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1. Core Claim
In this paper, we propose that distinctions between the lexical categories N, V and A, and their syntactic projections NP, VP and AP, are universal properties of language. Thus, we claim that there are no category-neutral languages (contra Bach 1992, Déchaine 1994, Jelinek 1993, 1995 and Jelinek and Demers 1994).

Salish languages have been claimed to provide striking evidence for the lack of lexical distinctions, and have been analyzed as category neutral - that is, as languages with a single lexical category (Kinkade 1983, Jelinek 1993, 1995, Jelinek and Demers 1994). We take one Salish language, St'at'imcets,\(^2\) and show that it is not category neutral. On the contrary, there must be a three-way distinction in the syntax between NPs, APs and VPs.\(^3\)

The evidence for these distinctions is subtle, implying that it reflects a fundamental property of Universal Grammar.

Our argument proceeds as follows. We first present Jelinek's category-neutral analysis of Salish languages, according to which every lexical item projects a clausal structure (IP). This analysis denies the existence of bare (uninflected) predicates - that is, of NF, AP or VP - in Salish. We then argue for the existence of restrictive noun modification in Salish. Restrictive noun modification entails the existence of bare (uninflected) predicates; since e.g. the head of a relative clause cannot be analysed as a clause. Finally, we show that within a class of bare one-place predicates which are semantically very close - namely, those which denote permanent properties - we must distinguish between NP and AP in the syntax. We argue that the existence of this distinction between NP and AP is surprising, not only in languages like the Salish languages which do not distinguish between categories at the inflectional level (see section 3) but also in languages like English. We claim that it reflects a deep property of the syntax of Universal Grammar.

2. St'at'imcets (Lillooet Salish)
In this section, we briefly summarize certain aspects of the syntax of St'at'imcets that will be relevant to the argumentation. St'at'imcets sentences are predicate initial, as shown in (1).\(^4\)

(1) [qwatsats-0] [ti smulhats-0-a ]
leave-3ABS DET woman-3ABS-DET
'The woman left'

St'at'imcets is a so-called head-marking language: overt subject and object arguments are optional, as shown in (2), and marked by obligatory pronominal affixes on the predicate, as shown in (3).\(^5\)

(2) [qwatsats-0] [nu]
leave-3ABS COMPL
'She left'

Finally, St'at'imcets is morphologically split-ergative: third person arguments induce ergative-absolutive marking on the predicate, as in (3a-a'), whereas first and second person arguments are inflected on a nominative-accusative pattern, as in (3b-b').

(3a) [anal-kacw] (a') [tup-un'-ts-kacw]
'You cried'
'He hit him'

(3b) [anal-kacw] (b') [tup-un'-ts-kacw]
'You cried'
'You hit me'

3. Evidence for Category Neutrality in Salish
Inflectional morphology provides the strongest evidence for the category neutral analysis of Salish languages. In particular, any open-class item can be inflected (take person markers) to form a finite clause (cf. Kinkade 1983, Jelinek 1993, and many others). This is shown in (4): the predicates qwatsats 'leave', smulhats 'woman' and xum 'big' can all take second singular subject marking or null absolutive marking.

(4a) [qwatsats-kacw] leave-2SG.SUBJ
'You left'/You leave'

(4b) [smulhats-kacw] woman-2SG.SUBJ
'You are a woman'

(4c) [xum-ibkacw] big-2SG.SUBJ
'You are big'

In (5), we see that a proper name can appear in predicate position and take subject person marking:

(5) [Rose-ibkacw] ha?
'She, Rose-2SG.SUBJ YES-NO
Are you Rose?'

\(^{1}\) This paper was presented at NELS 25 in Philadelphia, and is due to appear in the proceedings of that conference (Demirdache and Matthewson 1994). We present it here in order to receive feedback from Salishanists, and to facilitate comparison with other Salish languages.

Thanks to St'at'imcets consultants Alice Adolph, Beverley Frank, Gertrude Ned, Laura Thervare and Rose Whitley. Thanks also to Henry Davis, Paul Kroeber, M. Dale Kinkade, Rose-Marie Déchaine, Jan van Eijk and members of the Salish Syntax Working Group for discussion. Research on St'at'imcets was supported in part by SSHRC grant #8410-92-1629.

\(^{2}\) St'at'imcets (Lillooet Salish) is a Northern Interior Salish language spoken in southwest mainland B.C., with two dialects (Mount Currie and Upper).

