Introduction

Many Salish languages allow a single clause to contain more than one predicative element, as shown in (1c) and (2c).

1. single-predicate clause:
   a. ?ama
      [ta kuk"g1?-k-64t-a]
      good
      [DRT chief-1PL.POSS=EXIS]  
      "Our chief is good."  (Stʼatʼimcets)
   
   single-predicate clause:
   b. ?ama
      [ta kuk"g1?-k-64t-al]
      woman
      [DRT chief-1PL.POSS=EXIS]  
      "Our chief is a woman."  (Stʼatʼimcets)
   
   multi-predicate clause:
   c. ?ama
      [ta kuk"g1?-k-64t-a]
      good
      woman
      [DRT chief-1PL.POSS=EXIS]  
      "Our chief is a good woman."  (Stʼatʼimcets)

2. single-predicate clause:
   a. ?ama
      [?a k61]-[w64t]
      PERP-ge=1SG.SUBJ  
      "I went."  (Lushootseed; Hess 1995:6)
   
   single-predicate clause:
   b. les-baq"-[l64]?
      [?a k61]-[nu6]
      [PROG-BIG=have.on.shoulder=1SG.SUBJ]  
      "Iʼm carrying wood on the shoulder."  (Lushootseed; Bates et al. 1994:38)
   
   multi-predicate clause:
   c. ?61]-[w64t]
      [?a k61]-[w64t]
      go=1SG.SUBJ
      ANTIC-BIG=have.on.shoulder  
      [DRT DET firewood]  
      "Iʼm going (out) to pack wood on the shoulder."  (Lushootseed; Bates et al. 1994:22)

In this paper we begin by arguing that two separate multi-predicate constructions must be distinguished, COMPLEX NOMINAL PREDICATE constructions (as in (1); henceforth CNPs) and AUXILIARY constructions (as in (2)). We then examine CNPs in Stʼatʼimcets (Lillooet) and Secwepemcustin (Shuswap). Building on work done by Demirdache and Matthewson (1995a,b), we show that in both languages, since stage-level modifiers do not allow attributive readings. The attributivity requirement within CNPs in turn derives from a correlation between interactivity and relative clauses; crucially, CNPs are not relative clauses (Demirdache and Matthewson 1995a,b) and therefore may not have interjective readings. The claim that there is a one-to-one relation between structure and interpretation finally leads us to reanalyze certain complex DPs in Stʼatʼimcets, previously analyzed uniformly as headed relative clauses by Matthewson and Davis (1995), as structurally ambiguous.

1. Types of multi-predicate clause in Salish

Kroeber (1991:47-48) discusses multi-predicate clauses under the label of 'serial constructions'. Such constructions are attested both in Coastal and Interior Salish languages, and are defined as follows:

... constructions in which two predicates appear in the same clause, neither being set off in a subordinate clause by an introductory particle or special inflection, and only one set of pronominal markers appearing in the two predicate complex.

[3] a. nes=kn
   [cw-6m]
   go=1SGSUBC do-M
   "Iʼm going to work."  
   (Thompson)

   b. cu al=6a
      [ju?-5x]
      come=2SGSUBC go.home-Tr
      "(You) bring it home."  
      (Comox)

Kroeberʼs serial constructions appear to be equivalent to our auxiliary construction. For example, he observes that aspectual or directional meanings are typical for the first predicate in a serial construction; these are indeed typical for auxiliaries, but impossible in CNPs.2

The existence of a separate CNP construction in Stʼatʼimcets was first brought to light by Demirdache and Matthewson (1995a,b), who refer to such constructions as 'complex predicates'. Examples are given in (4) (see also (1c)).

4. a. leelal=4k6n
   [5axy]
   strong=2SG.SBJ
   man
   "I am a strong man."  
   (Stʼatʼimcets; RW)

   b. k61]-[5x]
      [5p2uza]
      [?1 ?a6k-ang-6n-a]
      small=3ABS
      bird  
      [PL.DET]
      see-DIR-1SG.CONJ=EXIS
      [hp]  
      "The ones I saw were small birds."  
      (Stʼatʼimcets; RW, GN)

Like the sentences in (3), those in (4) each contain two predicative elements, with only one marking for inflection (which in (4b) is null third person absolutive). However, in contrast to (3), the first predicate in (4) does not have aspectual or directional meaning, but rather is an attributive modifier of the second predicate, which must be a noun.

2 Kroeber imposes the additional constraint that in order for a clause to qualify as a serial construction, the first element must be able to function independently as a main predicate. Though this is true of the vast majority of auxiliaries in Salish languages with which we are acquainted, we feel that it is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for auxiliary status. It is not a necessary condition, since in Stʼatʼimcets, for example, there are a few auxiliaries which are marginal or impossible as main predicates (including k61]-[u], "about to", plan "already", and 6k6a "try hard to"), yet otherwise behave in exactly the same way as auxiliaries which regularly surface as main predicates (e.g., motion verbs). It is not a sufficient condition because there are syntactic, semantic and probably lexical constraints on which main predicates may surface as auxiliaries. Thus, auxiliaries may not be transitive (a syntactic condition); they may modify the main predicate by aspect, but not by manner (a semantic condition); and certain pairs of synonymous or near-synonymous predicates (e.g., 6k6a "try hard to", 6a11x idem) differ idiosyncratically as to their status as auxiliary or main predicate (a lexical condition). In short, the set of auxiliaries cannot be defined adequately as a subset of the class of main predicates.
The first goal of this paper is to establish criteria for distinguishing auxiliary constructions such as those in (2c) and (3) from CNPs of the type in (1c) and (4). We begin by reviewing the literature on Straits, which has been argued to possess only one kind of multi-predicate clause (Montler 1993, Jelinek 1995, 1996). We then turn to St'át'imcets, in which auxiliary constructions can be systematically distinguished from CNPs. We will argue that while St'át'imcets possesses both kinds, they cannot be collapsed into a single notion of 'serial predicate' or 'complex predicate'. This claim is supported by Secwepemctsin, which allows only CNPs, but not auxiliaries.

1.1. Straits

Montler (1993:245) describes 'complex predicates' in the Saanich dialect of Straits as follows:

Complex predicates are composed of two or more words juxtaposed to form a construction that functions as a unitary predicate... This construction is identical to what Thompson 1979 has called the auxiliary constructions which occur in several Salishan languages.

First and second person subject clitics always follow the first element in the Straits construction. Examples are given in (5) and (6).

5. a. \( \text{sa} \) \( \text{swa'y} \) qa? [tsa si?éh] 
   big male 
   "The boss is a big man."

b. \( \text{sa} \) =san \( \text{swa'y} \) qa? 
   big=ISUBJ male 
   "I am a big man."

6. a. ?an?e=san \( \text{h} \) w'al 
   come=ISUBJ join.in 
   "I came to join in. I came and joined in."

b. ?an?e=san \( \text{kwa'y} \) qa? 
   go=ISUBJ angle.for.fish 
   "I went and am going fishing."

The sentences in (5) are attributive constructions, with a nominal head. On the other hand, the first elements in (6) have aspectual or directional meaning and look like auxiliaries. Although Montler explicitly notes that there are both attributive and non-attributive cases of complex predicates, he does not classify them as different constructions.

Jelinek (1995, 1996) takes a similar approach to multi-predicate clauses in the Lummi dialect of Straits. According to Jelinek, complex predicates consist of two roots, the first of which must be intransitive. The clitic notes that there are both attributive and non-attributive cases of complex predicates, he does not classify them as different constructions.

Jelinek (1996) observes that there are two types of complex predicate:

Some of the predicates that appear first in complex predicate constructions describe qualities, as in (7a). Other complex predicates look more like "serial verb" constructions, as in (8), which contains a directional predicate (Jelinek 1995:524).

