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The purpose of this paper is to provide an analysis of the structure of the determiner phrase (DP) in Secwepemctsin. It builds on the work of Matthewson and Davis (1995), Demirdache et al (1994), Gardiner (1993), Gardiner et al. (1993) on various properties associated with determiner phrases, and is intended as a contribution to the comparative picture of determiner phrases in Salish.

I assume a standard X-bar representation for the DP as shown in (1):

(1)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{Specifier} D' \\
\text{D Complement}
\end{array}
\]

The determiner system in Secwepemctsin is discussed in (§1). In (§2), I turn to a discussion of the complements of D—in particular relative clauses (§2.1) and possessors (§2.2). Possessor scrambling is discussed in (§3) where I look at the interaction of possessors with quantifiers (§3.1), scrambling within PPs (§3.2), and scrambling out of clauses (§3.3). Demonstratives are discussed in (§4). Their interaction with possessors is discussed in (§4.1) and with quantifiers in (§4.2). The paper concludes (§5) with a summary of the findings.

1. Determiners

Determiners are obligatory on nominals in Secwepemctsin, including environments where determiners are not used in English. They appear on mass nouns (2), bare plurals (3) and on proper nouns (4-5):

(2) qwenën ken tek sëwilkke
want I obl water
'I want water.'

(3) re leñkëñmem ec re llen es te spepqä
det bears exist det eat 3conj obl berries
'Bears eat berries.'

(4) m-wëwk-t-en re Mary
compl-see-tr-1subj det Mary
'I saw Mary.'

(5) m-wëwk-t-sem s re Mary
compl-see-tr-1subj det Mary
'Mary saw me.'

As can be observed in (4-5), determiners do not distinguish subject and object case marking on overt nominals. Rather the determiner system distinguishes direct arguments (subjects and objects) from obliques, which are prepositional.2 The determiners are given in (6):

(6) Determiners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential</th>
<th>Non-refer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>Non-vis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Determiners</td>
<td>re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliques</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direct determiners are marked for referentiality, distinguishing referential from non-referential arguments. In addition, referential determiners are marked for spatial deixis. Non-referential determiners are common in negatives (7) and in questions (8).

(7) taj7 k-swi7-s
neg det nom-name-3poss
'He's not finished.'

(8) swëty ke 7-skwest
who det 2poss-name
'What is your name?'

Assuming the X-bar representation in (1) above, determiners are represented as the head of DP. The next section discusses the types of complements that D can select.

---

1I would like to thank the many Secwepemc speakers who have helped me to understand their language. In particular, Mona Jules has been my primary language consultant in this research. The data in this paper is given in the Secwepemc practical orthography. Note that 'Y+s'177. Y+s=Y[s], Y+s=Y[x], Y+s=Y[s], and Y+s=Y[t].

2As can be seen in (2) the non-referential oblique can be analysed as having internal structure, consisting of the oblique preposition 'te' and the non-referential determiner 'k'. Other instances involve fusion or a filter blocking combinations of prepositions and determiners. Constructions relevant to this property are given in (§3.2).
Complements

Determiners can select either NPs or clauses. The visible determiner /re-/ introduces direct nominal arguments (9) or dependent incomplete clauses (10):

(9) m-wirkt-en re Mary 
    compl-see-tr-1subj det Mary
    'I saw Mary.'

(10) tk'miks re s-767k wen 
    kamloops det dir-go lconj
    'I come from Kamloops.'

The non-visible determiner /-i/ can select either NPs that are not present (11) or headless relative clauses (12-13):

(11) m-7ilen-s I swewll 
    compl-eat-(tr)-3subj det fish
    'He ate the fish.'

(12) m-wirkt-en I m-qwetsets 
    compl-see-tr-1subj det compi-leave
    'I saw the one who left.'

(13) m-wirkt-en I xyum 
    compl-see-tr-1subj det big
    'I saw the one big.'

Factive clauses may also be selected with the non-visible determiner:

(14) telexm-st-én I m-qwetsets 
    know-tr-1subj det compi-leave
    'I know the one who left.'
    'I know that he left.'