\(^{3}\) We do not discuss FPs; the existence of prepositions in Salish is non-controversial (see Jelinek 1993).

\(^{4}\) Examples are presented in Van Eijk's (1981) orthography. Abbreviations used: 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person, abs = absolutive, compl = completed, conj = conjunctive morphology, dem = demonstrative, det = determiner, erg = ergative, erg.ext = ergative extraction, ec = empty category, nom = nominalizer, pos = possible, sg = singular, subj = subject, tr = transitive.

Functional categories do not select for particular lexical categories in Salish; for example, all open class items can take morphological marking for aspect or modality in St'a:mí'tc'm. This is shown in (6), where the complete and possible particles enclitize to the main predicate of the sentence (there is no copula):

(6a) [qwatsats-Ø tu7] [kw̓-s Gertie] leave-3ABS COMPL DET-NOM Gertie 'Gertie left'

(b) [qwatsats-Ø keh] [kw̓-s Gertie] leave-3ABS POS DET-NOM Gertie 'Gertie might leave'

(c) [pləmən-Ø tu7] [kw̓-s Bill] policeman-3ABS COMPL DET-NOM Bill 'Bill was a policeman'

(d) [pləmən-Ø keh] [kw̓-s Bill] policeman-3ABS POS DET-NOM Bill 'Bill might be a policeman'

(e) [xu̓m-Ø tu7] [ti s-g̕w̓p-a] big-3ABS COMPL DET NOM-meet-DET 'The meeting was big'

(f) [xu̓m-Ø keh] [ti s-g̕w̓p-a] big-3ABS POS DET NOM-meet-DET 'The meeting might be big'

Further, in (7), we see that the presence of a determiner turns any inflected predicate into a referring expression. Thus, when we add a determiner to the predicates (7a) [qwatsats-Ø] and (7b) [qwatsats-Ø] we obtain a DP.

(7a) [qwatsats-Ø] [ti smulhatx-Ø-a] leave-3ABS DET woman-3ABS-DET 'The woman left'

(b) [smulhatx-Ø] [ti qwatsats-Ø-a] woman-3ABS DET leave-3ABS-DET 'The one who left is a woman'

(c) [qwatsats-Ø] [ti xu̓m-Ø-a] leave-3ABS DET big-3ABS-DET 'The big one left'

We have so far seen no distinctions in behaviour between any open-class lexical items. Any item can appear in predicate position - that is, sentence initially - and be inflected with person markers and potential-level particles. Furthermore, any lexical item can be closed off by a determiner to become a referring expression. This lack of distinctions between lexical categories at the level of inflectional morphology has been the basis for a well-known analysis of Salish, namely that there is a single categorial distinction in these languages - that between functional and lexical categories. However, within lexical categories, there are supposedly no distinctions (i.e., there is no VP, NP or AP).

4. The Category Neutral Analysis: Every Lexical Item is a Clause

Our first goal will be to demonstrate the existence of bare (uninflected) predicates in Salish. Therefore, it is crucial to understand why the category neutral analysis entails that there are no bare predicates. Jelinek's (1993) major claim for (Sta:m) Salish is given in (8):

(8) "There are no lexical items that on syntactic grounds are exclusively either nouns or verbs. There is no subclass of predicate that alone is associated with the maximal projections VP and NP."

To understand the claims underlying the single category analysis of Salish, consider the DPs in (9a-b). These referring expressions must be relative clauses (that, noun phrases containing a restrictive subordinate clause) for two reasons; First, these DPs contain a clause which is inflected with person particles in an event. Second, the predicate in (9b) has overt subject (ergative) inflection; therefore, there must be a clause inside this DP. The same analysis is extended to (9a), although inflection is null in an intransitive clause:

(9a) ti qwatsats-Ø-a b) ti tup-un-Ø-as-a DET leave-3ABS-DET DET hit-TR-3ABS-JERG-DET 'The one who left' 'The one he hit'

[DP the [IP pro leave ]] [DP the [IP pro hit pro ]] Let us now turn to the DPs in (10a-b). Note that here we cannot tell whether D selects a bare predicate (NP) as illustrated by the structure in (10a), or whether D selects a clause (IP) as in (10b); the same phonological string has two possible analyses. The syntax of the noun phrase ti smulhatx is ambiguous for three reasons. First, there is no copula in the language; hence, there is no visible distinction between 'a woman' and 'is a woman'. Second, Salish allows null arguments; hence, the null subject analysis in (10b) is available. Finally, the null subject of an intransitive clause induces absolutive marking on the predicate, and third absolutive is phonologically null. Consequently, a DP containing a clause with an intransitive predicate inflected for subject agreement is phonologically identical to a DP containing a bare predicate.

