BACKGROUND ON PASSAMANDODDY

and finally, adverbial and verbal quantifiers (section 5).

There are three main sections in this paper: (1) the introduction, (2) the quantification of quantifiers, and (3) the grammatical structures of quantifiers. The introduction (section 5) provides an overview of the paper's main points, while the quantification of quantifiers (section 6) discusses the different types of quantifiers used in Passamandoddy and their properties. The grammatical structures of quantifiers (section 7) explores how these quantifiers interact with other elements in the language. This paper offers a description of how quantification is expressed in Passamandoddy.

INTRODUCTION

Quantification in Passamandoddy

This book is an introduction to the quantification of quantifiers in the language of Passamandoddy. It covers the different types of quantifiers used in the language and their properties. The book also explores how these quantifiers interact with other elements in the language. This book offers a description of how quantification is expressed in Passamandoddy.
Schramm (1969) discussed (1966) a landmark (1961) paper in Ponsford, but Ponsford and Ponsford's work on the microstructure of protein molecules, and in particular his emphasis on the role of secondary structure, has been influential. The understanding is based on many Chinese and several other environments, which the author is not prepared to discuss.
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3 INVENTORY OF QUANTIFICATIONAL ELEMENTS

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Nouns

Numerals usually precede the head noun. A noun modified by a numeral (without a demonstrative) is frequently used as an indefinite, to introduce new discourse referents:

- A woman said, "W. Newell, 1979, 11.

1.2 Numerals

Numerals plus nouns, or numerals by themselves, are definite when used with demonstratives (7b); they may also be definite without a demonstrative (7b), although such examples are rare:

- The two of them cannot be distinguished, one from another. 
- The two of them cannot be distinguished, one from another. 

1.3 Bare Nouns

Let us begin with bare nouns in Passamaquoddy. Passamaquoddy does not have determiners, so bare nouns are generally ambiguous between definite and indefinite uses (as an example of a definite the means "they" in example (17a)). The following example from a text illustrates a bare noun used as an existential, in the second denying it under negation:

- My mother once saw a white horse outside the house. 
- My mother once saw a white horse outside the house. 
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Qualification in Passamaquoddy

3.4 "Few", "many", "some"

Passamaquoddy has the elements k'unaq, i'ok, and k'unkwe, meaning "many", "few", and a combination of "many" and "a few", respectively. These elements appear in the main predicate, often functioning as numerals, similar to their counterparts in English.

(8) Semi-predicative main clause: k'unaq-pun-lk, because there used to be a lot of moomoomowak (Novell 1970:3).

The example in (8) might be more literally translated as "because many moomoomowak used to be numerous".

(9) a. Wook-pan-wook, because there used to be a lot of moomoomowak (Novell 1970:3).

b. Wook-pan-wook, because there used to be a lot of moomoomowak (Novell 1970:3).

In some syntactic contexts, like the question below, what would be the main predication in English is also forced to be the main predicate in Passamaquoddy. In such cases, the quantifiers must appear in the form appropriate for a relative clause, suggesting that analyzing the quantifier as a verb is correct in some instances.

(10) Koolask' inu-r Pref-3P moomoomowak-loc, because there used to be a lot of moomoomowak (Novell 1970:3).

(11) Wex-i we'l-wook-a-big-3P say-OBJ that-3P k'unaq, because there used to be a lot of moomoomowak (Novell 1970:3).

(12) Wex-i we'l-wook-a-big-3P say-OBJ that-3P k'unaq, because there used to be a lot of moomoomowak (Novell 1970:3).

3.4 Cardinal and proportional readings

The quantifiers "many" and "few" in Passamaquoddy seem to have both cardinal and proportional readings.

1. A moomoomowak is a person often in the form of an animal with a prominent feature. Particles like "n'an" and "noo" frequently appear separately from what would be their object in English. Nevertheless, neither predicate here is a relative clause.

2. Unfortunately, only one of the speakers was able to give judgments on this issue from one informant so far. It will be important to confirm these judgments with other speakers.
3.5 Wh-words as indefinites

Passamaquoddy uses wh-words as indefinites. These are "who," "what," and "why," which are quite distinct from "where." These wh-words are used to interrogatively refer to people, places, things, or events.

(17) a. KesQuoi, yaaq, koon-tum, um, ku. KesQuoi, going-dt, going-backwards, on. ket koon-tum, on. kesQuoi, going-backwards, on. ket koon-tum, on.
   b. While kesQuoi were dragging the deer they heard something. (Mitchell, 1974.5)
   c. Den Quoit rabbit and toad where Uncertain forest-loc.
   d. kesQuoi along-some-loc.to-view.3PGCon

The following example was judged to be true in two different contexts. In the first context, "many" is a proportion of the total; in the second context, "many" is a proportion of the available.

(13) Many-3PGCon...-

(14) "Many"-3PGCon...