7. a. ?an?e=la?=sx? 
   good=2SG.NOM man 
   "You are a good man."

b. * ?an?e \( \text{swa'y} \) qa?=sx? 
   (Lummi; Jelinek 1995:523)

Like Montler, Jelinek observes that there are two types of complex predicate:

(12) shows that just as in Straits, determiners may apparently be added to the constructions in (10) and (11) to create DPs:

b. * ?an?e \( \text{swa'y} \) qa?=sx? 
   (Lummi; Jelinek 1995:527)

(St'át'imcets; LT)

In summary, Straits apparently possesses a single type of multi-predicate clause, in which two predicative roots co-occur, with clitics appearing after the first element, and with the possibility in all cases of adding a determiner to form a DP.

1.2. St'át'imcets

St'át'imcets sentences of the type in (5,7) are illustrated in (10).

10. a. \( \text{ta'ila}=\text{ka} \) \( \text{kan} \) \( \text{gqax'=w} \) 
   strong=2SG.SUBJ man 
   "I am a strong man."

b. * \( \text{ta'ila} \) \( \text{gqax'=kan} \) 
   (St'át'imcets; RW, GN)

St'át'imcets sentences of the type in (6,8) are given in (11).

11. a. \( \text{pa'ot=ka} \) \( \text{kan} \) 
   always=2SG.SBJ see-DIR-1PL.OBJ 
   "You always come to see us."

b. * \( \text{ka} \) \( \text{kan} \) 
   (St'át'imcets; RW, GN)

(St'át'imcets; LT)

(St'át'imcets; LT)
c. ḏʷačt [ʔi] pǎt=a pʃx-ah
leave [PL.DET always=EXIS hunt-MID]
"The ones that always hunt are leaving."
(St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

In the following sub-sections we will argue that, unlike in Straits, two distinct complex predicate constructions must be distinguished in St’át’imcets: auxiliary constructions and complex nominal predicates (CNPs).

1.2.1. Auxiliary constructions

Auxiliary constructions have the following properties:

1. The main predicate is preceded by one or more strictly ordered auxiliary predicates.
2. The requirement that auxiliary predicates be intransitive is illustrated in (16) (cf. (11c)), and the requirement that they encode aspect or motion is illustrated in (17).
3. The final element must be a noun.
4. All non-final elements must be individual-level predicates.3

Examples of two co-occurring auxiliaries are given in (14), and evidence of ordering restrictions between auxiliaries is given in (15).

14. a. píán+kán wà? a’lkt t
already=1SG.SBJU PROG work
"I am already working."
(St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

15. a. * wâ?+kán wà? a’lkt
already=1SG.SBJU PROG-MID
"I am working already." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * wâ?+kán pąt pʃx-ah
PROG=1SG.SBJU always=hunt-MID
"I went hunting many times." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

The requirement that auxiliary predicates be intransitive is illustrated in (16) (cf. (11c)), and the requirement that they encode aspect or motion is illustrated in (17).

16. a. f làq-š ʔa gå-ʔa-túmù [ta tʃkxəʔ-š=á]
arvive-CAUS-JERG see-DIR-1SG.OBJ [DET mother=3SG.POSS=EXIS]
"The ones I saw were small birds." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * f làq-š ʔa gå-ʔa-túmù [PL.DET see-DIR-1SG.OBJ=EXIS]
"The ones who left were two women." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

17. a. naʃ ðeʔ-ā1c [kʷa=š Ken]
go dance-AUT [DET=EXIS Ken]
"Ken is going dancing." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * ðeʔ-ā1c [kʷa=š Ken]
sing-MID dance-AUT [DET=EXIS Ken]
"Ken sang and danced." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

The lack of categorial or syntactic restrictions on the main predicate is shown in (18-19). The main predicate may be verbal, as in (18), or nominal, as in (19). It may be intransitive, as in (18a,b, 19), or transitive, as in (18c).

18. a. wà? am tʃmnam [ʔi] stʃmāt=al
PROG make.animal.noise [PL.DET cow=EXIS]
"The cows are moving." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. naʃ pʃx-ah [k John]
go hunt-MID [DET John]
"John is going hunting." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

c. ʔa gå-ʔa [+m] see-DIR-1SG.OBJ-3ERG
"The man went to see me." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

19. a. wà?+kán wà? see-DIR=1SG-OBJ-3ERG
"Are you still a priest?" (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * ʔa gå-ʔa [kʷa=š [k Bill]]
go see-DIR-1SG-OBJ=EXIS
"Bill is going to be a policeman." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

1.2.2. Complex Nominal Predicates

In contrast to auxiliary constructions, CNPs have the following properties (see Demirdache and Matthewson 1995a,b):

20. i. The final element must be a noun.

21. a. [kʷa=š [k Bill]]
[blood=PL.OET see-DIR=1SG.OBJ=EXIS]
"The ones who left were two women." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * [ʔa gå-ʔa [k=š [k Bill]]
go see-DIR-1SG-OBJ=EXIS
"Bill is going to be a policeman." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

The final element must be a noun.
3. All non-final elements must be individual-level predicates.

Examples are given in (21).

21. a. [ʔa gå=ʔa [ʔa gå=ʔa=š]
[blood=PL.OET see-DIR=1SG.OBJ=EXIS]
"The ones I saw were small birds." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * [ʔa gå=ʔa [ʔa gå=ʔa=š]
[blood=PL.OET see-DIR=1SG.OBJ=EXIS]
"The ones who left were two women." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

22. a. [ʔa gå=ʔa [ʔa gå=ʔa=š]
[blood=PL.OET see-DIR=1SG.OBJ=EXIS]
"The ones I saw were small red (ones)." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

b. * [ʔa gå=ʔa [ʔa gå=ʔa=š]
[blood=PL.OET see-DIR=1SG.OBJ=EXIS]
"The ones I saw were small red (ones)." (St’át’imcets; RW, GN)

Demirdache and Matthewson argue that complex predicates provide evidence for the category Adjective in St’át’imcets, claiming that non-final elements must be individual-level adjectives. In later sections, we argue that a separate category of adjectives is not required to account for CNPs.
The necessity for the first element to be an individual-level predicate is illustrated in (23) and (24).

23. Auxiliary construction:

a. ?? [tayt maw] [?1 ?a?=??m=?a]
   [hungry cat] [PL.DET feed-DIR-1SG.CONJ=EXIS]
   "The one I fed was a hungry cat." (St'at'imcets; RW, GN)

b. * [s?w?] [sp?za?] [?1 ?a?=??m=?a]
   [fly bird] [PL.DET see-DIR-1SG.CONJ=EXIS]
   "The ones I saw were flying birds." (St'at'imcets; RW, GN)

24. a. (t?ina) ?k'w? ?qaye=y^*
   [strong LINK man] [DET-NOM John]
   "He is a strong man." (St'at'imcets; RW)

b. * [p?sw?] [?k'w? ?qaye=y^*]
   [strong LINK man] [DET-NOM John]
   "He is a frightened man." (St'at'imcets; RW)

b. * [tayt] ?k'w? ?qaye=y^*
   [hungry LINK man] [DET-NOM John]
   "He is a hungry man." (St'at'imcets; RW)

This sub-section has shown that the basic categorial properties of auxiliary constructions and CNPs differ markedly, implying that they form two distinct constructions.

1.2.3. Further differences between auxiliary constructions and CNPs

There are three additional differences between auxiliary constructions and CNPs. The first is that while auxiliary constructions allow second position clitics only after the first element, CNPs allow second position clitics after either the first or the second element. This is shown in (25-26).

