



Our challenge is to find a semantics for St'át'imcets pronouns which shares with determiners the absence of a familiarity effect, while blocking donkey interpretations only for full DPs. My solution relies on a controversial but independently-supported proposal, namely that presuppositions in St'át'imcets do not place the same constraints on the common ground as English presuppositions do (Matthewson 2006). What this means, roughly speaking, is that presuppositions exist in St'át'imcets and are detectable, but place constraints only on the speaker's knowledge, not on the hearer's (cf. Gauker 1998). If we assume this, we can adopt Elbourne's denotation for English *it/the*, given in (6), directly for St'át'imcets pronouns.

$$(6) \quad [[it/the/pro]]^g = \lambda f \langle \langle s, e \rangle, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle . \lambda s : \exists ! x f(\lambda s'.x)(s) = 1 . \iota x f((\lambda s'.x)(s) = 1$$

This denotation, combined with the above assumption about what it means to 'presuppose' something in St'át'imcets, correctly accounts for the donkey interpretations, as well as for the fact that St'át'imcets pronouns, while possessing a uniqueness 'presupposition', can be used in novel contexts. The cross-linguistic variation in familiarity effects for pronouns/determiners is thus derived from a broader lack of familiarity effects in the entire St'át'imc language.

As for the distinction between (4) and (5), I analyze this as deriving from the deictic presuppositions of the overt determiners, which are absent from the pronouns. We need only minimally alter (6) for overt determiners, so that these do not allow binding of their situation argument, but instead are forced to pick out a unique individual in the salient discourse situation.

This approach has a further interesting consequence, namely that it solves a problem for my previous analysis of St'át'imcets determiners (Matthewson 1999). As pointed out by Davis (2004), St'át'imcets allows sloppy readings in VP-ellipsis, which poses a problem for a widest-scope choice-function analysis. The situation semantics analysis correctly predicts that narrow scope/binding is licit *only* in cases of ellipsis. When a determiner is elided, its deictic features are lost – a claim for which I provide independent evidence – and the denotation of the determiner reduces to that of (6), which correctly predicts sloppy identity.

Davis, Henry 2004. VP ellipsis in St'át'imcets and some of its implications. *Papers for the 39th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, UBCWPL.

Davis, Henry 2006. The status of Condition C in St'át'imcets. *MIT Working Papers in Endangered Languages: Studies in Salishan*, ed. Shannon Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest and Daniel Siddiqi.

Elbourne, Paul 2005. *Situations and Individuals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gauker, Christopher. 1998. What is a context of utterance? *Philosophical Studies* 91:149-172.

Matthewson, Lisa 1998. *Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from Salish*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Matthewson, Lisa 1999. On the interpretation of wide-scope indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 7:79-134.

Matthewson, Lisa 2006. Presuppositions and Cross-Linguistic Variation. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society* 36. Amherst, MA: GLSA.