(10a) ti smulhatx-a b) ti smulhatx-Ø-a DET woman-DET DET woman-3ABS-DET 'The woman' 'The one who is a woman'

[DP the [IP pro woman ]] [DP the [IP pro is a woman ]] For proponents of the single category hypothesis, however, all the DPs in (9) and (10) must have an identical structure. In particular, the DP 'the woman' must have the same syntax as the DP in (9b) 'the one whom he hit'. Therefore, 'the woman' must be analysed as a covert relative clause (as 'the one who is a woman' (10b)), on a par with (9a-b). Thus, under the category neutral analysis of Salish, every DP consists of a determiner and a clause - with phonologically null pronominal arguments when the predicate is intransitive (Kinkade 1983).

6 In the literature, these categories are DET and I (the later split into AGR and T). We do not address here the exact nature of the functional category represented by the COMPL and POS particles in (6), the point being only that lexical categories are not distinguished.

7 Note that there is evidence for categorial distinctions in the domain of derivational morphology (for example see Davis and Mathewson 1995, Davis, Demirdache and Mathewson in prep., Kinkade 1964, Matina 1994 and van Eijk and Hess 1986).
Jelinek 1987, 1993, 1995b, 9). Hence, Jelinek assumes that every lexical item always projects the same syntactic category (IP), and that it is the presence of a determiner that turns a clause into a referential expression.

In conclusion, the category neutral analysis of Salish recognizes only two categories: IP and DP. The main claims of this analysis which we will dispose are summarized in (11):

(11a) Bach (1992), on Jelinek: "...there are simply no predicates ... What appear to be predicates are in fact logically full sentences or formulas, which contain pronominal arguments (perhaps phonologically null).

Such languages do not have full NP (term phrase) arguments at all." (b) Under the single-category hypothesis, there are no bare predicates. Every predicate is inflected, analysed as a clause.

Apparent support for this analysis is provided by the syntax of relative clauses. Relative clauses in Salish often appear to be of theware in the relative type (Hale 1976). For example, consider the relative clause in (12).

Determiners are homophonous with complementizers in St'timcets, so it is not clear whether we have one instance of D followed by an instance of C (and hence a single DP containing a subordinate clause, as in (12)), or whether we have two Ds (and therefore two distinct DPs, as in (12c)).

(12) [ats'x-en-0-lhkan] [ti sqaycw-0-a] [ti qwasuts-0-a] saw-TR-3ABS-1sg subj DET man-3ABS-DET DET leave-3ABS-DET

(i) 'I saw him, [the man who left]' or 'I saw [the man who left]

(ii) 'I saw him, [the one who is a man], [the one who left']

In summary, there are two factors that conspire to create an ambiguity in the structure of relative clauses: 1) a restriction of the 'adjoined' relative type. Under the analysis in (i), we have two distinct referential categories (two DPs) as in (12c).

As is well known, the head of a relative clause is never the predicate. Under the analysis in (i) of (12), we have a single DP with a non-referential head (NP). Under the analysis in (ii), we have two distinct referential categories (two DPs) as in (12c).

Thus, (12i) cannot involve restrictive noun modification. For the proponents of the single-category hypothesis, the absence of restrictive noun-modification follows from the absence of predicates (NPs) in Salish.

We will now demonstrate that there are bare (uninflected) predicates in the syntax in St'timcets. This entails that (10a) is a possible analysis of 'the woman'. We will then show that there are two distinct categories of bare predicates in St'timcets: NPs and APs.

