Ostension and definiteness in the Kwak'wala noun phrase[1]

Alexis Black
University of British Columbia

Recent work has examined the pragmatics of the Kwak'wala noun-phrase morphemes termed 'locative' and 'visibility' markers (Nicolson and Werle 2009). The current paper investigates yet another of the noun-phrase morphemes: the so-called 'definite' marker. Through a combined semantic and syntactic analysis, I conclude that the Kwak'wala morpheme *–da* does not encode definiteness, nor does it semantically or syntactically demonstrate those features typically associated with D-head status. Rather, it is proposed that *–da* encodes *ostension* – the linguistic equivalent of a physical pointing gesture and that it is fundamentally modificational (as opposed to functional).

1 Introduction

One of the best-known features of Kwak'wala, a Northern Wakashan language spoken in Northern-eastern Vancouver Island and along the BC coast, is its complex nominal phrase morphology. The maximal set of morphologically distinct features that may characterize an argument phrase includes case, location, definiteness, number, tense, and visibility. These categories were identified and defined by Boas (1911, 1947). Some elements of the nominal string have been discussed previously (Anderson 1984, 2005; Bach 2006; Chung 2007; Nicolson and Werle 2009; Black 2010; Littell 2010). No prior analysis, however, has been devoted to the so-called definite determiner, *–da*. As a result, most analyses have assumed – following Boas – that *–da* bears the syntactic and semantic features correlated cross-linguistically with definite determiners. It is the goal of this article to challenge this assumption.

At first glance, *-da* appears to be the simplest element of the Kwak'wala noun phrase. It was described by Boas (1911, 1947) as encliticizing to the preceding word in an utterance and as alternating with zero morphology, which contrastively denotes "indefinite." Indeed, in translations from Kwak'wala to English it is quite common that noun phrases characterized by *-da* in Kwak'wala are translated as "the" in English, and vice versa:

[1] I am deeply grateful to my consultant RCD for sharing her language with me, with great humour and patience. I am indebted to Henry Davis, Lisa Matthewson, and Molly Babel for their valuable feedback and comments on previous drafts of this work. Support for this research has come from the Jacobs Research Fund.

(1) [tɛnxalóχda tsɪdáq][2]
denxala=ox=**da** tsedak
sing=2.LOC=**DEF** woman[3]
'The woman is singing'

Furthermore, Kwak'wala *–da* displays paradigmatic asymmetries that parallel the distribution of the English definite determiner. For example, though the English determiner "the" marks an entity as *definite,* it does not co-occur with possessive morphology or proper names. The identical distributional pattern is found in Kwak'wala:

(2) *Proper names*
[tɛ́nxalóχ(*da) rubi]
denxala=ox=(***da)** Ruby
sing=2.LOC=(**DEF)** Ruby
'(*The) Ruby is singing'

(3) *Possessives*

a. [gʲúkwilòχda bəgwánəmʔéχìs(*da) gʲúkʷ]
gukwila=ox=da bagwanam-a=x=is=(***da**) gukw
build.house=2.LOC=DEF man-COMP=ACC=3.POSS=(*DEF) house
'The man built his (*the) house'

b. [aχʔéχstoχ ájako χə́n(*da) ájɛndʒisɛχ]
axaxsd=ox ajako x=an=(***da**) ayandzis=ax
want=2.LOC Ayako ACC=1.POSS=(***DEF**) orange=2.VIS
'Ayako wants my (*the) orange'

This distributional parallel between English and Kwak'wala is suggestive of a parallel structure.

Despite these distributional similarities, however, the mapping between English and Kwak'wala determiner phrases is not exact. For example, Kwak'wala arguments are obligatorily marked by locative clitics. There is, of course, no direct parallel in English – which raises the question: what is the semantic/pragmatic contribution and syntactic position of the LOC morphemes, and how do they relate to the semantics and syntax of *-da*? Secondly, and

---

[2] Data are from the investigator's field work unless otherwise noted. Phonetic transcriptions in IPA are provided on the first line of every example; morphemic representations are given on the second line in the Kwak'wala orthography (c.f. U'mista Cultural Society).

[3] The following abbreviations are used: AUX = *Auxiliary*; DISC = *Discourse marker;* REP=*Reportative*; INCH = *Inchoative*; PERF = *Perfective*; CONT=*Continuative;* PRO = *Pronoun*; 1.sg = *1st person singular pronoun (2.sg; etc)*; COMP = *Completive*; FV = *Fill Vowel*; ACC = *Accusative*; OBL = *Oblique*; PREP = *Prepositional;* LOC = *Loctive Determiner;* DEF = *Definite Determiner*; IND=*Indefinite Determiner;* RED=*Reduplication;* VIS = *Visibility Determiner*; POSS = *Possessive*; Dem=*Demonstrative;* NEG=*Negation*

perhaps more directly, the semantic correspondence between *the* and *–da* frequently fails to hold. For example, in the following two sentences we find 'indefinite' Kwak'wala morphology that is translated as a definite English DP (4), and 'definite' morphology that corresponds to an indefinite English DP (5):

(4) [aχʔéχsdən χa kúki]
ax'exsd-an=x-a=**∅** kuki
want-1.PRO=ACC-4.LOC=**IND** cookie
'I want the cookie'

(5) [aχʔéχsdən χada kúki]
ax'exsd-an=x-a=**da** kuki
want-1.PRO=ACC-4.LOC=**DEF** cookie
'I want a cookie'

These examples indicate that the semantic content of *-da* is unlikely to involve the same concept of definiteness as that which characterizes English determiners. Irrespective of the apparent syntactic parallelism, this semantic mismatch is not unexpected. Recent work has demonstrated the non-uniformity of determiner semantics cross-linguistically, despite their syntactic similarities (Enç 1991, Matthewson 1998, Gillon 2006).

Thus, to recapitulate: (1) the Kwak'wala clitic *–da* is correlated, but not perfectly matched, with definite English translations; (2) like the English definite article, *-da* does not co-occur with possessives, nor does it mark proper names; and (3) unlike the English determiner system, Kwak'wala noun phrases are marked by obligatory deictic (and case) clitics as well. Given these facts, it may therefore be reasonable to hypothesize that *–da* is a determiner that syntactically represents the D-head, but that semantically does not denote the exact combination of features that are associated with the English determiner.

To determine the role of *–da* in Kwak'wala grammar, we will assume as a null hypothesis that *–da* syntactically represents the D-head. In order to more precisely characterize the semantic properties of *-da*, I report the results of a series of tests developed in the cross-linguistic literature to probe determiner semantics. I follow up this analysis with a brief exploration of a number of syntactic diagnostics designed to test for D-head determiner status. The results of these tests lead to the following conclusions: 1) *–da* does not encode any feature typically associated with *definite*, and 2) it is not a D-head determiner. Instead, I propose that *-da* is the linguistic equivalent to a "pointing gesture" (Diessel 1997) and is a modificational, as opposed to functional, element of the Kwak'wala grammar. An additional contribution of this paper is the introduction of a fourth locative morpheme, which is hypothesized to encode 'assertion of existence.' It is furthermore hypothesized that *all* the remaining LOC markers encode 'assertion of existence' in addition to their respective deictic features.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a description of the Kwak'wala nominal phrase in more detail to aid in the analysis that follows. Section 3 tests *–da* against the semantic features *familiarity*, *uniqueness*,

specificity, *assertion of existence,* and *domain restriction*. The fourth section presents evidence for the proposal that *–da* encodes *ostension*. In section 5 I discuss some of the syntactic properties that characterize Kwak'wala noun phrases. Section 6 concludes.

2 Language Background

Kwak'wala belongs to the Northern branch of the Wakashan language family and is spoken by an estimated 200 people. The long-term viability of the language is in doubt; however, significant revitalization efforts have been initiated in the last several years (Anonby 1999; Jamieson-McLarnon 2005). The bulk of linguistic knowledge about Kwak'wala derives from the works of Franz Boas (1911, 1947), who spent decades documenting and analyzing the language with the assistance of George Hunt, a half Tlingit, half-British ethnologist who was connected through childhood and marriage to the Kwak'wakawakw people (Berman 1994). The volumes Boas published are primarily based on Hunt's adopted dialect (Kwakiutl), though at least 5 dialects exhibiting non-trivial distinctions have been claimed to exist in the modern era (Anonby, 1999). The data presented in this paper are from the author's fieldwork, and reflect the judgments of a speaker of the Gwaẏi (Kingcome Inlet) community.

Kwak'wala is usually characterized as a VSO language. Main clauses, however, are frequently headed by auxiliaries, the first of which is always inflected for subject agreement. DP subjects generally surface in second position; however, they may also appear following any of the stacked auxiliaries or the main verb. Direct objects, obliques, and prepositional phrases are realized in that order[4] following the main predicate and the subject. Auxiliaries are always marked by "agreement" morphology when the subject follows the main (Anderson 1984). This is demonstrated in (6).