The non-referential determiner also selects NPs or clauses:

Clause (11) with a NP complement and (13) with a headless relative clause are shown in (17) and (18) respectively. Notice that in (18), I assume that empty operator movement has taken place.

---

3Factives can also be introduced with the oblique marker:

(15) swetys k m-qwetsets k q67se-s 
    who det compi-leave det father-3poss
    'Whose father left?'

(16) tk's7en k s-76ek uc 
    where det dir-go 2conj
    'Where do you come from?'

---

4Davis 1994, Davis et al. 1993 and Gardner 1993 provide arguments in favor of empty operator movement. These are based on island effects and ergative agreement phenomena that is restricted to extraction environments.
2.1 Relative Clauses

Secwepemctsin has both headless and headed relative clauses. Headless relative clauses have been observed in (12-13) where they are introduced with the direct non-visible determiner. Headed relative clauses are introduced with the oblique:

(19) yin? n7 re nuxwenxw te tselexm-st-és
   that det woman obl know-tr-3subj
   'That's the woman that he knows.'

The head and its relative clause behave as a constituent in that they may be focussed, a position reserved for a single constituent.

(20) re nuxwenxw te tselexm-st-és lu7 mqwetsés
    det woman obl know-tr-3subj that det compl-leave
    'It's the woman that he knows that left.'

It has been argued that St'at'imcets has two types of headed relative clauses (Gardiner et al. 1993, Matthewson and Davis 1995): a head initial relative clause and a head final relative clause. Secwepemctsin lacks head final relative clauses. A headed relative clause is given in (21). Notice that it also has a factive interpretation:

(21) tselexm-st-éten re nuxwenxw te mqwetsés
    know-tr-1subj det woman obl compl-leave
    'I know the woman who left.' (NP S)
    'I know that the woman left.' (preposed NP)

Example (22) appears to provide evidence of a head final relative clause.

(22) tselexm-st-éten te mqwetsés re nuxwenxw
    know-tr-1subj obl compl-leave det woman
    "I know the woman who left." ('S NP)
    'I know that the woman left.'

This construction is unlike the one in St'at'imcets where the head generally does not take a determiner, and when it does, it takes the non-referential determiner. Secondly, notice that both the relative clause and factive interpretations are not available. The construction is only interpreted as a factive, and does not constitute a relative clause at all. This provides evidence that Secwepemctsin lacks the head final relative clause. The factive in (22) is the basic structure to which NP preposing has occurred in (21).

A representation of a headless relative clauses was given in (17-18) above. The headed relative clause (21) is represented in (23):

2.2 Possessors

In this section I discuss the behaviour of possessive constructions. Possessive phrases can be observed either following (24) or preceding (25) their head.

(24) wíxwí-t-en re tsiícw-s re úqwi-s re Mary
    see-tr-1subj det house-3poss det sister-3poss det Mary
    'I saw Mary's sister's house.'

(25) wíxwí-t-en re tsiícw-s re Mary re úqwi-s
    see-tr-1subj det house-3poss det Mary det sister-3poss
    'I saw Mary's sister's house.'

I assume that the head initial construction is basic with DP scrambling taking place in (25). In instances of stacked possessors there is evidence of an adjacency requirement. The possessor must occur either right or left adjacent to the possessed DP (26).

Some St'at'imcets speakers only permit the head initial possessive construction (Matthewson and Davis 1995). I have not observed this restriction in Secwepemctsin.
Possessive phrases are analysed as complements of the head N as shown in (27). As is common in head-initial languages, there is possessor agreement on the head in Secwepemcts'ul.

(27)

3 Possessor Scrambling

As can be observed in the following pair, the possessor can occur either in base position following the head or scramble to precede the head:

(28) wfwk-t-en re uqwis re Mary
    see-tr-1subj det sister-3poss det Mary
    'I saw Mary's sister.'

(29) wfwk-t-en re Mary re uqwis
    see-tr-1subj det Mary det uqwis
    'I saw Mary's sister.'

I analyse (29) as involving possessor scrambling with DP adjunction as represented in (30).