5. Restrictive Noun Modification
5.1. Relative Clauses: Evidence for NP

Compare the relative clauses (henceforth, RCs) in (13) to the 'adjoined' RC which was illustrated in (12). In particular, note that in (12) we have two (discontinuous) determiners, whereas in (13) we have a single (discontinuous) determiner:

(13a) [ats'x-en-0-lhkan] [ti qwasuts-0-a] sqaycw

see-TR-3ABS-1sg subj DET leave-3ABS-DET man

'I saw the man who left'

(13b) [ats'x-en-0-lhkan] [ti xdzim-0-a] sqaziza

see-TR-3ABS-1sg subj DET big-3ABS-DET bird

'I saw the bird who is big'

(13c) [ats'x-en-0-lhkan]

[ti wa7 alkt-Ø]

sk'uk't'mi7i

see-TR-3ABS-1sg subj DET prob work-3ABS-DET child

'I saw the child who was working'

(13d) [ats'x-en-0-lhkan] [ti sup-0-Ø-tali-ka]

sqaycw

see-TR-3ABS-1sg subj DET hit-TR-3ABS-ERG EXT DET man-DET

'I saw the man who hit him' * I saw the one who hit the man'

We first establish that the bracketed constituents in argument position in (13) do indeed have the syntax of RCs. The presence of an intransitive element - namely, the progressive auxiliary wa7 - in (13c) entails that the first element of the bracketed constituent (e.g. qwasuts, tiux or wa7 alkt) has a clausal structure. Note also in (13d) the presence of -tali on the predicate. This morpheme always signals that extraction of an argument, specifically the ergative (subject) argument, has taken place, as shown in (14):

(14) swat ku sup-0-Ø-talii who hit-TR-3ABS-ERG EXT DET man-DET

'Who hit the man?' * 'Who did the man hit?'

The presence of -tali in (14) indicates that the ergative argument has been extracted. The question in (14) cannot be construed as involving extraction of the internal (absolute) argument. Returning to (13d), the occurrence of -tali here entails that extraction of the ergative argument has taken place. Notice that the lexical item sqaycw 'man' in (13d) must be construed as the ergative argument - that is, it must be coreferential with the argument that has been extracted. A partial structure for the relative clause in (13d) is provided in (15):

(15) [CP DEP ] [IP [vp sup-0-Ø-tali-ka vp] ti [IP] CP sqaycw DEP DET hit-TR-3ABS-ERG EXT DET man 'the man who hit him'

Now, suppose we close off the final lexical item of the RC in (13d) with a determiner, as shown in (16). Note, crucially, that sqaycw 'man' can no longer be interpreted as the ergative (extracted) argument. It must be construed as the absolute (internal) argument - in other words, it cannot be interpreted as the head of the RC.

The semantic head of the relative is the null ergative argument (marked by -tali on the predicate).
The contrast between (16) and (13d) determines whether an overt nominal is construed as the head of an RC. In particular, when the determiner is present, *sqaycw* 'man' must be interpreted as the internal (absolutive) argument of the predicate *tupun* 'hit', as shown in (16). When the determiner is absent, *sqaycw* 'man' must be interpreted as the head of the RC (i.e. as coreferential with the extracted ergative argument), as shown in (13d)\(^\text{13}\).

Thus, the DPs in (13) have the syntax of head-final RCs: the first item is a clause (as shown by the presence of an inflectional element in (13c)), in which extraction has taken place (as shown by the presence of *sqaycw* in (13d)); and the final element must be construed as the head of the RC (as shown by the contrast between (13d) and (16)).

### 5.1.1. Bare Predicates

We now show that the head of the RCs in (13) must be a bare predicate: it cannot be inflected with overt subject (ergative) person-marking, as shown in (17a). Furthermore, only predicates with the semantics of nouns can appear in this position, as the ungrammaticality of (17d) demonstrates.\(^{14}\)

\[\text{[t\_sqaycw-0-a \_tupun-0-\_as\_as\_as]}\]

\[\text{saw-TR-3ABS-1SG.SUBJ DET man-DET hit-TR-3ABS-3ERG}\]

\[\text{'I saw the hitting one who is a man' or 'I saw the hit one who is a man'}\]

\[\text{\textbf{We thus conclude that the DPs in (13) are head-final restrictive RCs, for the reasons summarized in (18):}}\]

\[\text{(18a)}\]

\[\text{\textbf{The last element must be construed as the head (as shown by the contrast in (13d) vs.(16))}}\]

\[\text{(b)}\]

\[\text{\textbf{The head is a bare predicate with the semantics of a noun phrase (as shown in (17d))}}\]

\[\text{(c)}\]

\[\text{\textbf{The head of a restrictive RC must be an indefinite}}\]