(6) Kwak'wala word order and Subject-agreement morphology

a. *Subject-2nd (bare verb stem)*

[q'ínəmoχda gilá míχa]

kinam=**ox=da**	gala	mixa
many=**2.Loc=Def**	bear	sleep

'Many bears are sleeping'

b. *Post-verbal Subject (agreement on auxiliary)*

[lɨmóχ miχ^{w}oχda q'inəm gíʔgila]

la-m=**ox**	mixa=**ox=da**	k'inam	ga-gala	
Aux-Disc=**2.Loc**	sleep=**2.Loc=Def**	many	red-bear	

'Many bears are sleeping'

[4] Typically; some exceptions, however, can be found (Anderson 1984)

As mentioned above, argument phrases in Kwak'wala can be marked by case, up to three deictic features (location, visibility, and tense), number, and 'definiteness' (Boas 1911, 1947; Anderson 1984, 2003; Bach 2006; Chung 2007; Nicolson and Werle 2009). This determiner complex has previously garnered attention due to its curious phono-syntactic properties (Anderson 1984, 2003; Chung 2007). The case, deictic, and determiner clitics are split between prenominal and postnominal positions. Kwak'wala is an entirely suffixing/encliticizing language[5]; therefore, the prenominal clitics encliticize to a preceding word in the utterance. This creates a mismatch between syntactic and prosodic constituency[6]. A schematic and example are provided in (7):

(7) **Preceding Word =[$_{DP}$ Case = LOC = DEF #-Noun =Temp=VIS]**

Prenominal *Postnominal*

duq^{w}-x̓id=as **= [$_{DP}$ x = ox = da** guk^{w} **=ix]?**
see-PERF=2.sg = [$_{DP}$ ACC = LOC = DEF house =VIS]?
'Do you see this house (near addressee, visible)?'

The clitic morphemes are provided in two charts in (8).

(8) **Kwak'wala determiners**

a.

Kwakiutl dialect (Boas 1947)			
Prenominal			**Postnominal**
Anchor	LOC	DEF	VIS
1-vis	-g^{j}a	-(d)a (Def) -Ø (Indef)	-k
1-inv			-ga̓
2-vis	-oχ		-iχ
2-inv			-aq'/aχ
3-vis	-i (+Subj) -Ø (-Subj)		-Ø/-i
3-inv			-a/-i

[5] With the exception of number marking, which is marked through initial CV reduplication of the stem.

[6] This statement follows previous Kwak'wala scholarship; however, the data are a bit more complex. In addition to encliticizing to the previous prosodic word, it is quite common for all the prenominal clitics to solidify into a single unit (i.e. to form a distinct prosodic word).

b.

Gwaɣ̌i dialect (2010)			
Prenominal			**Postnominal**
Distance	LOC	DEM	VIS
1-vis	-gʲa	-da (+Dem)	-x
1-inv			
2-vis	-oχ		-iχ, -ɛχ, -χ
2-inv			
3-vis	-i		
3-inv			-a/-ɛʔ
4-	-a ('-Subj')		

The first chart (8a) represents the system as it was described by Boas in 1947, which has been assumed by many as the canonical representation of Kwak'wala DP morphology (Berman 1982, 1983;Anderson 1984; Bach 2006; Chung 2007). The second (8b) employs the paradigmatic organization defined by Boas, but lists those morphemes that have been attested in current field work on the Gwaɣ̌i dialect (Black 2010; Nicolson and Werle 2009).

There are two substantive differences between these charts that merit brief mention. It should first be noted that the label corresponding to the numbers (1)-(4) has been altered from *Anchor* to *Distance*. *Anchor* is a concept adopted from the literature on deixis (c.f. Fillmore 1966, Gerner 2009). It signifies the discourse participant's perspective from which deictic features derive. For example, English deictic terms (e.g. *this, that*) are generally considered to reflect the *speaker*'s point of view, and hence instantiate a speaker-anchor. Other languages display shifting anchors, or compound anchors (e.g. Miao, see Gerner 2009 for a detailed cross-linguistic survey). Boas' description of Kwak'wala suggests a deictic anchor that shifts between speaker, addressee, and a third person – the numbers one through three signify these referents, respectively. This three-way split has also been reported for Haisla (Bach 2006). Recent work has demonstrated that at least one contemporary dialect does not employ this shifting-anchor system; rather, it appears that all LOC and VIS markers denote distance (physical or metaphorical) between the associated referent/topic and the speaker (Nicolson and Werle 2009, Black 2010). The numbers (1)-(3), therefore, more closely signify the concepts *proximal, medial,* and *distal*.

The second substantive difference between the two determiner charts is the introduction of a fourth LOC category. I hypothesize that this morpheme has no deictic features, but that it occupies the same syntactic position as the deictically inflected LOC markers (see Appendix for details). I propose that the proximal, medial, and distal locative markers are composed of two semantic feature sets: they assert the existence of the modified NP, and contribute the relevant deictic features. The 4.LOC marker, on the other hand, simply denotes 'assertion of existence' (Matthewson 1998). Justification for this analysis will be discussed in section 3.4.

To begin to decode the nature of *–da,* it is necessary to first examine Boas' original description of the morpheme and the evidence that led to his label of 'definite.' In his *Kwakiutl Grammar* (1947), Boas described two contrastive sets of prenominal demonstratives: the *vocalic* and *consonantic* series. The *vocalic* series corresponds to 'definite' interpretations. These morphemes are termed *vocalic* because each word of the series shares word-final '-da,' which is sometimes realized as '-a' alone; therefore all members of the set are unified by a *vocalic* ending (i.e. Subject set: *–ida*, *-oxda*, *-gada*; Accusative set: *-xa*, *-xoxda/xwa*, *-xgada*; Oblique set: *-sa*, *-soxda*, *-sgada*). The *consonantic* forms, on the other hand, are not characterized by this terminal '-a'[7], and are found preceding indefinite nouns. The term 'indefinite' is characterized as "when a noun is used in a general sense" (see example (9)) or "when the existence of an object is unknown" (example (10)) (1947: 259). Boas notes that "the use of the indefinite is . . . much more restricted than that of the corresponding forms in English" (1900: 715). Unfortunately, he gives no further explication of these restricted contexts.

(9) General:

a. He-7am=∅=**∅** walhdam-s=**∅** bagwanam
3.DEM-DISC=LOC=**IND** word-OBL.=**IND** man
'That is the word of mankind'

b. la-m'-an watla=x=ga=**∅** bagwanam-k.
AUX-DISC-1.sg ask-ACC-1.LOC=IND man=1.VIS
'I ask the men in present existence'

(10) Existence doubtful:

a. ʔalasaw'=i=**∅** laisa=s=a ts'idak
search=3.LOC=**IND** mussel-OBL=DEF[8] woman
'Mussels are searched for by the women'

Much of this description has been confirmed in contemporary speech. The concatenations of LOC and DEF morphology listed in the *vocalic* and *consonantic* series above are all attested. An important point of difference between Boas' description and the analysis that follows, however, is that the so-called definite series, described as ending in word-final '-a' *or* '-da' by Boas, is *always* characterized by *–da* in the present work (see the Appendix for more details). Finally, though Boas notes a paradigmatic contrast between *–da*-marked and unmarked determiner strings, we observe a three-way contrast. Argument phrases in Kwak'wala can be marked with LOC clitics + *da,* LOC clitics alone, or with no LOC or DEF morphology at all. This morphological split does not appear straightforwardly amenable to a definite/indefinite distinction.

[7] Though note that the 1.LOC (i.e. proximal loctive) marker '-ga' is considered a *consonantic* form, whereas '-gada' is termed vocalic.

[8] This morphological breakdown reflects a Boasian analysis. Under the current hypotheses, however, '-a' is the 4.LOC clitic, not the definite determiner

Furthermore, it should be noted that a fourth logical possibility – argument phrases marked with *–da* but not LOC – is ungrammatical. This indicates that *-da* is only licensed when a LOC morpheme is present.

(11) Three-way contrast

a. axexsd=en x=**a=da** kuki
want-1.sg ACC=**4.LOC=DEF** cookie
'I want a/the cookie'

b. axexsd=en x=**a** kuki
want-1.sg ACC=**4.LOC** cookie
'I want a/the cookie'

c. k'is=en axexsda=x kuki
Neg-1.sg want=ACC cookie
'I don't want a cookie'

In this section I have laid out the morphological structure of Kwak'wala noun phrases. It was noted that a contemporary dialect employs a single-anchor deictic system, as opposed to a shifting-anchor. A fourth LOC category is proposed under the current analysis; this morpheme is not deictic, but shares the semantics of 'assertion of existence' with its deictic counterparts. According to the historical documents, the definite/indefinite distinction is instantiated by a contrast between LOC morphology + *da* versus LOC morphology by itself. When the concatenation of *case*, LOC, and 'definiteness' morphemes are considered, however, we observe a three-way contrast in noun phrases that is not as easily applied to the definite/indefinite English distinction originally proposed. With this information in hand, we now turn to the semantic analysis of *–da*.