(30)

3.1 Interaction with Strong Quantifiers

DP scrambling can be seen to interact with the strong quantifier /xwexwéyt/. While it is preferred to have the possessor adjacent to the head (31-32), the quantifier appears to be possible between the head and the possessor (33). This interaction provides evidence that both the quantifier and the possessor DP are adjoining to DP, as shown in (34).

(31) m-17e7y-en xwexwéyt compl-meet-1subj all
    re kwsélktken-s det John
    'I met all John's relatives.'

(32) m-17e7y-en xwexwéyt compl-meet-1subj all
    re John re kwsélktken-s det relative-3poss
    'I met all John's relatives.'

(33) m-17e7y-en re John xwexwéyt re kwsélktken-s
    compl-meet-1subj det John all det relative-3poss
    'I met all John's relatives.'
3.2 Scrambling within PPs

It can be observed that the scrambling operation is DP internal by looking at the behaviour of DP scrambling within PPs. A clause with a prepositional phrase containing a possessed DP is given in (35). Its representation is given in (36).

(35) me7 /7c ken ne tsîlcw-s re kûkpi7
exp sleep 1subj at house-3poss det chief
'I will be sleeping at the chief’s house.'

When the possessor DP scrambles as shown in (37) it does so within the DP.

(37) me7 /7c ken ne kûkpi7 re tsîlcw-s
exp sleep 1subj at chief house-3poss
'I will be sleeping at the chief's house.'

That the scrambling operation is DP internal can be seen by the fact that the DP is inside of the prepositional head. Notice that the first member of the possessive construction loses its determiner. Another pair is provided in (38-39):

(38) me7 /7c7k ken te tsîlcw-s re kûkpi7
exp go 1subj by house-3poss det chief
'I will be going by the chiefs house.'

(39) me7 /7c7k ken te kûkpi7 re tsîlcw-s
exp go 1subj by chief det house-3poss
'I will be going by the chiefs house.'
3.3 Scrambling out of Clauses

In the previous section it was shown that possessor scrambling is strictly DP internal. This predicts that there will be no scrambling out of clauses. First, I show that possessors cannot scramble out of transitives. However, there is evidence that scrambling of DPs out of intransitives is possible.

A transitive construction is given in (40):

(40) mele-ce-nt-es re Mary re John kick-tr-3subj det horse-3poss det Mary det John

'John kicked Mary’s horse.'

'Mary’s horse kicked John.'

While the entire possessive construction can be focussed, questioned or relativized, it is not possible to extract the possessor. A focus construction is given in (41):

(41) nts’e7sqexe7-s re Mary lu7 l mele-nt-és re John horse-3poss det Mary foc det kick-tr-3subj det John

'It’s Mary horse that John kicked.'

'It’s Mary whose horse John kicked.'

Possessives exhibit the same behaviour in wh-questions. The entire DP containing the possessor may be questioned (43), but the possessor cannot scramble out of the DP (44):

(43) sweti7 k nts’e7sqexe7-s k melcentés re John who det horse-3poss det kick-tr-3subj det John

'Whose horse did John kick?'

(44) *swéi7 k melcentés k nts’e7sqexe7-s re John

k who det kick-tr-3subj det John

'Whose horse did John kick?'

Headed relative clauses also do not permit the scrambling of the possessor:

(45) m-qwetsés re kl7ce-s re nuxwenxw te wík-t-en
compl-leave det mother-3poss det woman det see-tr-1subj

'The woman’s mother who I saw, left.'

Transitive constructions are problematic in general. First, notice that in (40) the possessor can only be associated with the object. Second, the difficulty with scrambling possessors out of transitive objects may reside in the fact that there is a preferred strategy for possessive objects (under disjoint reference). This involves the use of the applicative /ci/ and possessor raising to object as shown in (47):

(47) m-wík-ci-en re John te qe7ts-e-s
compl-see-appl-1subj det mother-3poss det woman

'I saw John’s mother.'

In this construction it is expected that objects can extract and this is the case. Give the problem of ergative possessors and the disjoint reference strategy for possessive objects?, it is best to turn to intransitive constructions to investigate whether possessors are able to scramble out of clauses.