25. Auxiliary construction:

a. ?i^n=tu? [p?x-?eh] [k?w=] [DET=NOM John]
   go-DIR-V-OBJ-ERG [DET nom John] *John went hunting." (St'at'imcets; BF)

b. * ?i^n=tu? [p?x-?eh=tu?] [k?w=] [DET=NOM John]
   go-DIR-V-OBJ-ERG [DET nom John] (St'at'imcets; BF)

26. Complex Nominal Predicate:

a. g?um=tu? [m?x=] [na p?x=a]
   big-V-INTR bear [DET poss child=EXIS]
   "The one who went by was a big bear." (St'at'imcets; RW)

b. g?um [m?x=] [na p?x=a]
   (St'at'imcets; RW)

Secondly, auxiliary constructions may not contain the linker k?w in between the auxiliary and the main predicate, while CNPs optionally allow k?w in between the first and the second elements.

27. Auxiliary construction:

na? [k?x^w] [p?x-?eh] [k John]
   go (* LINK) [DET John] *John went hunting." (St'at'imcets; BF)

The observations in (31) compel us to recognize two distinct complex predicate constructions, with differing syntactic and semantic properties. Explanations for some of these differences will emerge in later sections, based on the analysis proposed for the CNP construction.

1.3. Secwepemctsin

Kroeber (1991:137) observes that Secwepemctsin does not possess a serial construction. Instead of auxiliaries, Secwepemctsin makes use of clausal subordination, with the matrix and the subordinate clause being independently inflected. (32a) illustrates an unsuccessful attempt to use the motion verb ne? go' as an auxiliary, and (32b) shows the subordinate nominalized construction employed instead.

28. Complex Nominal Predicate:

{g?um (k?x^w) ?qaye=y^*} [ta nap[t+a]
   [big (LINK man)] [DET poss child=EXIS]
   "The priest is a big man." 

Finally, auxiliary constructions freely allow lexical subjects to follow an auxiliary as well as the main predicate, but CNPs may not contain lexical subjects unless k?w is present.

29. Auxiliary construction:

a. 1an [k?x=] a?z= [ti n-?k?x=m?z=a]
   already arrive see-DIR-1SG.OBJ-ERG [DET 1SG.POSS-child=EXIS]
   "My child already arrived." (St'at'imcets; LT)

b. 1an [ti n-?k?x=m?z=a] a?z= see-DIR-1SG.OBJ-ERG [DET 1SG.POSS-child=EXIS]
   [DET nom Mary] *DET woman
   "Mary is a good woman." (St'at'imcets; LT)

Table (31) summarizes the differences between the two types of multi-predicate clause in St'at'imcets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
<th>Complex nominal predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantics of non-final elements</td>
<td>aspectual/directional</td>
<td>attributive modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage/individual level</td>
<td>individual-level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category of final element</td>
<td>unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second position clitics</td>
<td>only after 1st element</td>
<td>after 1st or 2nd element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linker ku</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical subjects after 1st element</td>
<td>only when ku is present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observations in (31) compel us to recognize two distinct complex predicate constructions, with differing syntactic and semantic properties. Explanations for some of these differences will emerge in later sections, based on the analysis proposed for the CNP construction.
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a. * n?n=saan [p?x-am]
   go(REDUP=1SG.SBJ) hunt-INTR
   "I went hunting." (Secwepemctsin; MJ)

b. n?n=saan [n-?p?x=am]
   go(REDUP=1SG.SBJ) 1SG.POSS-NOM-hunt(REDUP-INTR)
   "I went hunting." (Secwepemctsin; MJ)
expressed by means of a (mono-clausal) auxiliary construction.

33. Examples well as auxiliaries. However, this is not the case:

6 ta also appears in (i), here linking two verbs and illustrating another way in which Secwepemctsfn avoids the CNPs.6

We leave the analysis of structures such and (i) and (ii) for future research.

34. a. [kə̦ tə ʔə̦gʷə̦mə̦] [ʔə̦ Mary] [tall LINK woman] [DET Mary] (Secwepemctsfn; MJ)
   'Mary is a tall woman.'

   b. [ʔə̦sə̦ dbo̦melə̦skə̦] [(ʔə̦ sə̦)5 n-s-w-f-w-k-ə̦m] [two LINK wolf] [(DET) 1SG.POSS-NOM-see(REOUP)-MID]
   'The ones I saw were two wolves.' (Secwepemctsfn; MJ)

   c. [kwə̦ltə̦ tə̦ skə̦lə̦kə̦] [ʔə̦ n-s-w-f-w-k-ə̦m] [green LINK grasshopper] [DET 1SG.POSS-NOM-see(REOUP)-INTR]
   'The ones I saw were green grasshoppers.' (Secwepemctsfn; MJ)

   d. [kẉə̦ltə̦ tə̦ ʔə̦pə̦l] [ʔə̦ n-s-w-f-w-k-ə̦m] [green LINK tree] [(DET) 1SG.POSS-NOM-see(REOUP)-INTR]
   'The one I saw was a green tree.' (Secwepemctsfn; MJ)

   i) CNPs in Secwepemctsfn obligatorily contain the linker ta, which also links adjectives to nouns inside DPs, as shown in (35). The linker ta parallels the St'at'imcets linker k"u which optionally appears inside CNPs.6

35. kwə̦lt [ʔə̦ wɨ̦tə̦ tə̦ ʔə̦pə̦l] [green [DET tall LINK tree]
   'The tall tree is green.' (Secwepemctsfn; MJ)

   As in St'at'imcets, the final element of a Secwepemctsfn CNP must be a noun. This is shown in (36). Moreover, the non-final element(s) must be an individual level predicate, as illustrated in (37).

36. a. [ʔə̦sə̦ dbo̦melə̦skə̦] [(ʔə̦ nə̦xʷ nə̦gʷə̦mə̦] [two LINK intelligent] [(DET) (REDUP)woman]
   'The women are the two who are intelligent.' (Secwepemctsfn; MJ)

   5 In Secwepemctsfn, determiners may often be phonetically absent. Our Secwepemctsfn consultant asserts that the determiner is 'there, but not pronounced' in examples such as (34a).

   6 ta also appears in (i), here linking two verbs and illustrating another way in which Secwepemctsfn avoids the use of auxiliaries.

i. [ʔə̦gʷə̦mə̦] leave [DET bahte-INTR]
   'She went bathing.' (Secwepemctsfn; Kuipers 1974:78)

The construction in (i), although superficially similar to the CNPs in (34), differs from the latter in that in (i) there are no categorial restrictions, and the order of elements may be reversed, something which is not possible with CNPs:

ii. [ʔə̦gʷə̦mə̦] leave [DET bahte-INTR]
   'She went bathing.' (Secwepemctsfn; Kuipers 1974:78)

The following sections turn to a more detailed examination of CNPs.

1.4. Conclusions

In preceding sub-sections we have shown that auxiliary constructions are systematically distinguishable from complex nominal predicates in St'at'imcets and Secwepemctsfn. This implies that when investigating other Salish languages, two distinct questions must be asked: 'Does the languages possess auxiliaries?' and 'Does the language possess CNPs?' Our cross-linguistic survey has just begun; information from already published works and other sources will eventually help to complete the table in (38):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>auxiliaries</th>
<th>complex preds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St'at'imcets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secwepemctsfn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lushootseed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The syntax of complex nominal predicates

Largely on the basis of categorial restrictions, Demirdache and Matthews (1995a,b) argue that in St'at'imcets CNPs are PREDICATE NOMINALS: that is, they consist of one or more individual-level adjectives plus a noun. In the rest of this paper we attempt to refine their analysis, addressing in particular the following issues.