However, the informant used the same wh-words in the following context:

(15) Many-3PGCon...

In any case, "many," in Passamaquoddy, is used with a special meaning that is different from its meaning in English. It is used to refer to a large number of things, even when the number is not precisely known.

It is also possible to use the same wh-words in Passamaquoddy, even when the number is not precisely known.

(16) Many-3PGCon...
English: This may be an optional use (see section 6).

They may also occur in the right of the NP they are associated with, much like those in the

one which thinks highly of himself: (W. Nessel 1974: 6).

They're going around asking all the questions if someone saw the water. (np,i.e.)

3. Rounding. Our 3-round-3-dry-3-un-6-3-dry. Our

use, in the middle of the world unknown, (W. Nessel 1976: 17).

We establish which way shipper-leading camera-win.

They can also occur in the left of the NP where the NP forms the restriction on the quantifier:

(2a) a. 4-round-3-shipper-3-dry-3-un-6-3-dry-3-dry.

The English: When someone asks all, they want to know what the

NP, 3-round-3-shipper-3-dry-3-un-6-3-dry-3-dry.

These may occur in the left of the NP where the NP forms the restriction on the quantifier:

(2b) a. 3-round-3-shipper-3-dry-3-un-6-3-dry-3-dry.

The English: When someone asks all, they want to know what the

NP, 3-round-3-shipper-3-dry-3-un-6-3-dry-3-dry.

"Some different people met up for him": (W. Nessel 1974: 6).

The English: When someone asks all, they want to know what the

NP, 3-round-3-shipper-3-dry-3-un-6-3-dry-3-dry.
null
Yatte won. 'Each.' Yatte won, which consists of the remote demonstrative won, the emphatic elicite te, and the animate wh-word won, is strongly distributive. There does not appear to be a term in the Pumani languages that can be used with yatte won in the same way it can be used with yatte won. In some cases, yatte won can appear by itself or with an NP. All the test examples have the same distribution as yatte won.

(29) a. On yatte won en-te-pi-ka-yen-2i
b. Then each one goes toward his own village. (Mitchell 1921/1976a, 18)

(30) a. Patamo-yok yatte won moko-se-wok.
b. 'Each one serves his own bowl.' (Mitchell 1921/1976b, line 55)

Further evidence that the singular-plural distinction does not encode anything like possession comes from pairs like the following, agreement is plural, nevertheless both are psychological predicates and are inherently distributive:

b. 'They are happy.' (Leavit and Francis 1990, 53)

While I do not fully understand the difference between singular and plural, or the contextual constraints on the use of the singular, I think we can conclude that the singular-plural distinction is probably not relevant to the derivation of the plural, since it requires a semantic property, and the next example shows that it is not.

(31) a. Wom-ju-tep-pi-ruh-2i.
b. 'I am the only one.' (Mitchell 1921/1976b, line 64)

Notes

1. In Pumani, the phrase is distributed over the plural morphemes, as if the following question:

2. The agent is not the agent of the entire sentence, but only of the part of the sentence that includes the possessive.

3. The structure of the sentence is not the same as in the example with the possessive: the agent of the sentence is the possessor.

4. The sentence is not the same as in the example with the possessive: the agent of the sentence is the possessor.

5. The sentence is not the same as in the example with the possessive: the agent of the sentence is the possessor.

6. The sentence is not the same as in the example with the possessive: the agent of the sentence is the possessor.

7. The sentence is not the same as in the example with the possessive: the agent of the sentence is the possessor.

8. The sentence is not the same as in the example with the possessive: the agent of the sentence is the possessor.
3.7 Negation and negative quantifiers

As stated above, it is not clear whether yore wot can function as an objective (and/or modifier) in the form yore wot, as is the case with wh-words like who. The expected objective form would be yore wot, and that form does occur occasionally, but what occurs more frequently, is the pronoun form yore wot. The nonpronoun yore wot form is not attested.

(31) *Yore wot* woman, girl

The example above, and others I have collected, make it look like yore wot can distribute over an object (most often, the first object of a ditransitive). However, we can also receive the interpretation on the form from informants. Quite often we are expected, suspect that some work is being done by a subject on which the object of the sentence must also be distributed. We can see this in the following example:

(32) Yore wot [woman, girl] woman, girl

The same holds true for the pronoun yore wot. In the following examples, the subject (yore wot, woman, girl) is the one who is doing the action (see below).

3.8 The element ten

One particularly interesting quantificational element in Pascagoula is ten, an element that generally appears at the right edge of the clause constituent, and is similar to the other quantificational elements as 

as ten. In one example, it is clear that the quantificational element ten is functioning as a quantificational element, not a numeral.

(44) *Ten* woman, girl

The informant commented that each strawberry picker would have their own cup to be picked by each picker, but the pickers are all working together.