3 The semantics of Definiteness

The semantic properties associated with determiners have been a subject of great debate over the past thirty years (Russell 1905, Heim 1982, Kadmon 1992, Matthewson 1998, Gillon 2006, and many others). For the purposes of this paper, I examine those features claimed to be associated with definiteness and/or the syntactic position D^0 by Heim (1982), Ludlow and Neale (1991), Matthewson (1998), and Gillon (2006). In the following sections I will describe these features and demonstrate their applicability (or lack thereof) to *-da.*

3.1 Familiarity

In her doctoral thesis (1982), Irene Heim proposed that definiteness fundamentally hinges on a familiarity/novelty contrast in discourse. This conceptualization relies on the notion of the common ground, which is defined as the propositions shared by every participant in discourse in a given context

(Stalnaker 1979, p. 321 [Heim 1982, p285-286]). According to this depiction of definiteness, a definite NP is one that is familiar to the common ground (CG). Indefinite NPs, on the other hand, are novel. This can easily be demonstrated in English (from Matthewson, 1998):

(12) *Context: out of the blue*
  a. I met a man today
  b. *I met the man today

(13) *Context: Conversation b/w two interlocutors*
  Interlocutor$_1$: I met a man today.
  Interlocutor$_2$:
  a. What did the man look like?
  b. *What did a man look like?

It is, of course, possible to introduce novel NPs with definite morphology in English (e.g. "Beware of the dog!"). These "exceptions" are argued to be felicitous due to *accommodation* (Lewis 1979); there are real-world restrictions, however, on the availability of this option. For example, a novel, out-of-the-blue utterance such as "Beware of the dog" relies on discourse participants' awareness that people in their community commonly keep dogs as pets. In other words, a hearer must have some reason to believe that the novel referent exists, and that this knowledge is/can be shared between the discourse participants without previous mention.

Assuming this definition of definiteness, we must first ask, then, whether Kwak'wala DPs reflect a simple distinction between novel and familiar references. As was stated in the introduction, it is often the case that *-da* morphology corresponds with English definite usage. This is most evident in the context of story-telling. For example, in the following story a novel referent (the squirrel) is introduced with an accusative case and distal LOC marker, but without the *–da* morpheme. In the next sentence, the referent is now marked by *-da*:

(14) a. [níkijɛ̀qələn dúqʷalaχa gígiǰatsáɢa dzəlxʷi láχa ʔəwíʔnaɢʷìł sáda kafé. gígiǰatsáɢa] (VF)

nikiyekala-an	dukwala=[x=a=**Ø**		giga'yatsaga]	dzalxwa=i
think-1.sg	see=[ACC-4.LOC=**IND**		mouse]	run=3.LOC
lax-a=Ø	awiˈnagwił		s=a=da	kafe.
PREP-4.LOC=Ind	floor		OBL=4.LOC=DEF	café
giga'yatsaga='am!				
mouse-DISC!				

'I thought I saw a mouse run across the floor of the cafe. It was a mouse!'

b. [ləmida gígiǰatsáca dzə́lx^{w}i láχa ʔəwíʔnaɢ^{w}ìɬ] (VF)
la-ˈm-[i-**da** **giga**ˈ**jatsaga**] dzulxw-i lax-a
AUX-DISC-[3.LOC-**DEF** **mouse**] run-3.LOC PREP-4.LOC
awiˈnagwił
floor
'The mouse ran across the floor'

If the story ended here, we might conclude that *–da* does indeed reflect the familiar/novel contrast. In the very next sentence of the story, however, we observe that the definite marker disappears:

c. [dúχ^{w}aλɛn χá gígiǰatsáca dzə́lx^{w}i láχìs q^{w}əbíɬ] (VF)
dukwatła-an [x=a=**Ø** **giga**ˈ**jatsaga**] dzulxw-i
see-1.sg [ACC-4.LOC=**IND** **mouse**] run-3.LOC
lax-is kwabił
PREP-3.POSS hole
'I saw the mouse run into his hole.'

This appears to be an alternation by syntactic position rather than a pragmatic/semantic distinction. In other words, when the NP is mentioned in the accusative, it is marked by the indefinite (i.e. null morpheme). When it is in subject position, it surfaces with definite morphology. This positional alternation is evidenced in the historical texts as well, and in ways that also indicate a non-English usage of 'definiteness.' For example, in the following passage the definite article is used to mark the *first* mention of the man.

(15) la-ˈam-ˈl-(a)-i walas gukw-i-da gax-i
AUX-DISC-REP-3.LOC big house-3.LOC-DEF come-3.LOC
ax'als lax k'wał-as-as wakas-i, ji-x
put PREP sit-place-POSS Wakas-3.VIS 3.DEM-ACC
gukw-as Quˈmasila. we la-ˈm-i
house-POSS Quˈmasila So AUX-DISC-3.LOC
nił'id**-[**i-**da** xwał-xwap-ala-gam-i
appear**-[**3.LOC**-DEF** RED-hole-CONT-face-3.VIS
bagwanam]…
man]…
'A large house came to be on the ground at the place where Great-River (Wakas) was sitting. It was the house of Wealth-Maker (Qumasila). Then **a man** with holes all over his face appeared (in the rear of the house)' (Boas 1903:427).

The use of *–da* on the first occurrence of a nominal in discourse is also found in contemporary speech. For example, the sentence in (16) was offered as the translation for "A boy is painting a house." An out-of-the-blue novel NP (*boy*) is modified by *da.* It was subsequently confirmed, moreover, that this structure can be translated with either an indefinite or definite English determiner.

(16) [ɢɬlsoχda bábagwəmɛχá gʲúkw] (VF)

gals=ox=**da**	babagwam-a	x-a	gukw
paint=2.LOC=**DEF**	boy-FV	Acc-4.LOC	house

'A boy is painting a house'

The preceding examples have examined discourse-new and discourse-old contexts, and have indicated that there is no alternation of *–da* on the basis of these contexts. It is also possible to draw a distinction between hearer-new and hearer-old (Prince 1992). We continue to see the identical asymmetry by syntactic position in these contexts. For example, mention of "the sun" or "the moon" is considered hearer-old. In (17) and (18) we observe reference to these entities in subject position marked by *–da,* while those in non-subject position are marked by LOC alone.

(17) *Subject position* (discourse-new, hearer-old)

a. [náχwaloχda t'lísalaχ] (VF)

nakwala=ox=**da**	t'łisala=x
bright=2.LOC=**DEF**	sun=VIS

'The sun is bright (today)'

b. [naqwaloχda m̓əkwalá χwa ɢánutlɛ] (VF)

nakwala=ox=**da**	m̓akwala	x=ox	ganutłe
bright=2.LOC=**DEF**	moon	Acc=2.LOC	night

'The moon is bright tonight'

(18) *Object position* (discourse-new, hearer-old)

a. [nəp'idi giɢamejəsa t'łisala laχwa ik'i] (VF)

nap'-x'id=i	gigamej=s=a=**Ø**	t'łisala
throw-INCH=3.LOC	chief=OBL=4.LOC=**IND**	sun
lax=ox	ik'i	
PREP=2.LOC	sky	

'God threw the sun at the sky'

b. [nəp'idəns giɢamejəsa m̓əkwalaχ laχwa t'it'ut'u] (VF)

nap'-x'id=ans	gigamej=s=a=**Ø**	makwala=x
throw-INCH=1.pl.POSS	chief=OBL=4.LOC= **IND**	moon=VIS
lax=ox	t'i-t'ut'u	
PREP=2.LOC	RED=star	

'(Our) God threw the moon at the stars'

These data have clearly illustrated the non-applicability of the familiar/novel distinction with regards to *–da.* The alternation between *–da*-marked NPs in subject position as opposed to object and oblique positions, however, is telling. While *–da* is licit in non-subject positions (as can be seen in (11a), for example), a preliminary examination of the texts compiled by Hunt and Boas and stories elicited in current fieldwork indicates a higher propensity for *–da* to occur with subjects. I will return to this asymmetry in section 4.

3.2 Uniqueness

Many theorists have proposed that *uniqueness*, rather than familiarity, plays an essential role in the denotation of the English definite determiner (Russell 1905; Hawkins 1978, 1999; Kadmon 1992, 2001; Heim 1991; Abbott 1999; Lyons 1999; Gillon 2006). Differences emerge primarily in whether uniqueness is presupposed (c.f. Frege 1892) or asserted (c.f. Russell 1905)[9]. Regardless, the crucial observation is the following: *the* requires the existence of a single referent, while *a* implies the existence of alternatives. This is demonstrated in the examples in (19).