39. i. Are CNPs syntactically zero-level categories, or are they phrases?

ii. Is it possible that CNPs are APs rather than NPs?

iii. Is the category 'adjective' necessary to capture the CNP facts?

iv. What is the nature of the semantic relation between the elements in a CNP?

v. Why is the semantic relation the way it is?

vi. Are CNPs just relative clauses in predicate position?

Several outstanding issues will remain unaddressed, including the status of the 'linker' particles which appear inside CNPs, and the process by which lexical subjects are 'inserted' inside CNPs (see (44-45) below).
2.1. Complex nominal predicates are not compounds

Demirdache and Matthewson do not explicitly argue against the possibility that CNPs are zero-level categories (i.e., compounds, as in (40)).

Demirdache and Matthewson do not explicitly argue against the possibility that CNPs are zero-level categories (Le., compounds, as in (40))

It is relatively straightforward to show that CNPs are not zero-level categories; for completeness we include the argumentation here. We offer both prosodic and syntactic evidence against a compound analysis for CNPs.

In St'lit'imcets, prosodic words have a single primary stress (see van Eijk 1985, Davis 1997).

In St'lit'imcets, prosodic words have a single primary stress (see van Eijk 1985, Davis 1997).

41. a. ?~tm~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?
   "I'll see you again."
   (St'lit'imcets)

41. a. ?~tm~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?  
   "I'll see you again."
   (St'lit'imcets)

41. b. ?~mt~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?
   "Did it (flying object) hit you?"
   (St'lit'imcets)

41. b. ?~mt~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?  
   "Did it (flying object) hit you?"
   (St'lit'imcets)

Compounds, which are rare in the language, also have a single primary stress:

42. a. ?~q~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?
   "stormy"
   (St'lit'imcets)

42. a. ?~q~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?
   "stormy"
   (St'lit'imcets)

42. b. ?~q~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?
   "buried salmon eggs"
   (St'lit'imcets)

42. b. ?~q~l~m~t~sa? lw~t~h~l~m~~t~sa?
   "buried salmon eggs"
   (St'lit'imcets)

CNPs, on the other hand, have more than one primary stress, indicating that they cannot be compounds.

43. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "John is a big chief."
   (St'lit'imcets)

43. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "John is a big chief."
   (St'lit'imcets)

The second piece of evidence that CNPs are not compounds is that they allow intervention of lexical subjects between the elements of the predicate itself, in both St'lit'imcets and Secwepemetsín:

44. a. ?~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "John is a strong man."
   "John is a strong man."
   (St'lit'imcets; RW)

44. a. ?~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "John is a strong man."
   "John is a strong man."
   (St'lit'imcets; RW)

44. b. ?~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "The hunter is an elderly man."
   "The hunter is an elderly man."
   (St'lit'imcets; RW)

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

45. a. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a beautiful woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

45. a. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a beautiful woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

45. b. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a good beautiful one."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

In summary, a compound has only one primary stress, and is syntactically a zero-level category. CNPs have more than one primary stress, and allow lexical subjects to intervene between elements within the predicate complex. For these reasons, CNPs cannot be compounds; they are phrases.

2.2. CNPs are NPs

Given that CNPs are phrasal categories, it is in principle possible that they are either NPs, as in (47a) or (47b), or APs, as in (48).

47. a. (ku) spzdza7 kwikws (ku)
   "Mary is a good woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. b. (ku) spzdza7 kwikws (ku)
   "Mary is a good woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. c. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a beautiful woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. c. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a beautiful woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

In summary, a compound has only one primary stress, and is syntactically a zero-level category. CNPs have more than one primary stress, and allow lexical subjects to intervene between elements within the predicate complex. For these reasons, CNPs cannot be compounds; they are phrases.

2.2. CNPs are NPs

Given that CNPs are phrasal categories, it is in principle possible that they are either NPs, as in (47a) or (47b), or APs, as in (48).

47. a. (ku) spzdza7 kwikws (ku)
   "Mary is a good woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. b. (ku) spzdza7 kwikws (ku)
   "Mary is a good woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. c. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a beautiful woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. c. k~x~z~m~m~t~sa?
   "Mary is a beautiful woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

Evidence that the sentences in (44-45) contain CNPs is provided by the fact that they are subject to the same categorial restrictions as ordinary CNPs. (46a) shows that non-final predicative elements cannot be stage-level, and (46b) shows that the sentence is ungrammatical if the final element is not a noun:

In summary, a compound has only one primary stress, and is syntactically a zero-level category. CNPs have more than one primary stress, and allow lexical subjects to intervene between elements within the predicate complex. For these reasons, CNPs cannot be compounds; they are phrases.

2.2. CNPs are NPs

Given that CNPs are phrasal categories, it is in principle possible that they are either NPs, as in (47a) or (47b), or APs, as in (48).

47. a. (ku) spzdza7 kwikws (ku)
   "Mary is a good woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)

47. b. (ku) spzdza7 kwikws (ku)
   "Mary is a good woman."
   (St'lit'imcets; LT)
2.2.1. Stacked CNPs

'Stacked' CNPs are CNPs which contain more than two roots; however, otherwise they act exactly the same as 'simple' CNPs. In particular, they have the same categorial restrictions. Thus, (49) shows that all non-final elements in stacked CNPs must be individual-level predicates:

49. a. *(\text{intelligent} \ LINK) \text{see-DIR-1SG.CONJ} (\text{the} \ LINK) \text{woman} [\text{DET=NON} \ Mary] \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; RW)}
   "Mary is an intelligent woman that I saw."

b. *(\text{intelligent} \ LINK) \text{go.home} (\text{the} \ LINK) \text{child} [\text{DET=NON} \ Mary] \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; RW)}
   "Mary is an intelligent sleeping child."

(50) shows that in stacked CNPs, just as in ordinary CNPs, the final element is always a noun:

50. a. *(\text{many} \ LINK) \text{bad} \text{policeman} \hspace{1em} \text{(PROG go.home)} [\text{DET} \text{woman} \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; LT)}]
   "The ones who went home were many bad policemen."

b. *(\text{small} \ LINK) \text{cat} [\text{DET see-DIR-1SG.CONJ=EXIS}] \hspace{1em} \text{(when=CONS=3CONJ)}
   "The ones I fed were two little cats."

c. *(\text{good(REDIS)-appendi}) \hspace{1em} \text{(on=CONS=7CONJ)}
   "The ones I saw on the mountain were two beautiful little birds." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; GN)}

Assuming that the head of a phrase is obligatorily present, the contrast between the grammaticality of (50) and the ungrammaticality of (51) implies that the head of a CNP is a noun:

51. *[\text{small} \ LINK) \text{red} \hspace{1em} \text{(PL.DET see-DIR-1SG.CONJ=EXIS)}
   "What I saw were two small red ones."