---

Note: The examples above show the negative suffix -we as the verb root. In these cases, the negative suffix is attached to the verb root, not to the verb itself. For example, in the sentence "You were not picking strawberries," the verb root is picking, and the negative suffix is attached to the verb root, not to the verb itself. This is in contrast to the other examples, where the negative suffix is attached to the verb root, not to the verb itself. This is a common characteristic of Pascagoula. Agreement in the subject and object is not marked in the subject and object.

---

One of the many examples is the following: This sentence has a subject and a verb, and it appears that the verb root is picking. The negative suffix is attached to the verb root, not to the verb itself. In this case, the verb root is picking, and the negative suffix is attached to the verb root, not to the verb itself. This is in contrast to the other examples, where the negative suffix is attached to the verb root, not to the verb itself. This is a common characteristic of Pascagoula. Agreement in the subject and object is not marked in the subject and object.
Quantification in Passamaquoddy

3.9 Summary

This section has illustrated various kinds of quantifiers that quantify over nominal elements. Some appear to be part of a noun phrase (nouns 'some', 'few', etc.), while others are more like floating 'each' in English ('one of'), or some kind of wh-phrase in CP (one)'. I turn now to the nominal syntax of these quantifiers that are part of a noun phrase.

4. NOMINAL SYNTAX

I turn now to the syntax of those nominal quantifiers within the NP. As discussed in section 3.1, Passamaquoddy does not have determiners, and we assume that pronouns can be used as other reference or quantifiers may occur with demonstratives. With many quantifiers any order seems to be possible, but it appears that the unmarked order is 'nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, ablative'. This order is that found in many non-Indo-European languages and may be a relic of a more basic noun phrase order.

For more on these types of questions in Passamaquoddy, see Brant (2004, 2006).

In another, probably related use, can does not form a question, but something like a free relative or quantifier structure. For instance, 'this is not the case' or 'it is not the case that he wants it'.


c. Tan oc, TAN: Emph, 'those he wants'
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Quantifiers may co-occur with possessors:

(38) a. peite ni toko pilgeis-ho 3PL nukup wala-wala-nik-
    pilgeis-ni-wa
    'all those girls from here'
    b. tokon ni all those girls from here pilgeis-
    ni-toko pilgeis-ni-wa
    'all those girls from here'
    c. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL ni all those girls from here
    nukup wala-wala
    'all those girls from here'

All may co-occur with pronouns:

(39) a. peite ni toko pilgeis-ho 3PL 3PL
    'all those girls from here'
    b. peite ni all those girls from here pilgeis-
    ni-wa
    'all those girls from here'
    c. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL ni all those girls from here
    nukup wala-wala
    'all those girls from here'

The unmarked order also appears to have 'few' or 'many' following the demonstrative (but they can also precede the demonstrative, not shown):

(40) a. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL 3PL peite
    'all those girls from here'
    b. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL 3PL peite
    'all those girls from here'
    c. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL 3PL peite
    'all those girls from here'

Universals may co-occur with numerals:

(41) a. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL 3PL peite
    'all those girls from here'
    b. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL 3PL peite
    'all those girls from here'
    c. pilgeis-ni-wa 3PL 3PL peite
    'all those girls from here'

In summary, all quantifiers appear to be able to combine with any element within the
Demonstrative Numerals (Some/Few/Many/Moderate, Neg) for Universal Numerals (see LeSourd 2004).
5.2 Use as predicate

Discorant constituents are very frequent in Passamaquoddy, but they all conform to a specific pattern. This is for quantifiers or demonstratives to occur provizibly, while the rest of the NP occurs postverbally. Some examples follow:

5.1 Discorant constituents

Discorant constituents are very frequent in Passamaquoddy, but they all conform to a specific pattern. This is for quantifiers or demonstratives to occur provizibly, while the rest of the NP occurs postverbally. Some examples follow:
### 5.3 Scope

I have argued elsewhere (Breuning 2001, chapter 2) that scope interactions among quantifiers in Passamaquoddy reveal much about the clause structure of the language and the proper analysis of the direct-object opposition. Data collected since then, elicited using pictures created for the purpose and illustrated below, have confirmed the generalizations of Breuning (2001). I illustrate these generalizations here using the new data. The facts appear to be quite robust. Before showing the data with more than one quantifier, I illustrate the interaction between quantifiers and negation.