\[\text{13 Note that once we add a determiner to *sqaycw* 'man' as in (16), the result is an RC with a null head (i.e. 'I saw the one who hit the man'), and not an 'adjoined' RC (i.e. 'I saw the one who hit him, the one who is a man'). This is the case because in an 'adjoined' RC, only the first nominal can be construed as the semantic head. Note that the adjacent analysis of these RCs (see the discussion of (12) in section 4) fails to account for this ordering restriction.}\]

\[\text{14 Constructions similar to (17b) are possible in certain circumstances; see Matthewson and Davis (this volume) for discussion. All the other types shown in (17) are consistently ruled out.}\]
The ungrammaticality of (20b) shows that although projections of any lexical item in St’at’imcets can serve as predicates (see section 3), it is not the case that projections of any lexical item can serve as arguments (without a determiner). We thus conclude that the ability to serve an argument is not exclusively a property of the determiner; it must be an intrinsic property of certain lexical items, which are called nouns.

To derive the ungrammaticality of (20b) vs. (20a), we follow Williams (1981) in assuming that Ns inherently differ from all other lexical categories. For concreteness, we adopt Williams’ proposal that N has a non-thermatic <R>-role which allows its projection to serve as an argument (that is, to be assigned a theta-role). Projections of other lexical categories can serve as arguments only when they are closed off by a determiner. These conclusions are summarized in (21):

(21a) The ability to serve as an argument is not exclusively a property of D.
(b) N differs from all other categories: it has an internal non-thermatic <R>-role which allows its projection - NP - to serve as an argument (i.e. to be assigned a theta-role, as in Williams 1981).

The claim in (21) is that the category NP has the intrinsic ability to serve as an argument. The claim is not that the category NP has the intrinsic ability to be used referentially - without a determiner 17. These two notions (argumenthood and referentiality) are not coextensive. Thus in (22), the NP an apple is the internal argument of the verb ate. However, an NP under the scope of negation is not referential; in (22), there is no specific apple that Max never ate.

(22) Max never ate an apple in his life.

5.1.2. The Article-S Analysis of Head-Final Relatives

We propose that head-final relatives in St’at’imcets have the structure given in (23a), which recasts Smith’s (1964) Article-S analysis in DP terms (cf. Larson 1987). Under the Article-S analysis, the relative clause and the head are both arguments of D.

(23) The Article-S analysis (see Smith 1964, Larson 1987):

(a) RC with overt head:
   [til qwatsats-a [sqaycw] leave-3ABS-DET man]
   ‘the man that left’
(b) RC with a null head:
   [ti leave-3ABS-DET ‘the one that left’
(c) *RC: Np
   [ti qwatsats-a [xuzun]
Current

More traditional structures are compatible with our analysis; we have selected this structure for two basic reasons. First, the core idea of the Article-S analysis is that the relative clause is selected by D, since it is a complement of the determiner. Hence, a relative clause is not licensed if there is no D; there can be no complement without a head to select it. As we shall see in the next section, this assumption explains why RCs cannot serve as predicate nominals in St’at’imcets. Second, this analysis explains the typological properties of these head-final relatives; namely, D forms a syntactic constituent with the restricting clause and not with the semantic head 18, as illustrated in (24a). In contrast, under the standard NP-S analysis of relatives, D forms a syntactic constituent with the head noun and not with the restricting clause, as illustrated in (24b):

(24a) The Article-S analysis:
   [DP [D (RC) [ NP ]]
(24b) The NP-S analysis:
   [NP [NP D (NP) [ RC ]]

In (23b) above, we show how our analysis extends to null-headed relatives, assuming that the head can be non-overt. (23c) is an ill formed relative clause: the RC cannot be predicative of the head. In particular, the head does not have the intrinsic ability to serve as an argument: an NP does not have an external <R>-role which allows it to serve as the subject of a predication (to be assigned a theta-role).