(St'at'imcets; GN)

We cannot analyze (50a-c) as containing an AP constituent with an adjoined NP. If this were the case, the adjoined NP's presence would be optional, and a sentence like (51) would be grammatical. This is not the case, since the predicate-final noun is obligatorily present. The same observations can be made with Secwepemctsin data (52) corresponds to (50), and (53), like (51), shows that the final element must be a noun:

52. a. *[\text{many} \ LINK) \text{red} \text{berry} \hspace{1em} \text{(DET 2SG.PASS-NOM-eat)}
   "The ones you ate were many red berries." \hspace{1em} \text{(Secwepemctsin; MJ)}

b. *(\text{tall} \ LINK) \text{green} \text{tree} [\text{DET 1SG.PASS-NOM-see-TRANS}]
   "The one I saw was a tall green tree." \hspace{1em} \text{(Secwepemctsin; MJ)}

Thus, (49) shows that all non-final elements in stacked CNPs must be individual-level predicates:

53. a. *(\text{SPEAKER} \ LINK) \text{make} \hspace{1em} \text{(DET woman=REDUP)}
   "The women are the two who are intelligent." 
   \text{(Secwepemctsin; MJ)}

b. *(\text{tall} \ LINK) \text{tree} \hspace{1em} \text{green} [\text{DET 1SG.PASS-NOM-see-TRANS}]
   "The one I saw was a tall green tree." 
   \text{(Secwepemctsin; MJ)}

2.2.2. \text{?a}-Prefixation

\text{?a}-, the St'at'imcets stative marker, attaches to nominal categories, giving the meaning of possession and creating a [-N] category (Burton and Davis 1996). The contrast between nouns and non-nouns is shown in (54) vs. (55).

54. a. \text{a.} \text{za?ag} \text{dog} [\text{k John}]
   \text{PROG STA-dog} [\text{DET John}]
   "John has a dog." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; LT)}

b. \text{b.} \text{za?az} \text{NA} \text{priest} \hspace{1em} \text{NEG 1PL.SUBJ STA-priest}
   "We don't have a priest." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; RW)}

55. \text{a.} \text{za?ag'?a?} \text{dog} [\text{k Mary}]
   \text{PROG STA-dog} [\text{DET Mary}]
   "Mary has a red one." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; LT)}

Using possessive stative prefixation is a diagnostic for nounhood, we can find out whether CNPs are nominal or not. (56) shows that \text{?a}- may attach to the first element of some CNPs, and (57) shows that it may only attach to the first element.\footnote{There is some speaker variability on the acceptability of \text{?a}-prefixation to complex predicates. While \text{?a}-prefixation to non-initial elements of the complex predicate is bad for all speakers, prefixation to the initial element is good for some speakers only.} Note also the contrast between (55), where \text{?a}- may not attach to \text{?a}?\text{?a} \text{red}, and (56b) from the same speaker, where \text{?a}- may attach to a CNP containing \text{?a}?\text{?a}. This indicates that the entire CNP in (56a-c) is an NP, and that the stative marker attaches only to the maximal projection NP, rather than to the zero-level category N0.

56. a. \text{a.} \text{za?ag'?aw?} \text{dog} \hspace{1em} \text{DET Doreen}
   \text{PROG STA-dog} \hspace{1em} \text{root} [\text{DET=NON} \text{Doreen}]
   "Doreen has car roots." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; RW; BF)}

b. \text{b.} \text{za?ag'?aw?} \text{dog} \hspace{1em} \text{DET Doreen}
   \text{PROG STA-dog} \hspace{1em} \text{shirt} [\text{DET Mary}]
   \text{DET=NON} \text{Doreen} \hspace{1em} \text{shirt} \hspace{1em} \text{DET=NON} \text{Doreen}
   "Mary has a red shirt that I'm gonna borrow." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; LT)}

57. a. \text{a.} \text{za?ag'?aw?} \text{dog} \hspace{1em} \text{DET Doreen}
   \text{PROG STA-dog} \hspace{1em} \text{shirt} [\text{DET=NON} \text{Doreen}]
   "Doreen has car roots." \hspace{1em} \text{(St'at'imcets; BF)}

11 There is some speaker variability on the acceptability of \text{?a}-prefixation to complex predicates. While \text{?a}-prefixation to non-initial elements of the complex predicate is bad for all speakers, prefixation to the initial element is good for some speakers only.
Recall that Demirdache and Matthewson (1995a,b) propose that CNPs contain individual-level adjectives and a head noun. However, (58a-d) are examples of CNPs which contain only nouns; see also (56a) above:

58. a. [ŋaš'menə̃ã k'w ũ X̱mə̃lə̃c] [k'w ũ Mary]
   "Mary is an old woman." (St'át'imctc; LT)

   b. [ŋaš'fen] [tu wa?] [pi-g-aš]
   [old.person man] [DET PROG hunt-MID]
   "The hunter is an old man." (St'át'imctc; RW)

   c. [I'1ɪ̱tə̃m X̱mə̃lə̃c] [k'w ũ Mary]
   [adult woman] [DET=NOM Mary]
   "Mary is a grown-up woman." (St'át'imctc; RW)

   d. [čə̃taw-az' kə̃k'mə̃lə̃x's] [l] [qə̃wə̃-ə̃n-ə̃l]
   [cedar-tree root] [PL.DET use-DIR.1SG.CONJ=EXIS]
   "The ones I used were cedar roots." (St'át'imctc; BF)

The non-final elements in (58a-d) pass independent tests for nownthood such as allowing possessive marking (59a), being able to occupy final position in a CNP (59b), and being able to function as the head of a relative clause (59c):

59. a. -čə̃taw-az' [ta Ɂũc-uh-ə̃g-aš]
   ISO.POSS-cedar-tree [DET chop-DIR.3ERG=EXIS]
   "What he chopped was my cedar tree." (St'át'imctc)

   b. [ŋaš'mãlə̃] [k'w ũ Mary]
   [good old.person] [DET=NOM Mary]
   "Mary is a good old person." (St'át'imctc; RW)

   c. pə̃n-kə̃n [na qə̃mə̃lə̃] [na X̱'xə̃l-ə̃n-ə̃nə̃]
   meet(DIR=1SG.SUBJ [DET old.person=EXIS DET look-for-DIR.1SG.CONJ=EXIS]
   "I met the old person I was looking for." (St'át'imctc)

The data are compatible with CNPs forming an NP constituent, but not an AP constituent.12

3. Do we need the notion 'adjective'? The test of individual-level membership was based on CNPs (Demirdache and Matthewson 1995a,b), we can now dispense with A altogether, leaving us with a single lexical categorical distinction in CNPs. [aN].

We have seen that the final element in a CNP must be a noun. Now we see that non-final elements can be either nouns or (individual-level) adjectives.

There are three potential hypotheses that can account for the data in (58)-(61). They are given in (62).

62. Hypothesis 1: CNPs optionally allow individual-level members of either the category A or the category N as modifiers.

Hypothesis 2: Nominal modifiers in CNPs undergo Ø-derivation (N→A).

Hypothesis 3: Non-final elements of a CNP must simply be individual level predicates (i.e. 'adjectiveness' is not a requirement). Hypothesis 1 is no more than a statement of the facts. Hypothesis 2 is circular: since the distribution of predicates in CNPs is the sole diagnostic for a separate category A, this distribution cannot itself be determined by the CNP construction. Hypothesis 3, on the other hand, is sufficient to derive the correct results. As long as the non-final element of the CNP is an individual-level predicate, its syntactic category is irrelevant. Note that there are no individual-level predicates in St'át'imctc with verbal equivalents in English; this explains why the non-final elements of the CNP are equivalent to nouns and adjectives in English.

Once we acknowledge the independently needed requirement that non-final elements of CNPs be individual-level predicates, motivation for the category A is lost, unless we decide to treat all individual level predicates as belonging to the category A. This would be absurd, however, since the class of individual level predicates includes nearly all (independently definable) Ns. In conclusion, we do not need the category A (or AP) to account for CNPs. The semantic restriction to individual-level predicates subsumes any lexical categorial restrictions on non-final elements in CNPs.13

This conclusion has wider implications: since the sole argument for a category A in St'át'imctc was based on CNPs (Demirdache and Matthewson 1995a,b), we can now dispense with A altogether, leaving us with a single lexical categorical distinction in CNPs. [aN].

4. Semantic properties of CNPs

This section investigates the semantic relation between the head of a CNP and its modifiers.