In order to test the interaction between universal quantifiers and negation, I created picture stories like the one illustrated below. Each story the man catches three out of four fish, and then leaves. Both of the sentences in (47a–b) are appropriate descriptions of what happened in this story, indicating that negation may take scope over a universal quantifier as needed. However, Breuning (2007) shows that words that are used as indefinites can only take scope below negation.

| (47) a. | He didn't catch all the fish. Neg over all fish. OVP psite; nonelbamai. (Neg over all)  |
| (47) b. | He didn't catch anything. Neg over all fish. OVP psite; nonelbamai. |
| (48) a. | He doesn't catch all the fish and then he goes home. (all over Neg) |
| (48) b. | He doesn't catch all the fish and then he goes home. |

That is, a universal quantifier as object may take scope above or below negation.
Quantification in Possessiveness

This is not true for object quantifiers. An object may not take scope over a subject. The following sentences are not true when several men each holding a bottle, or where several whales are each biting a fish, respectively:

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One man is biting all the fish.

Instead, these sentences only describe pictures where a single man is holding all the bottles, or where a single whale is biting all the fish, respectively. When the inverse is used, suddenly the object takes scope over the subject.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

Of course, there is a way out of the problem: the object is not the subject, but the subject is the object. The following sentence is true:

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

Similarly, for some information, this sentence can describe a case where all the whales are biting down on the same fish:

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.

a. A man is holding all the bottles.
b. One whale is biting all the fish.
6. ADVERBS AND VERBAL QUANTIFIERS

In summary, adverbial quantifiers intersect with the senses of the directional opposite.

a. A common trick in everyday life (drivetrain)

b. Possession causes it to become more

c. In every sense to some, it is

d. Even when it is brought to a close (cathexis)

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) a. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) b. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) c. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) d. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) e. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) f. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) g. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) h. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) i. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) j. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) k. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) l. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) m. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) n. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) o. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.


The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) q. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) r. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) s. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) t. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) u. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) v. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) w. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) x. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) y. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) z. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) A. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) B. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) C. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) D. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) E. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) F. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) G. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) H. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) I. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) J. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) K. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) L. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) M. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) N. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) O. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) P. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) Q. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) R. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) S. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) T. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) U. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) V. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) W. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) X. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) Y. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) Z. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) A. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) B. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) C. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) D. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) E. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) F. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) G. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) H. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the adverb meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) I. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the nominal meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.

(5) J. A possessive construction determines an agent.

The procedure for checking the prepositional meaning is to insert the adverb meaning into the sentence and then ask whether the sentence is still true.
Each prf/pc (in both languages), this is clearer with a singular subject, where all could not be quantifying over the subject, in this use they typically (but not always) appear right before the verb, and again they may be modified by elements (like almost):

(57) a. Padei 3pl prf wap-sewo.

b. Pashe 3pl prf all white-dress.

c. Patei 3pl prf all white-dress.

d. Pashe 3pl prf almost all white-dress.

(58) a. Espons 3sg prf that brain

b. Espons 3sg prf all

c. Kolesayk 3sg prf all

d. Kolesayk 3sg prf almost all

In this use the universal quantifiers appear to be some kind of adverbial element.

6.2 Passives

Pasaqai oxid has a large inventory of prf elements that attach more or less loosely to the verb stem. Some of them were illustrated in section 3.8, where they were quantified over the verb stem. In these cases, the prf elements are highly bound as a phrasal constituent, often appearing right before the verb (i.e., they are preverbal). In other cases, they can be separated, either by overt material (as in what we call prepositional phrases), or by covert material (as in what we call adverbial phrases). In these cases, prf elements can sometimes appear after the verb (i.e., they are postverbal). The reader should be aware that the prf elements in these cases may not always behave as adverbial elements, and may instead function as complements or adjuncts of the verb.

Note that in such cases, the prf elements may quantify over the verb itself (amount of digging, etc.), the argument

For example, in the sentence "I am going to catch a lot of crickets," the prf element "a lot of" quantifies over the verb "catch a lot of crickets."
These preventives do not mean completely with a plural argument, the only requirement is that every member of the quantified-over argument be affected. Consider the following pair of sentences, for instance, involving a morphologically complex verb meaning knock out of each other. The teeth do not matter, all that matters is that at least one tooth is knocked out of each.

   b. Nakka-kaurhwa-i

(63) a. Nakka-tapan-tham-kar
   b. Nakka-tapan-tham-kar

(64) a. Nakka-mon-kirhwa-i
   b. Nakka-mon-kirhwa-i

(65) a. Nokkai-mi-ki-i al.
   b. Nokkai-mi-ki-i

(66) a. Kalkar-kusaci-tha-wok
   b. Kalkar-kusaci-tha-wok

(67) a. Pesaq skilap nokka-pes-ka
   b. Kusaci-tha-wok

(68) a. Lihaan-tha-wok
   b. Kolakap kalkar-tama-tha-wok

In discussing this sentence with an informant, it turned out that 'Kalkar's role in the sentence is  

to specify that many people, not just one, and leaving him behind.

This interpretation does not arise automatically, however, if the object is plural, the

Regular phonological rule, only the prefix is actually pronounced before the kai. Kalkar when it does not.

However, my informant, do not always test this rule, and have found a few examples that do not.
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