(19) a. **The** king is on holiday. → Only one king in context
b. **A** king is on holiday. → Implies "one, out of many"

The extension of this concept to plurals and mass nouns poses some complications; for the remainder of this paper I assume the formal definition of maximality as presented in Gillon (2006). Her analysis relies on the notion of the supremum (Link 1983), the maximal individual sum of the members in a predicate. If a single atom is a member of the predicate, it is the maximal sum. In Gillon's definition of *the* (see (21)), uniqueness is derived through the intersection of the supremum operation with domain restriction.

For example, in the following exchange in English, the breakdown in (20a) can be traced back to a violation of uniqueness:

(20) *Context: Two interlocutors sit across from each other. Two pencils lie on the table in front of one of the interlocutors.*
a. **Interlocuter1: ***Give me **the** pencil
b. **Interlocuter1:** Give me **a** pencil

Adopting Gillon's formalism of *the* (given in (21)), the violation occurs due to a mismatch between the need for a maximal *individual* and the maximal sum given by the domain (which yields a supremum that is not an atom).

(21) [[the]] = $\max(\lambda x[P(x) \wedge C(x)])$; where C = domain restriction
a. *Give me the pencil $C_{\text{the pencil}} = \{\text{pencil}_i, \text{pencil}_{ii}\}$
[[the pencil]] = $\max(\lambda x[\text{pencil}'(x) \wedge C(x)])$ = undefined

The same situation in Kwak'wala, however, is entirely licit:

(22) [tsólasɛn χáda k'^{j}ádaju]
tso-la-as=s=ən x=a=**da** k'adayu
give-Imp-2.sg=Obl=1.sg Acc=4.LOC=**DEF** pencil
'Give me the pencil'

[9] This division was noted by Gillon (2006)

We might thus conclude that *–da* does not encode uniqueness. The data, however, require a bit more contemplation. Kwak'wala plural morphology crucially differs from English in that it is generally considered to be optional. Under a uniqueness/maximality analysis of *–da*, therefore, we do not simply predict the same failure as in English for "Give me the pencil," when two pencils are in the domain. Rather, since Kwak'wala bare nouns may be interpreted as referring to more than one entity[10], we would predict that the Kwak'wala equivalent of "Give me the pencil" could target the set of pencils in the domain. This, however, is not the case; rather, the consultant demonstrates sharp judgments that the interlocutor's command targets a single pencil. This uniqueness effect is not amenable to a definite analysis of *–da*, which would predict infelicity in the given context. Furthermore, the effect is not restricted to the use of *–da*, for the consultant responds similarly to the same context when bare LOC morphology modifies the noun phrase.

Gillon employs a number of maximality tests with plural and mass nouns in her analysis of Sḵwx̱wú7mesh. These include contexts similar to (23).

(23) I went hunting yesterday. I saw four bears. I killed the bears, but one of them escaped.

Native speaker judgments of this and similar English contexts should, according to the given denotation of *the*, reject this sequence of utterances; however, I have found that judgments vary (my own, for example, is that this sequence is perfectly acceptable). This may suggest the need for a more flexible plural denotation (i.e. that *the* does not always denote a supremum) than previously assumed (c.f. Brisson 1998). For example, it may indicate that maximality is an implicature of English, rather than a presupposition. To the extent that there are stronger ungrammaticality judgments associated with these contexts in English than in Sḵwx̱wu7mesh, however, such an analysis would still fail to account for the gradient differences between the two languages. Interestingly, this issue is similarly raised by the Kwak'wala data. As shown in (24), the use of the "definite" determiner in a test context is marginal:

(24) [muwida bibibəgwanəm laχ pa:tiʔɛs steisi. mitsi steisiʔɛχa**(#da)** bibibəgwanəm. k'is mitsaχa nəmukw bəgwanəma]

mu=i=da	bi-bi-bagwanam	lax=	pati=s
four=3.LOC=DEF	RED-RED-man	PREP=LOC/DEF	party=OBL
Stacey.	mitsa=i	Stacey=x̱=a=**(#da)**	
Stacey	kiss=3.LOC	Stacey=ACC=4.LOC=(**DEF**)	
bi-bi-bagwanam.		k'is	mitsa=x̱=a
RED-RED-man.		NEG	kiss=ACC=3.LOC
nimukw		bagwanam=a	
one		man=VIS	

[10] At least, hypothetically. The constraints on non-singular interpretations, however, have not yet been investigated.

'Four men came to Stacey's party. Stacey kissed the men. Stacey didn't kiss one of the men.'

We have thus far determined that familiarity cannot account for *–da*'s function in Kwak'wala; however, our tests have yielded inconclusive results regarding uniqueness. A related concept that has been shown to interact with the definite/indefinite distinction is specificity. Perhaps the gradient readings associated with the preceding examples derive from this conceptually similar designation.

3.3 Specificity

It has long been noted that *specificity* is logically separable from definiteness. For example, it is possible to use the definite English determiner in a non-specific context (e.g. *The murderer of Smith* is insane*)* (Donnellan 1966), and it is equally possible to use specific indefinites (e.g. John will marry *a girl his parents don't approve of)* (Partee 1972). Some languages are known to morphologically encode specificity in their determiner system (e.g. Turkish, Enç 1991). It is therefore possible that *–da* is restricted to a specific/non-specific function. Ludlow and Neale (1991) define specificity as a feature that arises from the conflict between a speaker's knowledge underlying the expressed proposition and the proposition that the speaker intends to communicate. In other words, if the speaker has some reason to communicate a proposition as indefinite (for example, if the speaker has some reason to believe the hearer is unfamiliar with the given entity), but has a unique referent in mind, the resulting proposition represents a specific indefinite.

(25) Specificity:

a.	*Speaker's Grounds*:	the proposition that is the object of the most relevant belief furnishing the grounds for an utterance
b.	*Proposition meant:*	the proposition(s) a speaker intends to communicate
c.	*Proposition expressed:*	the proposition expressed by the utterance (Ludlow and Neale 1991:176)

In Kwak'wala, these mismatches are irrelevant to determiner usage. For example, the same sentence is used to express "A doctor is coming over today," irrespective of the various represented permutations of speaker vs addressee knowledge:

(26) [gʲaχλida dagʷəda χʷaʔnalax]

gax-tɬ=i=**da**	dagwada	x=ox=da	nala=x
come-FUT=3.LOC=**DEF**	doctor	ACC=2.LOC=DEF	day=VIS

'A/The doctor is coming over today'

Test contexts:

a. **Speaker grounds (familiar & specific); Addressee (novel)**
   I've been sick, and have had a lot of doctors coming to see me b/c it's an interesting disease. I get a phone call, and it's one of the doctors telling me that he's coming over later. I hang up, and turn to you and tell you . . .
b. **Speaker grounds (familiar & specific); Addressee (familiar & specific)**
   Let's say my cousin is a doctor – and you know that my cousin is a doctor. I've been hoping that he's going to visit for some time (b/c I think that he'll be a good match for our mutual friend). I get a phone call, and it's him, telling me that he's coming over later. I hang up, and turn to you and tell you . . .
c. **Speaker grounds (familiar, non-specific); Addressee (novel)**[11]
   I've been sick, and have had lots of doctors coming to see me. The secretary calls me and tells me that one of them is coming over to visit this afternoon. I hang up, and turn to you and tell you . . .
d. **Speaker grounds (novel); Addressee (novel)**
   Let's say we're in a class, and I've been getting visits from all different professionals. A lawyer one day, an astronaut another day – I know that the theme of the day is "medical professionals." You ask me: Who's coming today? I answer . . .

These examples demonstrate the target NP in subject position; despite the fact that this is an unfamiliar topic introduced to the discourse, the subject NP is marked by *–da.* The Kwak'wala translation for these contexts further contrasts with the English counterpart of the specific and non-specific indefinites above. When the sentence is changed to control for syntactic position, the previously observed asymmetry again emerges. Given the same contexts as in (26), the sentence "I'm going to see a doctor today" is consistently given without *–da*, as in (27):

(27) [dùχ^{w}aƛáƛɛn χa dág^{w}əda χ^{w}analax] (VF)

dukwatła-tł-an	x=a=**Ø**	dagwada	x=ox=nala=x
see-Fut-1.sg.	Acc=4.Loc=**Ind**	doctor	Acc=2.Loc=day=Vis

'I'm going to see a doctor today.'

We have now conclusively determined that *–da* does not denote familiarity, nor does it interact with specificity. It does not appear to encode uniqueness, but may be sensitive to maximality. We will finally consider two other features that have been hypothesized to characterize determiner heads: assertion of existence (Matthewson 1998) and domain restriction (Gillon 2006).