4.1. Attributive vs. intersective modifiers According to Higginbotham (1985), modification of a noun by an adjective expresses conjunction. In its simplest form, conjunction works as in (63).

63. a. That is a big dog.
   b. That is a fat child.

However, Higginbotham points out that the situation is usually more complex than in (63):

Adjectives grade things along dimensions that are partly contextually filled in, but also partly controlled by the syntactic environment. When an adjective combines with an N to form a complex N', as in tall man, big butterfly, or good violinist, then it is taken as grading with respect to the attribute given in the N (Higginbotham 1985:563).

Note that the restriction that the head of a CNP be a noun is not subsumed by semantics, but requires reference to the lexical category

\[305-306\]

12 Secwepemctsin does not possess a parallel morpheme to St'át'imctc ʔaš-. Possession can be indicated by the prefix pa+, which attaches only to nominal categories, but does not appear on CNPs (Lai 1997a). Further investigation is required.

13 Note that the restriction that the head of a CNP be a noun is not subsumed by semantics, but requires reference to the lexical category N.
The use of the N as the standard of comparison for the adjective is illustrated in (64), where the standard of 'bigness' varies according to the kind of individual which is modified by big. For example, (64a) is judged to be true if the butterfly is 10 inches long, but (64b) is false if the dog is 10 inches long.

64. a. That is a big butterfly.
   b. That is a big dog.

The possibility of using the noun as the standard of comparison for the adjective gives rise to ambiguity, as noted by Larson (1996), among others. For example, (65) is ambiguous between a reading in which I saw someone who dances beautifully, but may be unattractive otherwise, and a reading in which I saw a beautiful person, but she danced poorly.

65. I saw a beautiful dancer.

The ambiguity of (65) is accounted for if we assume that the adjective beautiful is relational. It takes an individual argument x (the object that is beautiful), plus an argument for a standard of comparison C (the standard according to which beauty is assessed) (Larson 1996:497). The standard of comparison may either be dancers (giving the reading where x dances beautifully), or people in general. This is illustrated in (66).

66. a. beautiful (x, C)
   b. beautiful (x, person) & attributive reading: beautiful (x) & dancer (x)
   c. beautiful (x, dancer) & attributive reading: beautiful (x) for a dancer (cf. Larson 1996)

The difference between the two readings reduces to whether the noun provides the standard of comparison or not. If the noun provides the standard of comparison, the attributive reading results.

Note that attributive readings reduce to pure intersective readings in certain cases, namely whenever there is no sense in which the noun can provide a standard of comparison for the adjective. For example, adjectives such as wet or dead typically do not rely on the noun which they modify for a standard of comparison, and numerals like three never do. In other words, there is no standard of wetness, deadness or threeness which a noun can provide; these adjectives always result in pure conjunction semantics:

67. a. wet hair -> hair (x) and wet (x) (for an X) (intersective)
   b. dead bindweed -> bindweed (x) and dead (x) (for an X) (intersective)
   c. three snowflakes -> snowflake (x) and three (x) (for an X) (intersective)

The next section investigates the semantics of CNPs in Secwepemctsin and Secwepemctsin, to determine whether they allow attributive or intersective semantics, or give rise to ambiguity.

4.2. CNPs only have attributive interpretations

In both St'A't'imcets and Secwepemctsin, CNPs which allow their head noun to provide a standard of comparison (i.e. which contain modifiers like beautiful, big and unlike dead, three) always require that the head noun provide the standard. In other words, CNPs only allow the attributive interpretation. Thus, (68a) is unambiguous: it only has the attributive reading in (68c).

68. a. [s'at lb] k6k6p? [p?]
   "John is a strong chief."
   [strong chief] [DET=NOM John] (St'A't'imcets; BF)

   b. reading | strong (x,C) | meaning | paraphrase | status
   -- | -- | -- | -- | --
   b. | interjective | strong (John, person) | chief (J) & strong (J) (for a person) | John has big muscles | *
   c. | attributive | strong (John, chief) | chief (J) & strong (J) (for a chief) | John is a powerful leader | √

CNP's containing only nouns also have attributive, rather than intersective, meanings. Consider (69):

69. [s'at lb]wet [k6k6p?]
   [big] [s'at lb]wet
   "The ones I used were cedar roots."
   [DET use=DIR=ISO.CON=EXIS] (St'A't'imcets; BF)

Under an attributive reading, the items that were used would have to be simultaneously cedar trees and roots. This clearly does not represent the meaning of the sentence. Under an attributive reading, the first element 'cedar tree' Attributionally modifies the second element 'root', and the complex NP denotes a particular kind of root.14

The same is true in (70); in these cases the sentences are ungrammatical because they would require an intersective reading, whereby John is simultaneously described as belonging to two professions:

70. a. * [nap t k6k6p? [p?]
   [policeman chief] [DET John]
   "John is a priest (and a) chief."
   (St'A't'imcets; LT)
   b. * [p?if man k6k6p? [p?]
   [policeman chief] [DET John]
   "John is a policeman (and a) chief."
   (St'A't'imcets; LT)
   c. * [k6k6p? [p?if man] [p?]
   [chief policeman] [DET John]
   "John is a chief (and a) policeman." (St'A't'imcets; LT)

Secwepemctsin CNPs similarly have only attributive readings. In (71), the intersective reading whereby Mary is both a woman and a chief is disallowed. Instead, k6k6p? 'chief' modifies n6k6w 'woman' giving the reading 'respectable woman':

71. [k6k6p? [p?to n6k6w] [p?]
   [chief Link woman] [DET Mary]
   * "Mary is a female chief."
   "Mary is a respectable woman." (Secwepemctsin; MJ)

In (72), the intersective meaning whereby John is a chief and also a policeman is disallowed. Instead, sentence can only mean that John is a police chief; the first noun 'policeman' specifies the kind of chief that is being picked out (i.e. he is a police chief rather than a band chief).15

14 The same constraint holds for stacked CNPs. (i) only has an attributive reading, in which 'cedar-tree' Attributionally modifies 'root' and 'big' Attributionally modifies 'cedar-tree root':

   i. [k6k6p? [s'at lb]wet [k6k6p?] [p?]
   [big] [s'at lb]wet
   "The one I dug was a big cedar root."
   [DET dig=DIR=ISO.CON=EXIS] (St'A't'imcets; BF)

   The bracketing given in (i), where the predicate refers to a cedar-tree root which is big (rather than to the root of a big cedar tree), is the only possible one available. We can see this from continuations of the sentence in (i). (ii) is perfectly fine, but (iii) is a contradiction.

   ii. ....ku6 k6k6p? [s'at lb]wet
   but small [DET cedar-tree=EXIS]
   "...but the cedar-tree (itself) was small." (St'A't'imcets; BF)

   iii. ....ku6 k6k6p? [s'at lb]wet
   but small [DET root=EXIS]
   "...but the root (itself) was small." (St'A't'imcets; BF)

15 Why the same possibility does not hold for the St'A't'imcets examples in (70) is an open question at this stage; it is not clear whether this represents a systematic difference between the two languages.
The connection we have seen in St'át'imcets and Secwepemcctsin between the stage / individual-level contrast and the interactive / attributive contrast also holds in English, suggesting that the connection is more than just a contingent fact about Salish. In English, just as in St'át'imcets, modifiers in predicate nominals (i.e. CNPs) must be individual-level; they must also attributively modify their head noun. For example, the individual-level modifiers in (76) are fully acceptable, unlike inside CNPs: (attributive \( \psi \), intersective \( \ast \)),

78. a. This man is a tired detective. (attributive \( \psi \), intersective \( \ast \))
    b. This man is a singing detective. (attributive \( \psi \), intersective \( \ast \))
    c. This man is a sick detective. (attributive \( \psi \), intersective \( \ast \))

In summary, English parallels St'át'imcets and Secwepemcctsin in the semantic requirements on CNPs.