While there are apparent examples of possessor scrambling in some intransitive constructions, many of these can be eliminated. Notice that in the pair (48-49), the possessor appears to scramble:

(48) xyum re tsitcws
big house-3poss

re John

'John’s house is big.'

(49) re John xyum re tsitcws
det John big house-3poss

'John’s house is big.'

In Gardiner (1993) constructions like (49) with putative possessor scrambling are argued to be external topics. Under this analysis, the possessor has not scrambled at all, but rather is binding an empty pronoun.

A different analysis can eliminate the claim of possessor scrambling in wh-constructions:

(50) swéi7 k tsítow-s k xyum
who det house-3poss det big

'Whose house is big.'

(51) swéi7 k xyum k tsítow-s
who det big det house-3poss

'Whose house is big.'

The inability to get both interpretations in (40) is unexpected and needs further research. There may be some constraint on ergative possessors or on ‘heavy NPs’.  

Binding Condition C will block all coreferential constructions with an overt possessor in object position.
In Davis et al. (1993), and Gardiner (1993), wh-constructions are analysed as being base generated, involving empty operator movement in the dependent clause. Therefore, while there may be movement associated with the possessor in (51), it is an empty operator and not the wh-word that is moving.

A third type of construction, however, provides evidence that possessors can scramble when they behave as internal topics. The entire possessive construction can scramble to preverbal position in (52):

(52) /he7en re John re q67ise-s k l7ek wes
where det John det father-3poss det go 3conj
"Where is John's father going?"

It is also possible to scramble the possessor to preverbal position stranding the head:

(53) /he7en re John k l7ek wes re q67ise-s
where det John det go 3conj det father-3poss
"Where is John's father going?"

This construction provides evidence that the possessor can scramble when it behaves as an internal topic. More research is needed on scrambling in internal topic constructions.

4 Demonstratives

In this section, I discuss the general properties of demonstratives. Then the interaction of demonstratives with possessors (§4.1) and quantifiers (§4.2) is discussed, in order to determine their syntactic status.

There are three common demonstratives, that mark spatial deixis in relation to the speaker:

(54) ye7/e re yerý re yerí7

A DP containing a demonstrative is given in (55):

(55) xwent yerí7 re nts'e7sqexe7
fast that det horse
"That horse is fast."

Demonstratives occur to the left of the direct determiner and may occur in positions where DPs occur:

(56) xwent yerëy fast that
tag that one is fast'

A reduced form of the visible distal demonstrative ri7/ and the invisible one lu7/ are very common:

(57) xwent ri7 fast that
tag that one is fast'

(58) m-7llen-s lu7 compl-eat-3subj that
"He ate that."

These reduced deictics appear to have grammaticized as focus particles:

(59) nwí7s ri7 re xwent
3emph that det fast
"It's that one that is fast."

(60) swéwll lu7 m-7i1Ien-s fish that det comp-eat-3subj
"It's fish that he ate."

Finally demonstratives cannot occur as predicates:

(61) yerëy re nts'e7sqexe7 that det horse
"that horse"
"The horse is that."

Next we need to look at the interaction of demonstratives with possessors and quantifiers in order to determine their syntactic status.

4.1 Interaction of Possessors with Demonstratives

Demonstratives may introduce DPs that contain possessors:

(62) xwent yerëy re nts'e7sqexe7 re ko7plí7
fast that det horse-3poss det chief
"That horse of the chief's is fast."

---

8) have only investigated the visible demonstratives, shown in (54). There is another set of demonstratives used to mark non-visible deixis.
The possessor in (62) is not able to scramble to a position preceding the head DP:

\[(63) \text{\textit{xwent yerey re k\textcircled{\textkupa}7 re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7-s}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{fast that det chief det horse-3poss}}
\]
\[
\text{"That horse of the chief's is fast."}
\]
\[
\text{"That chief's horse is fast."}
\]

This construction provides evidence that the demonstrative occupies Spec of DP and that the possessor cannot adjoin to D'.

\[(64)\]
\[
\text{\textit{DP Spec yerey}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{D' NP re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7}}
\]