[11] This context is not generally used in tests of specificity

3.4 Assertion of existence

Matthewson (1998) describes Salishan determiners as operating on an 'assertion of existence' contrast. Assertion of existence differs from the existential force of definiteness in that it informs the discourse participants of the truth/existence of a given entity. Definites presuppose this information, and are thus subject to accommodation. Assertion of existence determiners, on the other hand, will not be subject to accommodation. Matthewson argues that all assertion of existence determiners will move outside the scope of a non–factual operator (a category whose members can be language-dependent), whereas non-assertion of existence determiners will be licensed only in the scope of non-factual operators.

The morpheme *–da* is an unlikely candidate for the "assertion of existence" parameter. An important distributional fact about *–da,* as mentioned above, is that it is only licensed in conjunction with LOC markers. The locative markers are deictic – in other words, their interpretation is contingent on the context of the discourse, and their use is to *locate* the referent in the space of discourse. This function is not compatible with entities whose existence is in doubt; in fact, their usage would appear to assert/presuppose existence. As *–da* cannot occur without the use of one of these spatially anchored locative morphemes, we can therefore reject the idea that *–da* itself encodes assertion of existence. There is evidence, however, that "assertion of existence" is directly encoded in the Kwak'wala grammar. Three of the four locative markers denote deictic spaces. The proximal marker (1.LOC) references an entity within an intimate/immediate relationship to the speaker; the medial (2.LOC) indicates that the NP is within the common ground, or visible; the distal marker (3.LOC) appears to denote a referent that is not present, or is novel to the discourse. This same function is not shared, however, by the non-subjective *–a* (4.LOC). The fourth locative marker appears to be used, rather, as a default – it makes no claim about the deictic space of the referent. I hypothesize that the 4.LOC marker is therefore the non-deictic version of the LOC markers – and that this non-deictic form boils down to assertion of existence.

Evidence to support these hypotheses comes in the form of negated sentences. First, I have hypothesized that locative markings entail the existence of the noun they refer to. Negative existential sentences do not display any locative marking, as exemplified in (28a). When locative morphology is inserted into the same structure, the negative existential reading no longer obtains; rather, the sentence is a standard case of sentential negation (28b).

(28) *Negated sentences*

a. [k'ijós bəgwánəm]

k'ios	bagwanam
NEG	man

'There is no man'

'*He is not a man'

b. [k'isóχ bəgwánəm]
k'is=oχ bagwanam
NEG=2.LOC man
'This/He is not a man'
'*There is no man'

Negation also provides evidence for the hypothesis that the 4.LOC marker similarly entails assertion of existence, despite its lack of spatial deictic features. This is demonstrated in (29a) and (b), where a contrast between a dog asserted to exist vs. one not asserted to exist is reflected in an alternation between locative marking and a bare case marker (see also example (11c)).

(29) *Negated sentences, ctd.*

a. k'is=en dukwala **x=a** w'at'si
NEG=1.sg see ACC=**4.LOC** dog
'I don't see the dog'

b. k'ios=en dukwala=x w'at'si
NEG=1.sg see=Acc dog
'I don't see any dog'

More generally, this hypothesis predicts a difference in scopal behavior between the arguments marked by locative morphology versus arguments that are unmarked for locative: unmarked arguments should be restricted to narrow scope contexts, while locative-marked arguments will force wide scope interpretations. Preliminary tests have yielded some support for this hypothesis. For example, in the following examples with the strong quantifier *wi'la* 'all,' we observe that both the deictically-anchored and the 'assertion of existence' marked arguments are restricted to specific interpretations. Furthermore, it is important to note that *–da* is not responsible for forcing these wide-scope interpretations.

(30) [wíʔlaʔmoχda tsitsítsedaχə mítsaχwoχ(da) ginánem] (VF)
wíl'a-m'=ox=da tsi-tsí-tsidak mítsa=χ=**oχ**(=**da**)
all-DISC=2.LOC=DEF RED-RED-woman kiss=ACC=**2.LOC=DEF**
ginánem
child
'Every woman kissed a child'
Consultant's comment: There's only one child; it can't be different children, unless you make it (child) plural.

(31) [wíʔlaʔmida tsidak yákantamaχa bəgwánəm laχa bijáʔilas] (VF)
wíl'a-m'=i=da tsi-tsidak jaqentama=x=**a**
all-DISC=3.LOC=DEF RED-woman talk=ACC=**4.LOC**
bagwanam lax=a biya'ilas
man PREP=4.LOC bar
'Every woman talked to a man at the bar'

Consultant's comment: There's only one man.

The current analysis predicts that arguments without locative marking will be licensed by other non-factual operators (e.g. modals, questions, imperatives, and intensional verbs). A full exploration of these contexts is unfortunately beyond the scope of this paper. In the meantime, therefore, I tentatively hypothesize that 'assertion of existence' is a relevant concept for Kwak'wala DPs, but only within the LOC determiner category. While the evidence presented here is not sufficient to conclude the exact relationship between 'assertion of existence' and the LOC clitics, it is sufficient for us to conclude that *–da* is *not* responsible for the wide-scope behavior of locative-marked DPs.

3.5 Domain Restriction

Gillon (2006, 2009) proposes that the universal property of determiners cross-linguistically is domain restriction. Formally, this property derives from an unpronounced variable C, which represents the characteristic function of the set of individuals provided by the discourse context (Gillon 2009:189). Some languages have determiners that consist of *only* this property (e.g. *kwi* in Sk̲wx̲ú7mesh), while other determiners denote domain restriction as well as other semantic properties (e.g. uniqueness, as in English *the*). As was noted in the previous section, Kwak'wala non-negated argument phrases are obligatorily marked by the locative clitics, which bear deictic features that actively situate the referent within the discourse space. The 'definite' determiner, however, is not obligatory, and never occurs without accompanying locative morphology. This suggests that domain restriction, when conceived of at the level proposed by Gillon, takes place via the denotation of the locative clitics – but not via *-da*.

We have now determined that *–da* does not encode familiarity, specificity, or assertion of existence. There is very little evidence, furthermore, that *–da* is sensitive to uniqueness/maximality. If this 'determiner' does not encode any of these properties, what *is* its function in the DP?

4 The proposal: ostension

The *-da* morpheme is not limited to nominal phrases; rather, it is also found in 3rd person pronominal and demonstrative adverbial constructions. In the following section, I will briefly visit the properties of Kwak'wala pronouns. As will be shown, *-da* is an *optional* component of pronominal forms. The pragmatic contexts that accompany the use of pronominal *–da* are hypothesized to parallel those that characterize full NP uses of *–da;* therefore, it is useful to examine these contexts for determining *–da*'s denotation.

The 3rd person pronoun enclitics described by Boas (1947) as well as those observed in contemporary speech can be found in the charts in (32). The third person pronoun is homophonous with the case marker (i.e. Nominative = null; Accusative = x̲; Oblique = s); however, these forms can be additionally modified by the locative and visibility deictic morphology. Boas terms these the

"demonstrative pronominals." The label "visibile/invisible" is kept for simplicity; however, it should be noted that this is neither a sufficient nor required feature for use of the so-called "visible/invisible" forms.

(32) **The enclitic pronoun series of Kwak'wala**

a. **Kwakiutl (1947)**

Demonstrative 3rd person Pronominal		
NOM	ACC	OBL
-Ø+	-χ+	-s+

Anchor	LOC+VIS
1-vis	-kʲ
1-inv	-gʲaʔ
2-vis	-oχ
2-inv	-oʔ
3-vis	-iq
3-inv	-iʔ

b. **Gway'i (2010)**

Demonstrative 3rd person Pronominal		
NOM	ACC	OBL
-Ø+	-χ+	-s+

Distance	LOC+VIS
1	-gʲa
2-vis	-oχ
2-inv	-oʔ
3-vis	-i
3-inv	-ɛʔ

There is no mention in the Boas data of pronominal forms that combine with *–da*. However, pronominal forms with *–da* are common in the current dialect (and other Wakashan languages, e.g. Haisla (Bach, et al, see http://www.people.umass.edu/ebach/xles-3.htm)):

(33) a. *Context: A toy frog had been thrown to the floor*
[lɪmóχ jáʔxidoχda] (VF)
la-m=ox jax7id=ox=da
Aux-Disc=2.Loc die=2.Loc=Def
'He died'
Consultant's comment: 'He died, that slimy frog' (VG)

b. *Context: One of the men at a party didn't get kissed, but all the other men did*
[jiχoχda k'is mitsatsu] (VF)
ju=x=ox=da k'is mitsa-su
2.Dem-Acc=2.Loc= Def. Neg kiss-Pass
'That one didn't get kissed' (VG)

c. [t'saʔja nukwoχda]
tsaya=nukw=ox=da
youger.sibling=have=2.Loc=Def
'That person has a young person or sibling' (VG)

As the translations indicate – the insertion of *–da* gives a demonstrative flavor to the constructions. Even more direct evidence of the nature of *–da*'s contribution is the fact that pronominal demonstratives with *–da* are often judged infelicitous if not accompanied by a pointing-gesture.