4.3.2. Argument DPs

In order to understand the restrictions on CNPs, which hold in both Salish and English, we must determine which of the properties of CNPs derive from their predicator status. This means that we must investigate the properties of complex nominal DPs in argument position, and compare these to the CNP facts. Inside English DPs, both individual-level and stage-level modifiers are possible:

78. a. I caught a big fish. (individual-level modifier)
    b. I met a hungry grizzly bear. (stage-level modifier)

The same is true in St'át'imcets;\(^{17}\) the stage-level modifiers in (80) are acceptable, unlike inside CNPs:

79. a. This insect is a little butterfly. (attributive \( \psi \), intersective \( \ast \))
    b. This insect is a beautiful butterfly. (attributive \( \psi \), intersective \( \ast \))

What are the interpretations of these modifiers? The interpretation of modifiers inside argument DPs in both English and Salish shows one striking difference from those inside CNPs, and one striking similarity. The difference is that inside argument DPs, individual-level modifiers may have intersective readings as well as attributive readings. Thus, in the English DPs in (81), the individual-level modifiers have both an attributive reading, whereby the referent in question is tall by the standard of skyscrapers or small by the standard of butterflies, as well as an intersective reading, whereby the skyscraper is simply tall (compared to all other comparable individuals) or the butterfly is simply small (compared to all other comparable individuals).

It is not clear to us that (i) is indeed ambiguous, but see §4.4 below for a potential explanation of Larson and Segal’s claim.

\(^{16}\) Our claim that CNPs in English lack intersective readings contrasts with Larson and Segal’s (1995) claim that the sentence in (i) is ambiguous:

1. Olga is a beautiful dancer.

\(^{17}\) Information on some of the points discussed in this and later sections is presently unavailable for Secwepemcctsin. We expect that similar facts will hold.
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Next, we turn to (85b). In order for this implication to hold, all individual-level modifiers would have to be incompatible with intersective readings. This is false; (84a) shows that individual-level modifiers allow both attributive and intersective readings (modulo the independent restriction against any intersective readings inside predicates, which we discuss below).

This leaves (83c). Here, the implication is valid: attributive modification is uniformly incompatible with stage-level predicates, both in arguments and in predicates. We conclude that:

86. **ATTRIBUTIVE \(\rightarrow\) INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL**

The obvious next question is why it is the case that CNPs are only attributive. That is the topic of the following sub-section.

4.4. Why are intersective readings disallowed in CNPs?

As shown in §4.3.2, the absence of intersective readings only holds for NPs in predicate position. Intersective readings are possible inside argument DPs in both Salish languages and in English. Given the difference between NPs and DPs with respect to attributivity, it will be useful to examine independently-attested differences between NPs (predicates) and DPs (arguments).

Complex nominal DPs have been argued to be **HEADED RELATIVE CLAUSES** in St’at’imcets (see Demirdache and Matthewson 1995a,b, Matthewson and Davis 1995 for detailed argumentation). Examples are given in (87). (87a) and (87b) are head-final relative clauses where the clausal portion contains overt inflectional marking and an anaphoric constituent. The parallelism between (87a,b) and (87c) leads Demirdache and Matthewson (1995a,b) and Matthewson and Davis (1995) to propose that (87c) is also a headed relative clause, whose clausal portion happens to contain an intransitive predicate with null third person absolute personal marking.

**Example:**

87. a. čuń=č=š=ā=š Mary [ta šaay-š=ā=š ąqay=x] suck-nose-DIR-3SG [NOM=Mary] [DET love-CAUS-3SG-JEROG=EXIS man] “Mary kissed the man she loves.” (St’at’imcets; RF)

b. pàn=š=ā=tə wə=ʔ pən=š=ā= qay=ay=ʃ{l=[tu=ł qəw=š=̄=ā] find(REOUP)=ISG.SBJ [DET PROG=3ABS afraid(REOUP) rabbit] [on=DET road=EXIS] “I found a frightened rabbit on the road.” (St’at’imcets; RW)

c. ąqay=x [ta ə=ŋ=š=ā=š ąqay=x] fly [DET big=3ABS=EXIS bird] “The big bird flew.” (St’at’imcets; RW, GN)

Thus, DPs which contain head nouns modified by other material may be analyzed as headed relative clauses.

On the other hand, NP predicates are crucially not relative clauses (Demirdache and Matthewson 1995a,b). This is supported by the obligatory absence of any indicators of clausal status inside CNPs. For example, non-final elements of CNPs never take verbal inflectional endings.\(^{18}\)

Next, note that relative clauses have the semantics of conjunction; that is, they involve set intersection.

88. a. čuń=č=š=ā=š Mary [ta šaay-š=ā=š ąqay=x] suck-nose-DIR-3SG [NOM=Mary] [DET love-CAUS-3SG-JEROG=EXIS man] “Mary kissed the man she loves.” (St’at’imcets; RF)

a’. Mary kissed (x) ll man (x) & loved-by-Mary (x)

83. **stage-level modifier:**

84. a. argument DPs: stage-level modifier individ-level modifier

\(\rightarrow\) attributive  \(\rightarrow\) intersective

b. CNPs: stage-level modifier individ-level modifier

\(\rightarrow\) attributive  \(\rightarrow\) intersective

For both CNPs and argument DPs, only individual-level modifiers may have an attributive reading. Where CNPs and argument DPs differ is that only argument DPs allow intersective readings.

We will deal with the difference between arguments and predicates in §4.4. For now, let us turn our attention to the correlation between individual-level modifiers and attributive readings.

4.3.3. Correlation between individual-level modifiers and attributive readings

As shown above, Salish and English CNPs allow only individual-level modifiers, and these modifiers have attributive semantics. The question now arises as to whether these two restrictions are independent, or whether they are reducible to one another. There are three possibilities, outlined in (85):

85. a. The attributivity requirement and the individual-level requirement are independent of one another.

b. The attributive requirement derives from the individual-level requirement.

c. The individual-level requirement derives from the attributive requirement.

We begin by dismissing (85a), on the grounds that it fails to account for the systemic absence of stage-level attributive modifiers in both predicate and argument positions (see 84a,b). The fact that there is a consistent correlation between attributivity and individual-level modification means that the relationship cannot be random.
The simplified logical form in (a) indicates that the meaning of the relative clause in (a) is to be derived by intersecting the sets denoted by the predicates "man" and "loved by Mary". 

On the other hand, we have already seen that set intersection is not adequate to capture the semantics of attributive modification. Attributive modifiers are relations between individuals and values of a contextually-defined comparison class (the 'for-a' relation).

89. a. "Mary kissed a tall man." (St'at'imcets; BF)

b. Mary kissed (x) tall-for-a (x) man.

The comparison class is supplied by context: its default value is that of the modifiee itself (i.e., 'man' in the case above).

Summarizing so far, we have established the following differences between predicates (CNPs) and arguments (DPs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNPs</th>
<th>DPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>always predicative</td>
<td>never predicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>may not contain clausal modifiers</td>
<td>may contain relative clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>always have attributive readings</td>
<td>may have intersective readings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(90) shows a correlation between argument DPs, which are relative clauses and have intersective readings, and CNPs, which are not relative clauses and do not have intersective readings. The next question is, what is the basis for this correlation? More specifically, why is the intersective reading unavailable in CNPs?

