The Definite Determiner as a Modifier

Urtzi Etxeberria (IKER-CNRS) & Anastasia Giannakidou (U. of Chicago)

Proposal. Since Partee (1987), the definite determiner (D) is assumed to denote in three different denotations, i.e. type *e*, type *et*, type *ett*, and be able to shift from one denotation to another by means of type-shifting operations. In this paper we propose a novel use of the D as an overt contextual domain restrictor for quantifiers in certain languages. This strategy of domain restriction via D—D_{DR}—happens by applying D_{DR} to the nominal argument, but D_{DR} can also apply to the quantificational determiner (Q-det) itself, in which case it forms a constituent with it. In both cases, D_{DR} is a type preserving function, i.e. a modifier, and supplies the contextual C variable. Evidence for our analysis is drawn from Greek and Basque—two genetically unrelated languages; our analysis also covers the behaviour of D in St'át'imcets Salish (SS). We build here on data and earlier insights of Matthewson (2001), Giannakidou (2004), and Etxeberria (2005, 2008, to appear).

Furthermore, our analysis provides support for the program that domain restriction is syntactically realized (von Fintel 1994, Stanley 2002, Stanley and Szabó 2000, Martí 2003, Giannakidou 2004)—as opposed to the purely pragmatic analysis (via e.g. *free enrichment* as in Recanati 2002, 2004, 2007, or a relevance theoretic process)—, but we propose an important refinement: domain restriction can affect the Q-det itself (*pace* Stanley 2002), and in fact quite systematically in certain languages. The Q-det that is affected by D_{DR} is typically a *strong* one, and we explain here why. Crucially, D_{DR} is incompatible with weak Q-dets in both Basque and Greek, as we show here, and we explain this by assuming that weak Q-dets are quantity predicates (Etxeberria 2005), thus not of the appropriate input to D_{DR} when it applies to the Q-det. We examine whether weak Q-dets can be contextually restricted in some other way, as suggested by Martí to appear. We reconsider Martí's data, and argue that what she analyzes as contextual restriction is in fact a *felicity condition* (in the sense of Ionin 2006) due to specificity.

Domain restricting function of D. Two sets of data serve to motivate our analysis. First, in SS, strong Q-dets *every* and *most* require DP rather than NP complements (Matthewson 2001):

(1) tákem [i smelhmúlhats-a]
all D woman(PL)-D

The discontinuous element *i...a* is D, hence the domain of *tákem [i smelhmúlhats-a]* is a DP rather than an NP. Second, in Basque and Greek, a D composes with a strong Q-det, as shown in the (2) and (3), but not with a weak one as shown in (4), to produce a complex Q-det:

(2) **O kathe** fititis efere ena doro. (Greek)
the every student brought.3sg one present

(3) Ikasle **bakoitz-ak** opari bat ekarri zuen. (Basque)
student each-D.sg present one bring aux
'Each student brought one present'

(4a) * **o kapjios** fititis '*the some student' (Greek)

(4b) * ikasle **batzuk-ak** '*the some students' (Basque)

The result is, as we see, a universal Q-det equivalent to *each*, which presupposes a nonempty domain. In Basque, all strong Q-dets appear necessarily with D (Etxeberria 2005); weak Q-dets, on the other hand, are either incompatible with it (as shown in (4a,b)), or if they do appear with D (e.g. in cases like *the many students*, impossible in Basque) they form a constituent with the NP rather than composing with the Q-det, as we argue is the case with the strong Q-dets.

Matthewson 2001 argued that the D in (1) creates a (discourse salient) individual (type *e*) out of the property *woman.* The DP thus denotes an individual, and this in turn implies that the

domain of the Q-det is not a property (type *et*), but an individual. Giannakidou 2004, on the other hand, suggested that what looks like *e*-formation is in fact overt domain restriction of the nominal argument. Building on Westerstähl's (1985) idea that the D introduces a context set (C), we capture this in (5) below: D_{DR}, the domain restricting function of D, preserves the type of the NP argument, and further adds the contextual restriction C:

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

In (5), D_{DR} functions as an intersective modifier, and this, we argue, is what *i…a* in SS (1) does: it contextualizes the NP argument and gives a salient set of women which is the domain of *takem* 'all'. To account for the Basque and Greek data in (2) and (3), we generalize that the D_{DR} can also take the Q-det as its argument, illustrated in (6c):

(6) a. ikasle guzti-ak = (ikasle) [guzti-D_{DR}] 'student all-D.pl' — o kathe fititis = [D_{DR} kathe] (fititis) 'the every student'

b. $[[\text{Q-det}]] = \lambda P\, \lambda Q\, .\, \forall x\, P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)$

c. $[[D_{DR}]] = \lambda Z_{et,ett}\, \lambda P_{et}\, \lambda Q_{et}\, Z\, (P \cap C)\, (Q)$; where Z is the relation denoted by Q-det

d. $[[\text{o kathe/guzti-ak}]] = \lambda P\, \lambda Q.\, \forall x\, (P(x) \cap C(x)) \rightarrow Q(x)$

The result is again intersecting the NP argument of the Q-det with C, but this time the Q-det and D compose together, and an inherently restricting quantifier is created. In languages like Greek and Basque, where D_{DR} applies only to strong quantifiers, the result is that only these will be domain restricted ("presuppositional"). Weak quantifiers and regular indefinites, as a result, will not be inherently restricted in our system, since they are incompatible with D_{DR} (5). In order to understand why weak determiners cannot be contextually restricted through D_{DR} in Basque and Greek, we must recall that, with the exception of SS, D_{DR} cannot apply directly to the NP (e.g. in Basque, Greek, English, and other European languages we are considering). For this use we use the partitive. Hence in these languages, D_{DR} does not apply to a predicate (while it can do in SS), so it can only function as a modifier of the Q-det; as cardinality predicates, however, weak "determiners" are *et* elements (e.g. they can appear in predicative position, as opposed to strong ones), thus not of the appropriate input for D_{DR}, which needs a determiner.

Domain restriction or specificity? In recent work, Martí to appear claims that certain indefinite determiners can also be inherently domain restricted: Spanish plural *algunos* is argued to be domain restricted via *alg-* which is given an analysis like our D_{DR} in (6c). We see two problems with this idea. First, it predicts generality: *alg-* should systematically apply to indefinite and weak Q-dets to contextualize them, just like D_{DR}. But this is not the case --in fact, and this is the second problem, *alg* cannot even contextualize singular *un*. As Etxeberria to appear shows (see also Alonso-Ovalle & Menéndez-Benito 2007), singular *algún,* is free to receive context dependent *and* independent values. If *alg* always contributes C, as Martí suggests, we do not expect this difference and non-systematicity. Instead, it seems more profitable to treat *algunos* lexically as a specificity marker, contributing the following felicity condition (we draw here from Ionin 2006):

(7) [[algunos chicos]] is intended by the speaker in a context c (s_c) to refer to some non-singleton set P_c of individuals in c.

This condition is weaker than the *presupposition* of context dependence, because it is anchored to the speaker only. It explains the "anaphoric" nature of plural *algunos*, as well as the non-systematicity: (7) is tied to the Q-det *algunos* only. This again is consistent with the general idea we pursue here, that the determiner is the place where conditions on the interpretation and anchoring of QPs are stated (*inter alia*, Giannakidou 1998, 2001, Farkas 2002, Ionin 2006).