This may be somewhat unexpected. Demonstratives are frequently conceived of in English as the combination of locational deixis and definiteness. In Kwak'wala, the Locative markers are, at least partially, locational deictic elements – it would therefore seem reasonable, upon noting this demonstrative flavor in translation and use, to assume that *–da* contributes the definite portion of the demonstrative complex[12]. I have already shown that this position is untenable – *-da* is simply not a definite marker. Deixis, on the other hand, is itself composed of many features (Gerner 2009). We might hypothesize, then, that while the LOC markers denote spatial deixis, *-da* represents a separate deictic feature. One such feature that appears particularly appropriate is OSTENSIVE (Gerner 2009). Ostensive demonstratives contrast with non-ostensive demonstratives in that they often require a physical gesture, and are typically used when "confusion with other potential referents exists (Gerner 2009:62)." For example, in Lisu, a Tibeto-Burman language that contrasts demonstratives on an ostensive dimension, the non-ostensive demonstrative is used when referring to a mountain which is easily distinguishable from other referents in the context. The ostensive demonstrative, on the other hand, is used when the referenced mountain is a part of a range – and therefore potentially confusable with respect to the other mountains in context.

This characterization of *–da* based on pronominal contextsis also supported by the deictic contrasts employed in noun phrases. For example, in the following situations, the speaker does not use *–da* when referring to a pencil that she is holding (and hence cannot easily point to, nor has any need to disambiguate by pointing to). When the pencil is lying on the table, it is typically marked by a medial LOC marker; however, it can still be marked by the proximal locative deictic, but *only* if this marker is accompanied by *–da* and a pointing gesture. The medial distal marker in this context does not have to be accompanied by *–da.* If it *is* spoken with *–da,* a pointing gesture is again preferred.

(34) *Context:* Speaker is holding a pen

axexsd=en	x-a=x=**ga**	k'adayu.
want=1.sg	ACC-4.LOC=ACC=**1.LOC**	pencil

'I want **this pen**.' (VF, VG)
Consultant's comment: "It's mine."

[12] This assumes a referential English-type demonstrative; it should be noted that other languages (e.g. Salishan) employ demonstratives that lack this presuppositional component (Henry Davis, p.c.)

(35) *Context:* The pencil is on the table – i.e., the speaker is **not** holding the pencil

a.	*axexsd=an	x=a=x=**ga**	k'adayu.
	want=1.sg	ACC-4.LOC=ACC=**1.LOC**	pencil
b.	axexsd=an	x=**ox**=**da**	k'adayu.
	want=1.sg	ACC-**2.LOC= DEF**	pencil
c.	axexsd=an	x=a=x=**ga=da**	k'adayu.
	want=1.sg	ACC-4.LOC=ACC=**1.LOC=DEF**	pencil

It isn't necessary for the speaker to be holding the item, or for the item to be visible, in order to use the proximal marker. However, as the following examples show, it is necessary for the item to be visible – and thus reference-able by a pointing gesture – if the speaker wishes to combine the proximal locative marker with *–da.*

(36) *Context:* There's a special cookie that you know I really like, and I've been thinking about eating it – but it's in my bag, because I've been saving it for later. I say, "I want that/my/the cookie"

a.	#axexsd=an	x=ga=da	kuki
	want-1.sg	ACC=1.LOC=DEF	cookie

'I want the cookie'
Consultant's comment: This is okay if it's right in front of you (but not if it's in your bag)

b.	axexsd=an	x=a=x=ga	kuki
	want=1.sg	ACC=4.LOC=3.PRO=1.LOC	cookie

Consultant's comment: You can say this if I all know where it is, I've been talking about it (but it's in the bag at the time of utterance)

These examples support the general hypothesis that *–da* signifies ostension. However, 'ostension' is merely a descriptive term. How can we formalize this concept? As discussed above, one function of ostension is to restrict the range of referents when there is a potential for confusion (Gerner 2009). This might lead us to hypothesize that *–da* operates as a contrastive-topic marker. However, disambiguating between multiple possible referents need not be ostension's sole function. For example, English demonstratives are frequently used to achieve "mutually-recognized salience" for a referent/topic between discourse participants (Mount 2008). This might lead us to predict that *–da* will serve to mark focus. But are all demonstrations necessarily focus-sensitive? In English, at least, the answer is no. For example, consider the following context: Three friends have found a cookie lying on the ground, and are discussing who will eat the cookie. Two of the friends are known to really love sweets, and aren't particularly fastidious. The third friend is much pickier, but suddenly says that he's going to eat the cookie. In this context, it would be perfectly reasonable for one of his friends to exclaim, "YOU wanna eat that

cookie?!" while pointing at the cookie. In this context, "that cookie" is not in focus, yet is accompanied by a demonstrative and a demonstration. The focused second person pronoun, on the other hand, cannot co-occur with a demonstrative (similarly to the distributional facts of Kwak'wala), and need not co-occur with a demonstration. These facts illustrate that demonstratives and demonstrations are not synonymous with focus. It is also worth noting that demonstrations and demonstratives in English are not synonymous with each other. In other words, it is possible to use *demonstrations* in English without an accompanying demonstrative (e.g. "Give me the pencil" while pointing at the pencil).

As far as I am aware, there is as yet no comprehensive analysis that can account for these factors with regards to demonstration/demonstratives, nor are there studies that provide formal analyses of pure ostensive markers (e.g. as in Lisu). This makes the next step of our analysis difficult. Though I will not be able to solve this complex issue within this paper, I offer a few additional observations that may help lead us to a more concrete understanding of *-da*.

The Kwak'wala examples addressed thus far give rise to the following question: if *–da* is equivalent to a pointing gesture, does this predict that it can only be used in contexts for which there is a visual referent? The answer, of course, is no – we already know that *–da* combines freely with the Distal (3.LOC) marker. As was noted in Section 2, the distal marker denotes that the associated NP is either not present, or is novel to the domain of discourse. I have proposed that the *–i* LOC marker, like all the LOC markers, functions to 'assert the existence' of the following NP in addition to its particular deictic meaning (i.e. 'not-present'). It then follows that the *–da* is an abstract pointing gesture to an entity that we are asserting to exist, but that we cannot see. What is the function of this abstract gesture?

I propose that *–da* serves both the pragmatic functions previously mentioned: disambiguation and promoting the salience of a referent. These functions, furthermore, interact with the LOC denotations. When *-da* combines with the distal LOC morpheme it serves both to restrict the domain (from the domain of entities) as well as mark the NP as salient to the discourse. This is the nature of the 'abstract' pointing gesture, and is functionally parallel to the 'domain restriction' feature proposed by Gillon for S<u>k</u>w<u>x</u>wú7mesh determiners. When *–da* combines with either a proximal or medial LOC morpheme, on the other hand, it will primarily function to mark salience (because objects that are already located in the space of the discourse are inherently less likely to be ambiguous). This proposal may explain the propensity for *–da* to occur in subject position: as subjects are often the topic of the given discourse context, *-da* naturally co-occurs with this position as it promotes the noun to salience. *-da* is not, however, limited to this syntactic position (as non-subjects may be salient, or may require disambiguation), nor are *subjects* required to be marked as salient.

5 The syntax of *-da*

The semantic features familiarity, uniqueness, specificity, assertion of existence, and domain restriction have been claimed to characterize the D-head position of determiner phrases in English, Turkish, Skwxwu7mesh, Lillooet, and many other languages. We have established that *–da* does not fundamentally denote any of these features. This does not necessarily mean, however, that *–da* is not a D-head. Several syntactic features have been claimed to characterize D-heads cross-linguistically. In the following section, we will discuss the distribution of *–da* with respect to arguments and D-level noun phrases (e.g. possessives).

5.1 Argumenthood

One of the most common diagnostics for determinerhood is the obligatory nature of the D-determiner for marking arguments (Longobardi 2001). As was noted in Section 2, *-da* as a nominal modifier is evidenced in all argument positions (i.e. subject position, accusative, oblique, and prepositional); however, it is not obligatory in any of these positions. The LOC morphemes in Kwak'wala *are* arguably obligatory for arguments (except in certain negated contexts; see section 3.4). This is demonstrated in (37a-c).