Interestingly, when there is a demonstrative in specifier position, the possessor cannot scramble outside of the DP:

\[(65) \text{\textit{xwent re k\textcircled{\textkupa}7 yerey re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7-s}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{fast that det chief det horse-3poss}}
\]
\[
\text{"That horse of the chief's is fast."}
\]

However the possessor may occur as an external topic, binding an empty pronoun within the possessed DP:

\[(66) \text{\textit{re k\textcircled{\textkupa}7 xwent yerey re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7-s}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{det chief fast that det horse-3poss}}
\]
\[
\text{"The chief, that horse of his is fast."}
\]

4.2 Interaction of Demonstratives and Quantifiers

Recall that possessors are able to intervene between strong quantifiers and the head as shown in (67):

\[(67) \text{\textit{m-t\textcircled{\textkupa}7\textcircled{\textkupa}7y-en xwexw\textcircled{\textkupa}y\textcircled{\textkupa}t re John re \textkupa kw\textcircled{\textkupa}l\textcircled{\textkupa}k\textcircled{\textkupa}t\textcircled{\textkupa}k\textcircled{\textkupa}ten-s}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{compl-meet-1subj all det John det relative-3poss}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{I met all John's relatives."}}
\]

This contrasts with (68) where the possessor cannot intervene between the specifier and the head:

\[(68) \text{\textit{xwent yerey re k\textcircled{\textkupa}7 yerey re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7-s}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{fast that det chief det horse-3poss}}
\]
\[
\text{"That horse of the chief's is fast."}
\]
\[
\text{"That chief's horse is fast."}
\]

That the strong quantifier is analysed as adjoined to DP and the demonstrative as Specifier of DP makes a prediction. The quantifier will not intervene between the specifier and its head. This prediction seems to be good with a small twist. Quantifiers can intervene but the determiner is oblique.

\[(69) \text{\textit{m-w7 re n-s-pip\textcircled{\textkupa}qw xwexw\textcircled{\textkupa}y\textcircled{\textkupa}t ri7 te specw\textcircled{\textkupa}l\textcircled{\textkupa}k\textcircled{\textkupa}cw}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{compl-finish det 1poss-nom-look all those obl book}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{I've stopped looking at all books."}}
\]
\[(70) \text{\textit{m-w7 re n-s-pip\textcircled{\textkupa}qw ri7 xwexw\textcircled{\textkupa}y\textcircled{\textkupa}t te specw\textcircled{\textkupa}l\textcircled{\textkupa}k\textcircled{\textkupa}cw}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{compl-finish det 1poss-nom-look those all obl book}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{I've stopped looking at all books."}}
\]
\[(71) \text{\textit{xwent xwexw\textcircled{\textkupa}y\textcircled{\textkupa}t yery\textcircled{\textkupa}t re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{all those obi book}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{All those horse's are fast."}}
\]
\[(72) \text{\textit{xwent yerey xwexw\textcircled{\textkupa}y\textcircled{\textkupa}t re nts'e7sq\textcircled{\textkupa}xe7}}\]
\[
\text{\textit{fast those all obi horse}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{All those horse's are fast."}}
\]

These constructions should be possible if the oblique is counted as evidence that there is a DP adjunct. Under this analysis, the strong quantifier and the demonstrative are in a projection with an empty pronoun. This predicts structures (73) and (74), for (71) and (72) respectively.

\[(73)\]
The structures in (73-74) correctly predict the order of the demonstrative and the quantifier. Future research will hopefully help to determine whether the right-adjuncts are base generated or result from movement. The analysis also predicts that demonstratives in structures such as (74) ought to be able to scramble and this is the case.

(75) ḡup-st-és yeʔéne te sukwinh
    break-caus-3subj this obi knife
    'He broke this knife.'

(76) yeʔéne ḡup-st-és te sukwinh
    this break-caus-3subj obi knife
    'He broke this knife.'

5 Conclusion

In this paper I have provided an analysis of the structure of determiner phrases in Secwepemctsin. The interaction of determiners, quantifiers, demonstratives and possessives provide evidence for the structure represented in (77):

(77)
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