many PL.DET house- EXIS] PROG red
‘Many houses are red.’
* ‘The houses are mostly red.’ (St’át’imcets)

II. The range of *tákem* is over the single DP to which it adjoins

- Salish DP-universal quantifiers can quantify only over the single DP to which it adjoins.¹

- (43a) **tákəm** šwat ?acx-ən-táli [ti škúk^wmit-a]
tákem swat ats’x-en-táli [ti sk’úk’wm’it-a]
all who see-TR-ERG.EXTR [DET child-DET]

¹ In cases where English DP-quantifiers allow unselective quantification (e.g., donkey sentences), St’át’imcets DP-quantifiers do as well.

‘Everyone saw the child.’

(St’át’imcets)

- (44) a. [táƙəm ła sm-smúteč] ha wik-t-íyxs us [ła snkyáp]
 [all DET AUG-woman] DET see-TR-3PL CONJ [DET coyote]
 ‘All the women saw the coyote.’ (Nl̥eʔkepmxcin)
- b. [ła sk^{wúk^w}miʔt] ʔupi-t-íyxs [táƙəm us ła sq^wíyt]
 [DET child] eat-TR-PL [all CONJ DET fruit]
 ‘The child ate all the berries.’ (Nl̥eʔkepmxcin)
- c. [takəm ła sm-smúteč] ha wik-t-íyxs us [táƙəm us ła snkyáp]
 [all DET AUG-woman] DET see-TR-PL CONJ [all CONJ DET coyote]
 ‘All the women saw all the coyotes.’ (Nl̥eʔkepmxcin)

• Cf. Japanese universal A-quantifier *mo* ‘all’ can bind *wh*-words unselectively:

- (42) **Dare-ga doko-de nani-o kaw-te-mo boku-wa kamawa-nai**
 who-NOM where-at what-ACC buy-Q I-TOP care-not
 ‘For all, *x*, *y*, *z*, *x* a person, *y* a thing, *z* a place, I don’t care if *x* buys *y* at *z*.’ (Japanese)

3. Actually, St’át’imcets has few A-quantifiers

(45) St’át’imcets quantifiers

	DP-quantifiers	A-quantifiers
strong	<i>táƙem</i> ‘all’ <i>ziʔzeg</i> ‘each’	<i>papt</i> ‘always’
weak	<i>pálaʔ</i> , <i>án’was</i> , ... ‘one, two, ...’ <i>cwʔit</i> ‘many’ <i>k’wik’wenaʔ</i> ‘(a) few’	<i>lhnúkwas</i> ‘sometimes’

4. Revision of the D- vs. A-quantification division

(47) DP-/D⁰-/A-quantification

Quantification type	Definition	Example
A-quantification	Q external to DP	A man <i>always</i> loves roses.
DP-quantification	Q internal to DP	[<i>All</i> the men] love roses.
D ⁰ -quantification	Q in D ⁰ position	[<i>Every</i> man] loves roses.

5. How do Salish and English differ?

• English quantifiers can take not only DP but also NP as their range.

- (50) a. [All [the men]_{DP}]_{DP} left.
 b. [Most [men]_{NP}]_{DP} left.

• Salish allows only DP as the range of a quantifier.

• Matthewson’s hypothesis: there is a parameter on whether determiners can be quantificational or not. English D⁰ can, while Salish D⁰ can’t. From this, the difference follows directly.

6. Conclusions

- Many Salish languages possess quantifiers which adjoin to DP. They are not A-quantifiers.
- Three-way split of quantification: D⁰-/DP-/A-quantification. Salish lacks D⁰-quantification.
- This result follows directly from the parameter Matthewson hypothesizes on availability of quantifiers at D⁰.