(37) LOC, not *–da*, is obligatory for argument DPs:

a. [tɛnxalida tsɪdaq]
denxala=i=(da) tsidak
sing=3.LOC=(DEF) woman
'The woman is singing'

b. *denxala tsidak
sing woman

c. *denxala=da tsidak
sing==DEF woman

The non-obligatory nature of *–da,* of course, does not prove that the morpheme is not a D^0. It is possible, for example, that *–da* alternates with a null morpheme. Indeed, Boas' description of *–da*-marked noun phrases as 'definite,' and unmarked phrases as 'indefinite' is suggestive of this kind of paradigm. A full exploration of this possibility is beyond the scope of this paper. I will leave the issue, however, with two observations derived from my fieldwork experience: 1) restrictions on the occurrence of –da are not easy to come by, and 2) differences in interpretation of a noun phrase depending on the presence or absence of *–da* have not been particularly transparent. This lack of a specific interpretation for unmarked NPs stands in stark contrast to the alternation of locative morphemes. Consider the following examples, repeated from (28) above. In (38a) and (b), we observe that a negated sentence with no locative morphology is interpreted as a negated predicational. A negated sentence where

the argument is marked by locative morphology, on the other hand, is interpreted as a negative existential.

(38) Locative as an inherent feature

a. k'ios begwanam
NEG man
'There is no man'

b. kis=ox begwanam
NEG=2.LOC man
'This/He is not a man'

This kind of interpretational contrast does not characterize the absence of *–da.* As has been demonstrated throughout the paper – arguments not marked with *–da* can be translated/interpreted as definite or indefinite, depending on other contextual factors. They can also be unique, specific, familiar – or not. These facts lead me to believe that *–da* does not alternate with a null morpheme; rather, it serves a modificational (as opposed to functional) role in the NP.

5.2 Distributional restrictions: DPs vs NPs

I mentioned in the preceding section that I have found few restrictions on the occurrence of *–da*. This is not to say, however, that *-da* is entirely unrestricted. It has already been mentioned, for example, that *-da* does not co-occur with possessives or proper names. This is distributionally parallel to the English definite determiner. This alternation in English has been taken as evidence for both the semantic type and syntactic position of proper nouns and possessives (i.e. that whereas bare nouns sit at the N level of the DP, proper nouns and possessed phrases sit in the specifier position of the DP). In order to interpret the Kwak'wala pattern as truly reflecting the same English structure, we must believe that bare nouns and proper nouns are syntactically distinct in a similar way. Is there any independent reason for believing that proper nouns in Kwak'wala belong to the same category as they do in English?

Interestingly, there is – while most bare nouns can be realized as predicates in Kwak'wala, proper nouns are barred from this position. Take the examples in (39a-d) below. Whereas either the noun *chief* or *woman* can operate as a predicate, the proper name Bill cannot. In fact, attempts to render this sentence were judged nearly uninterpretable.

(39) *X is the chief* vs *The chief is X*

a. [gíɢamejùχ bɪl]
gigamey=ux Bill
chief=2.LOC Bill
'Bill is the chief'

b. [tɕɪp^{h}amej:ùχda tsɪdáq]
tsipamey=ux=da tsidak
woman.chief=2.LOC=DEF woman
'That woman is the chief'

c. *Bill-ux gigamey
Bill-2.LOC chief

d. *Bill-ux=da gigamey
Bill-2.LOC=DEF chief

This contrast is further exemplified by the equative predicate structure (Littell 2010). Littell proposes that the 'independent pronoun' series described by Boas are actually inflected predicates. He notes an asymmetry in their application: while certain equative sentences (e.g. "Pat is an owl" (40)) cannot be interpreted with an equative structure, others (e.g. "John is the winner" (41)) must be.

(40) daxdaxaliɬx=ux Pat
owl=2.LOC Pat
'Pat is an owl' (Littell, pg. 7)

(41) he=da dulo=i John
3.DEM=DEF winner=3.LOC John
'John is the winner' (Littell, pg. 9)

Littell proposes that what necessitates the equative structure in examples like (40) is the fact that "the winner" is no longer a predicate NP, but a full DP. In other words, much as "Bill" cannot serve as a predicate (presumably due to its status as an entity, example (39c)), "the winner" has also been encoded as an entity, and so cannot serve as a predicate. The question then arises – is the DP status of "the winner" related to the presence/absence of *–da*? An examination of Littell's data suggests no; the majority of equative predicate structures are marked by neither LOC morphology nor *–da*; however, as shown in (41), *-da* is not blocked from occurrence. These data therefore suggest that the distinction between bare nouns and proper nouns is paralleled between Kwak'wala and English. It does not appear to be the case, however, that *–da* is instrumental to this distinction.

5.3 Distributional restrictions: agreement

As was described in section 2, agreement in Kwak'wala occurs when a verb is preceded by auxiliaries. When the subject surfaces after the verb, the locative marking associated with this NP will also obligatorily appear in second position after the auxiliary (42a). Crucially, *-da* is blocked from occurring in this position, even if it is present in the subject DP (42b). It is furthermore illicit

to move *–da* to 2nd position, and leave the predicate marked only by locative morphology (42c).

(42) a. [lɪmóχ miχʷóχda gíʔgilà]
la=m=**ox** mix=**ox=da** ga=gala
Aux-Disc=**2.LOC** sleep=**2.LOC=DEF** RED=bear
'The bears are sleeping (Ruby)'

b. *la=m=**ox=da** mix=**ox=da** ga=gala
*Aux-Disc=**2.LOC= DEF** sleep=**2.LOC=DEF** RED=bear

c. *la=m=**ox=da** mix=**ox** ga=gala
*Aux-Disc=**2.LOC= DEF** sleep=**2.LOC** RED=bear

In contrast, when the subject raises to second position after the auxiliary, the full LOC and DEF morphology associated with it also raise (43).

(43) [lɪmóχda waq'ɛsiχ dəxwa]
la=m=**ox=da** wak'es=ix daxwa
Aux-Disc=**2.LOC= DEF** frog=2.VIS jump
'The frog is jumping'

These data indicate that *–da* is in some way bound (morphologically/positionally) to the noun with which it occurs. LOC, on the other hand, is not.

In this section, we have established that *–da* does not transparently display the properties that are expected to characterize D^0 determiners. The most common diagnostic for determinerhood – obligatory co-occurrence with arguments – is not upheld by *–da.* While it is possible that *–da* alternates with a null morpheme (which would allow *–da* to pass the argumenthood-diagnostic), I have presented evidence suggesting its absence is not associated with a specific meaning – which is incompatible with a null morpheme hypothesis. A second diagnostic for determinerhood involved parallels between the distributional asymmetries of *–da* and English determiners. For example, in both English and Kwak'wala possessive morphology and proper names (D-heads by hypothesis) are in complementary distribution with the definite determiner *-da*. Unlike the definite determiner in English, however, *-da* does not appear to create DPs, as evidenced by their non-obligatory nature in equative predicate structures (Littell 2010).

On the other hand, we have determined that the LOC markers do evidence some properties expected of D^0 determiners. For example, LOC markers obligatorily co-occur with arguments, except in non-veridical contexts. The 4.LOC marker, furthermore, appears to be used as a kind of default. Finally, the LOC markers are used to indicate agreement (while *–da* cannot be), which suggests that they must be a "part of the syntactic machinery of the clause" (Henry Davis, pc). When the syntactic facts of both the LOC morphemes and –

da are considered together, we can reasonably hypothesize that the underlying structure of the Kwak'wala DP involves a LOC D-head with *–da* as a D-modifier:

(44) $[_{KP}$=Case$[_{DP}[_{DP}$=LOC]=*da*]]

6 Conclusions

This exploration of Kwak'wala noun phrase morphology has led to the following conclusion: *-da* is not a definite determiner; rather, it is the equivalent of a 'pointing gesture,' or ostension in deictic terms. It bears no other deictic or referential features, and is thus different from English demonstratives both in terms of a) not being definite and b) not indicating location. As predicted by the definition of "ostension" it serves two functions: to help disambiguate when there are multiple references in the domain, and to promote the referent to salience in the discourse. When combined with the distal LOC marker, *-da* is equivalent to 'domain restriction' in the sense of Gillon (2006). In combination with the medial, proximal, and assertion-of-existence LOC markers, *-da* primarily serves to mark salience. Finally, its distributional asymmetry with regards to subjects vs. objects (i.e. higher propensity to occur in subject position) supports the hypothesis that *–da* interacts with topicality, as opposed to focus.

I have also given evidence suggesting that the LOC markers serve two semantic functions: 1) locational deixis and 2) assertion of existence. A fourth LOC marker has been introduced to the LOC paradigm, and it has been shown to contrast with the other three markers by lacking locational deixis features, instead denoting assertion-of-existence alone.