We do not have a convincing answer to this question, but we can sketch a possible approach. Notice that in (89) (the attributive case) we are effectively creating a derived predicate, "tall-for-a-man" based on the predicates "man" (the "modifiee") and "tall" (the modifier), together with the "for-a" relation. On the other hand, in the relative clause case, we have two distinct predicates, which end up conjoined. The attributive and intersective readings thus involve different semantic 'modes' of modification, with different syntactic realizations: in attributive modification we have a single derived predicate; in intersective modification we have two conjoined predicates.

The reason for the absence of the intersective reading in CNPs now follows straightforwardly: intersection is dependent on conjunction, but there is no conjunction in non-coordinated CNPs, since they involve a single predicate. Note that in fact an intersective reading is available in predicate position just in case overt conjunction is employed:

91. a. [kʷəˈtəl] mətə? pɪʃ[man] [kʷəˈg] Mary [DET=NOM Mary] [chief and policeman] [DET=SPEC Mary] "Mary is a chief and a policeman." (St'at'imcets; RW,)

b. [kapən mətə? qənt] [ʔ] s-4əw-ʔ-s-4ən-a [PL=DET STA-put.on-COAUS-1SG.CONJ=EXIS] "I am wearing a coat and a hat." (St'at'imcets; RW)

c. [ʔiˈtəl kʷəˈtəl-pəʔ] mətə? [ʔəˈləməs] [DET=SPEC John] [DET=SPEC John] [strong chief and [good policeman]] [DET=SPEC John] "John is a strong chief and a good policeman." (St'at'imcets; RW)

92. [qəˈum qəˈtəl-fəʔ] [ʔə məˈnəməskə] [DET=SPEC wolf] [DET=SPEC wolf] [big and black] "The wolf is big and black." (St'at'imcets; MJ)

Next, we turn to the converse case: the interpretation of modifiers in argument DPs. The account we have developed so far correctly predicts that the intersective interpretation is available in DP environments, associated with relative clause syntax. Recall, however, that DPs with individual-level modifiers in both St'at'imcets and English are ambiguous between intersective and attributive readings. Thus, (93) is ambiguous between (93a) and (93b):

93. a. I met a person who was a powerful leader. (attributive)

b. I met a person who was a chief and had big muscles. (intersective)

As long as all complex DPs are relative clauses, as was assumed by e.g. Matthewson and Davis (1995), we cannot account for the attributive reading in (92). However, nothing in our account forces this assumption. Suppose we assume instead that DPs like that in (92) are structurally as well as interpretively ambiguous: they can either involve relative clause syntax and intersective semantics, or non-clausal adjunction and attributive semantics. In that case, we can maintain a tight fit between syntax and semantics, and generalize our account fully to both predicates (CNPs) and arguments (DPs).

Finally, note that our analysis implies that English DPs which allow both intersective and attributive readings (cf. §4.3.2) are also structurally ambiguous, with the intersective reading correlating with a structure which is (derived from) a relative clause (cf. e.g. McCawley 1988).

4.5. Why are there no relative clauses in predicate position in St'at'imcets?

Main predicates in St'at'imcets (and in Salish more generally) lack determiners (see Matthewson 1996). We can therefore explain the absence of relative clauses in predicate position in Salish if we can explain why relative clauses require determiners in these languages.

In fact, the requirement that relative clauses be introduced by determiners follows simply from the fact that determiners are the principal clausal subordinators in Salish (Kroeber 1991, Davis and Matthewson 1997b). Since relative clauses are by definition a subtype of subordinate clause, it will follow that - as long as subordinate clauses must be introduced by some subordinating functor - determiners will be obligatory on relative clauses.

Note that English provides support for our analysis of relative clauses in Salish. English, unlike St'at'imcets, allows determiners on predicates, and likewise allows relative clauses in predicate position:

94. a. Mary is a chief.

b. Mary is the love of my life.

c. Mary is a woman who I adore.

d. Mary is the chief who signed this treaty.

The relative clauses in (94) have an intersective reading, in accord with our claim that relative clauses are universally associated with set intersection. The only difference between English and St'at'imcets is that English allows relative clauses in predicate position. St'at'imcets, on the other hand, lacks relative clauses in predicate position, and consequently lacks all intersective readings in predicate position.

Note that this analysis offers a potential explanation for the supposed ambiguity of Olga is a beautiful dancer (see footnote 16). The English DP a beautiful dancer has the possibility, in predicate as well as in argument position, of being formed from a relative clause (cf. McCawley 1988) and therefore allowing an intersective reading.

20 Head-initial relative clauses in St'at'imcets (see Matthewson and Davis 1995) always contain two determiners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>kʷəˈg-ʔ-s-4ən-a</th>
<th>[DET=SPEC Mary] [DET=SPEC Mary] [DET=SPEC Mary] [DET=SPEC Mary]</th>
<th>kʷəˈg-ʔ-s-4ən-a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Mary kissed the man she loves. (St'at'imcets; RW, GN)</td>
<td>跋斯威克 said the man I kissed.</td>
<td>Following Davis and Matthewson (1997), the italicized determiner ta in (i) occupies Inf, and as such these constructions are always relative clauses. Therefore, we predict that examples such as (i) will be non-ambiguous, always receiving only the intersective reading. The relevant fieldwork has yet not been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6. Summary

Summarizing our discussion of the semantics of CNPs, the following points have been made:

95. i. CNPs only allow individual-level modifiers
   ii. CNPs only have attributive readings

96. i. The fact that: CNPs only allow individual-level modifiers
       follows from the fact that: CNPs only have attributive readings
       given the fact that: only individual-level modifiers allow attributive readings
   ii. The fact that: CNPs only have an attributive reading
       follows from the fact that: interactive readings are correlated with relative clauses
       given the fact that: relative clauses are disallowed in predicate position
   iii. The fact that: relative clauses are disallowed in predicate position
       follows from the fact that: predicates do not contain Ds
       given the fact that: relative clauses require D (= Infl)

5. Conclusion

In this paper we have first argued that there are two separate multi-predicate constructions in (at least) St'at'imcets and Secwepemctsin. Auxiliary predicate constructions are distinguished from complex nominal predicates morphologically, syntactically and semantically and cannot be regarded as instances of the same phenomenon.

Next, outstanding issues with respect to CNPs were discussed. Among other things, we have argued for the following points (cf. (39) above):

97. i. CNPs are syntactically phrases rather than zero-level categories.
   ii. CNPs are NPs.
   iii. A separate category 'adjective' is not required to capture the CNP facts. Non-final elements inside CNPs are subject only to the independently-required restriction that they be individual-level predicates.
   iv. The head noun in a CNP is attributively modified, and may not be intersectively modified.
   v. The attributive nature of CNPs follows because for an interactive reading, a relative clause is required and relative clauses are only licensed in argument positions.

Throughout the discussion of the semantics of CNPs, we have seen that St'at'imcets and English parallel each other closely, with differences falling out from independent differences in the respective languages.
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Abbreviations

ABS = absolutive, ACC = accusative, ANTIC = anticipated, APPL = applicative, AUT = autonomous, CAUS = causative, CMP = complete speaker knowledge, CONJ = conjunctive, DEM = demonstrative, DES = desiderative, DDT = determiner, DIR = directive transitive, ERG = ergative, EXIS = assertion of existence, FOC = focus, INTR = intransitive, LINK = linker, MID = middle, NEG = negative, NOMIN = nominative, NOM = nominalizer, OBJ = object, FERP = perfective aspect, PL = plural, POSSE = possessive, POT = potential, PREP = preposition, PROG = progressive, REDUP = reduplication, SG = singular, STA = stative, SUBJ = subject, SUCL = subject clitic, TR = transitive, YNO = yes-no question. A dash (−) indicates an affix boundary and an equals sign (=) a clitic boundary.