5.2. Complex Predicate Nominals: Evidence for NP and AP

We will now show there are two distinct categories of uninflected one-place predicates in St’at’imcets: NPs and APs. Consider the sentences in (25). Note that the main predicate is complex: it consists of two predicates (without determiners):

(25a) [kwikws sprdzutz] [i sq'w-a] small bird PL.DET fly-DET [the ones who flew]DP
   ‘The ones who flew were small birds’
(b) [at'was smulhats] [i kwatsats-a] two woman PL.DET leave-DET [two woman]PRED [the ones who left]DP
   ‘The ones who left were two women’

We argue that these complex predicates are predicate nominals (NPs), for the following reasons. First, the final item in these complex predicates must be an NP, as the ungrammaticality of (26) shows:

(26a) * [an'was kwatsats-a] two leave PL.DET woman-DET [two leave]PRED [the ones who were women]DP
   ‘The women were two who left’
(b) * [at'was kwikws] two small PL.DET woman-DET [two small]PRED [the ones who were women]DP
   ‘The women are two who are small’
(c) [kwikws sqatztsw] small red PL.DET see-TR-3ABS-1SG.CONJ-DET [small red]PRED [the ones I saw]DP
   ‘The ones I saw were small red ones’

The fact that the rightmost predicate in (25-26) must be of the category NP suggests that these complex predicates could be analyzed as RCs used predicatively. This analysis, however, is untenable. In particular, the first item cannot have a clausal structure, as shown in (27). In (27a), we see that the first item cannot be analyzed as a (restrictive) clause because it cannot take overt subject (ergative) inflection. Further the impossibility of -still in

17 For instance, in St’at’imcets, referential expressions are DPs (i.e. are always closed off by a determiner).
18 Recall that the discontinuous determiner encliticizes to the first lexical item in an RC.
(27b) shows that extraction has not taken place (cf. (14) above). Thus, we conclude that the first lexical item in a complex predicate must be a bare (uninflected) predicate.

(27a) * [un-INF-of-as] squyw [ti att’s-en-Ø-fn-sa]
hit-TR-3ABS-3ERG man DET see-TR-3ABS-1SG.CONJ-DET
[IP hit-pro-ti [man]pRED] [the one I saw] hp
'The one I saw was a man who hit him' or 'The one I saw was a man he hit'

(28) Max is a man who likes asparagus.

In (28) is not analysed as a determiner but as a cardinal adjective (see for instance Higginbotham 1985).

Max is nonetheless robust. In particular, complex predicates are very productive. Furthermore, Larson’s (1987) analysis of null operator structures in terms of ‘indirect q-role’ requires predication between the head and the modifier - to be the modifier a bare predicate (AP), or an open sentence (a restrictive subordinate clause). Thus, in both an ugly man and a man that is ugly ‘(ugly x)’ must be predicated of a ‘man’. This is illustrated in (32). (32b) is ill-formed because the AP ‘small’ cannot be predicated of the head ‘thin’. Conversely, (32a) is well-formed because the head ‘bird’ can serve as the subject of a predication.

To explain this restriction, we make the following proposal. Restrictive noun modification always requires predication between the head and the modifier - to be the modifier a bare predicate (AP), or an open sentence (a restrictive subordinate clause). Thus, in both an ugly man and a man that is ugly ‘(ugly x)’ must be predicated of a ‘man’. This is illustrated in (32). (32b) is ill-formed because the AP ‘small’ cannot be predicated of the head ‘thin’. Conversely, (32a) is well-formed because the head ‘bird’ can serve as the subject of a predication.

6. Conclusions

The single category hypothesis is based on the undisputed fact that any lexical item in St’at’imcets can be a predicate. The data from inflectional morphology overwhelmingly point to a lack of categorial distinctions. The category neutral hypothesis denies the existence of bare predicates in Salish: any open-class lexical item must project the same syntactic category, namely IP. We have shown, on the contrary, that there are bare uninflected predicates.
that have the ability to serve as arguments - that is, that there are noun phrases - in St'át'imcets. We have further argued for a three-way categorial distinction between NP, AP and VP in St'át'imcets Salish. We summarize our claims in (33).

(33a) Projections of any lexical item can serve as predicates; it is not the case that projections of any lexical item can serve as arguments
(b) The ability to serve as an argument (in the sense of 'to be assigned a theta-role') is universally intrinsic to certain lexical items (N6)
(c) There are no category-neutral languages

The evidence for the distinctions between NP, AP and VP in St'át'imcets is very subtle. In contrast, the evidence for category neutrality (e.g. inflectional morphology) is overt. We have argued, however, that the fact that complex predicates must be NPs (and not APs) or restrictive noun-modification structures cannot serve as arguments in either St'át'imcets or English. We take this distinction to be an arbitrary categorial distinction. We claim that it reflects a deep property of the syntax of Universal Grammar.
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