Finally, I have suggested that LOC serves as the D-head determiner in Kwak'wala. The ostensive marker *-da*, on the other hand, is a D-level adjunct. This conclusion is supported by the fact that 1) LOC, not *–da*, appears to obligatorily co-occur with arguments (except in non-veridical contexts); 2) the ostensive marker is licensed only in co-occurrence with LOC, and 3) LOC marks agreement, whereas *–da* is blocked from agreement positions.

Appendix

Boas' description of the prenominal determiners is called into question by three additional forms that are attested in the current dialect (*-xada*, *-sada*, *-xwada*). In Boas' description, the *vocalic* series (associated with definite) are characterized by the morpheme *–da.* In the accusative and oblique forms, however, the '-d' is absent when the argument is not marked by the proximal or medial LOC marker. Boas claims that these forms derive from older, more transparent forms (e.g. *–sida*) (1911: 531). According to his description, the three additional forms found in this dialect would represent adjacent occurrences of the *da* morpheme (i.e. *x+i+da+da*). This does not occur in the historical data; furthermore, there are no other instances of *da* doubling with the other Locative morphemes (e.g. **x+ga+da+da*). On the other hand, the *–a* ending of these

accusative and oblique forms occurs in complementary distribution with 1st and 2nd LOC morphemes:

LOC Category	Nominative	Accusative	Oblique
1st	Word]-[$_{DP}$Ø=ga . . .	Word]-[$_{DP}$χ=ga . . .	Word]-[$_{DP}$s=ga . . .
2nd	Word]-[$_{DP}$Ø=oχ . . .	Word]-[$_{DP}$χ=oχ . . .	Word]-[$_{DP}$s=oχ . . .
3rd/(4th)	Word]-[$_{DP}$Ø=i . . .	Word]-[$_{DP}$χ=a . . .	Word]-[$_{DP}$s=a . . .

This parallelism suggests that the *–a* suffix functions similarly to the *–i* clitic found in the Nominative 3.LOC environment. Indeed, Boas' himself provides data supporting this conclusion: "in the Newettee and Koskimo dialects -*x̲a* and -*sa* are replaced by -*x̲i* and -*si* (1947: 254)." Furthermore, the 3.LOC marker is not exclusively restricted to nominative contexts, though the parameters that permit its occurrence in other syntactic positions (e.g. prepositional) are as yet unclear.

The forms *–x̲ada* and *–sada* are much less common than their nominative counterparts; I believe that this distributional fact, coupled with the availability of definite readings on the unmarked 4.LOC forms, may have misled Boas. Regardless, it does not appear tenable to claim that *–x̲a* and *–sa* represent coalescence of LOC and DEF morphology in the current dialect. I will therefore treat the *–a* of these forms as a separate morpheme belonging to the LOC clitic category.

References

Abbott, Barbara. 1999. Support for a Unique Theory of Definiteness. *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 9:1-15.

Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. Aspects of the Theory of Clitics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Stephen R. 2003. *How to put your Clitics in their Place or Why the Best Account of Second Position May be Something Like the Optimal One.*

Anderson, Stephen R. 1984. *Kwakwala Syntax and the Government-Binding Theory*. Eung-Do Cook and Donna B. Gerdts, eds. The Syntax of Native American Languages. Syntax and Semantics, vol. 16. Orlando: Academic Press. 21-75.

Anonby, Stan J. 1999. *Reversing Language Shift: Can Kwak'wala be Revived?* Chapter 4 of *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages,* edited by Jon Reyhner, Gina Cantoni, Robert N. St. Clair, and Evangeline Parsons Yazzie (pp.33-52). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University. Copyright 1999 by Northern Arizona University

Bach, Emmon. 2006. Paradigm Regained: Deixis in Northern Wakashan. SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics 14. 267-281.
Bach, Emmon, Dora Robinson, and Rose Robinson. *Haisla Lessons.* Lesson 3. http://www.people.umass.edu/ebach/xles-3.htm; DOA 5/18/2011.
Berman, Judith. 1982. Deictic Auxiliaries and Discourse Marking in Kwak'wala narrative. *Papers for the 17th International Conference on Salish Languages,* pgs. 305-408. November.
Berman, Judith. 1983. Three discourse elements in Boas' Kwak'wala texts. *Papers for the 18th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 1-52, November.
Berman, Judith. 1994. "George Hunt and the Kwak'wala texts." *Anthropological Linguistics.* Vol. 36, No. 4 (Winter 1994): 483-514.
Black, Alexis 2010. *Seeing is* not *believing: A reanalysis of the Kwak'wala Determiners.* Conference Presentation, Linguistics Society of America Annual Conference Winter 2010.
Boas, Franz. 1947. Kwakiutl Grammar with a Glossary of the Suffixes. Helene Boas Yampolsky, ed. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series 37:3.
Boas, Franz. 1911. *Kwakiutl.* Extract from Handbook of American Indian Languages (Bulletin 40), Part 1: Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, Government Printing Office. 425-557.
Brisson, Christine. 1998. *Distributivity, Maximality, and Floating Quantifiers.* Ph.D. Thesis, Rutgers University.
Chung, Yunhee. 2007. The internal structure of the Kwak̓wala nominal domain. Papers for the 42nd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, vol. 20. 101-118.
Diessel, Holger. 1998. Demonstratives in Crosslinguistic and Diachronic Perspective. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of New York at Buffalo.
Donnellan, Keith. 1966. Reference and definite descriptions. *Philosophical Review.* 75:281-304.
Enç, Murvet. 1991. The Semantics of Specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 1-25.
Fillmore, Charles J. 1966. Deictic categories in the semantics of 'come'. *Foundations of Language*, *2*, 219–227.
Frege, Gottlob. 1977 [1892]. On Sense and Reference. *Readings in the Philosophy of Language.* ed. Peter Ludlow, 563-583. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Gerner, Matthias. 2009. *Deictic Features of Demonstratives: A Typological Survey with Special Reference to the Miao Group.* Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique 54(1): 43–90.
Gillon, Carrie. 2006. *The semantics of determiners: domain restriction in Skwxwu7mesh.* Doctoral Thesis, The University of British Columbia. Faculty of Linguistics.
Gillon, Carrie. 2009. The Semantic Core of Determiners: Evidence from Skwxwú7mesh. *Determiners: Universals and Variation,* eds. Jila Ghomeshi, Ileana Paul, and Martina Wiltschko, 177-214.

Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A study in reference and grammaticality prediction.* London: Croom Helm.
Hawkins, John A. 1991. On (In)definite Articles: Implicatures and (Un)grammaticality Prediction. *Journal of Linguistics* 27, 405-422.
Heim, Irene. 1982. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases.* Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Graduate Linguistics Students' Association. 1988.
Heim, Irene. 1991. Articles and Definiteness. Published in German as "Artikel und Definitheit." *Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, eds Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich, 487-535. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Jamieson-McLarnon, Susan. "Native Language centre planned." *SFU News online* Simon Fraser University, 33(6) (July 7, 2005). DOA: 5/17/2011.
Kadmon, Nirit. 1992. *On Unique and Non-Unique Reference and Asymmetric Quantification.* New York: Garland.
Kadmon, Nirit. 2001. *Formal Pragmatics: Semantics, Pragmatics, Presupposition, and Focus.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Lewis, David. 1979. Scorekeeping in a Language Game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8, 339-359.
Link, Godehard. 1983. The Logical Analysis of Plural and Mass Terms: A Lattice-Theoretical Approach. *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language,* eds. Rainer Bauerle, Christoph Schwarze and Arnim von Stechow, 302-323. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Littell, Patrick. 2010. *Mistaken Identity: Boas's Dilemma and the missing Kwak'wala copula.* Qualifying Paper, Winter 2010.
Ludlow, Peter and Stephen Neale. 1991. Indefinite descriptions: in defense of Russell. *Linguistics and Philosophy,* 14(2): 171-202.
Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Matthewson, Lisa. 1998. *Determiner Systems and quantificational strategies: evidence from Salish*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
Nicolson, Marianne and Adam Werle. 2010. *An Investigation of modern Kwak'wala determiner systems.* University of Victoria.
Partee, Barbara. 1991. Adverbial Quantification and Event Structures. *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Berkley Linguistic Society.* University of California, Berkley.
Postal, P. 1966. On So-called Pronouns in English, in D. Reibel and S. Schane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 201–223.
Prince, Ellen F. 1992. The ZPG Letter: Subjects Definiteness, and Information-Status. *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising text,* eds. William C. Mann and Sandra A. Thompson, 295-325. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Russell, Bertrand. 1998 [1905]. On Denoting *Definite Descriptions: a reader,*

ed. Gary Ostertag, 35-49. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Stalnaker, Robert C. 1974. Pragmatic Presuppositions. *Semantics and Philosophy*. eds. Milton K. Munitz and Peter K. Unger, 197-213. New York; New York University Press.