#### On negation in Salish

#### Henry Davis UBC

This paper examines patterns of negation across Salish. I distinguish three (and a half) different patterns across the family, with the original and most widespread involving a negative predicate taking a negated clause as its complement. I examine this pattern in some detail in Lillooet (St'át'imcets), and conclude that it involves negative existential quantification over minimal situations. I then investigate the development of other negative patterns in Salish, focusing on the weakening of the clausal boundary and the development of separate negative existential quantifiers in Central Salish. Finally, I compare the biclausal Salish pattern to similar constructions in Polynesian, and conclude with some remarks about its theoretical status.

#### 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In contrast to many areas of Salish syntax, there exists a fairly large body of work on negation. Though there are only a couple of explicit treatments (see in particular Kinkade 1976 on Upper Chehalis and Wiltschko 2000 on Upriver Halkomelem), most grammars of individual languages include relatively extensive discussion of negative patterns, due to their prominence and frequency in textual materials. This makes negation a fairly promising candidate for cross-linguistic investigation within the Salish language family, both in terms of reconstruction of the proto-Salish system and in terms of possible syntactic parameters. A good start to the former enterprise has been provided by Kroeber (1999) who includes a substantial amount of information on negation in his exhaustive study of subordination in Salish. I will concentrate on the latter task here, though obviously since the two issues are closely linked, historical questions will inevitably arise.

My major claims are the following:

- (i) Across the Salish family, there are three major and one minor negation patterns, more or less systematically distributed by area and subfamily.
- (ii) Of these, the original pattern (still attested in almost all branches of the family, either as the principal means of negation or as a secondary pattern) almost certainly involved negation as a main predicate with a nominalized subordinate clause.
- (iii) This pattern is best analyzed as involving negative existential quantification over

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Acknowledgements. As ever, this work relies heavily on the acute grammatical intuitions and endless patience of St'át'imcets consultants Beverly Frank, Gertude Ned, Linda Redan, Laura Thevarge, and Agnes Rose Whitley: kukwstum'ckál'ap, nsnek'wnúk'w7a. Wayne Suttles was kind enough to let me cite data from his compendious and I hope soon to be published grammar of Downriver Halkomelem. I'd also like to thank the participants of the UBC working group on negation (Rose-Marie Déchaine, Carrie Gillon, Felicia Lee, Hiroko Miyazaki, Naomi Sawai, Scott Shank, Martina Wiltschko), the audience at the Victoria Workshop on Grammatical Structures of the North/West, January 2001, and Lisa Matthewson for help with the ideas presented here.

either events or individuals.

(iv) In several branches of the family, loss of nominalization on the complement of negation correlates with the development of a separate negative existential predicate.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I will take a tour of Salish, introducing the three-and-a-half attested patterns of negation. In Section 3, I will turn to a detailed examination of negation in the Northern Interior language Lillooet (St'át'imcets), and propose an explicit account of how it works. In Section 4 I will return to various diachronic, typological, and theoretical implications of the analysis presented here. Finally, Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Three (and a Half) Patterns of Negation

There are three major patterns of negation in Salish, and one intermediate subpattern, restricted to Squamish. In this section, I will briefly introduce and exemplify each pattern.

## 2.1 Pattern A

This is the 'classic' pattern of negation in Salish. It involves a negative predicate (more precisely, an impersonal intransitive stative verb) which takes a nominalized subordinate clause, typically introduced by whichever determiner/complementizer the language employs to introduce non-factive subordinate clauses.<sup>2</sup> Schematically, we can represent this pattern as in (1).

### 1. Pattern A. [NEG [D/C [NOMINALIZED CLAUSE]]]

Pattern A is the dominant form of negation in all the Northern Interior languages (Lillooet, Thompson, and Shuswap), in Tsamosan (at least in Upper Chehalis), and in the Central Salish language Lushootseed. It is attested as a secondary pattern in several other Central Salish languages, including Squamish (as a relic, without an introductory determiner), Straits (either with or without an introductory determiner), and Halkomelem (usually with the meaning "never" in the Musqueam and Cowichan dialects, but in Musqueam also as a simple negator with transitive verbs when no auxiliary is present). It is also found in all the Southern Interior languages, where it generally occurs without an introductory determiner use in the Southern Interior). Examples follow.<sup>3</sup>

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  I take no position here as to the categorial status of the D/C element. See Kroeber (1999: 126] for pertinent remarks.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Language names are abbreviated as in Kroeber (1999), except I use Hk rather than HI for Halkomelem. Abbreviations are as follows: ABS = absolutive, ANTI = antithetical, ASP = aspect, ATT = attributive, AUT = autonomous, AUX = auxiliary, CAU = causative, CERT = certainty, CN = conjunctive, D/C = determiner/complementizer, DEIC = deictic, DEM = demonstrative, DET = determiner, DITR = ditransitive, EMP = emphatic, EST = established, EXCL = exclusive, EXIS = existential, FOC = focus, FUT = future, IND = indirective, INS = instrument, INT = interrogative, INTR = intransitivizer, IRR = irrealis, LMT = limiting, LNK =link, MID = middle, NCT = non-control, NEG = negation, NOM = nominalizer, OBJ = object, OBL = oblique, OOC= out of control, PERS = person marker, POSS= possessive, PART = particle, PAS = passive, PL = plural, PROG = progressive, PST = past, REC = reciprocal, RED = redirective, RFL = reflexive, REL = relational, SG = singular, SPC = specific, STA = stative, SU = subject, SUB = subordinate, T = tense, TOP = topic-maintenance, TR = transitive. A dash (-) stands for an affix boundary and an equals sign (=) for a clitic boundary. I have generally maintained

2.	təté? NEG "I didn	k=s=cu-t-éne D/C=NOM=do-TR-1SG.TR.SU 't do it.''	(Th: Thompson and Thompson 1992:167)
3.	tá? NEG "He ha	k=s=pə-s-kén-m-s D/C=NOM=have-NOM-do-MID=3POSS id no success."	(Sh: Kuipers 1974:96)
4.	x <sup>w</sup> ?az NEG "He di	k <sup>w</sup> =š=?aćž-ən-čí-haš D/C=NOM=see-TR-2SG.OBJ-3TR.SU dn't see you."	(Li)
5.	mí†ta? NEG "You c	t=?a=s=?až-э-c D/C=2SG.POSS=NOM=see-TR-1SG.OB lo not see me."	(UCh: Kinkade 1976:19)
6.	x <sup>w</sup> i? NEG "You c	k <sup>w</sup> i=g <sup>w</sup> =ad=s=u-át-əd D/C=IRR=2SG.POSS=NOM-ASP-eat-TR lid not eat it."	(Ld: Hess 1995:96)
7.	haw=q NEG=I "She d	na s=ničim=s RR RL NOM=speak=3POSS id not say anything."	(Sq: Kuipers 1967:195)
8.	?áwə NEG "He do	k <sup>w</sup> =s=kwác-nəx <sup>w</sup> =s D/C=NOM-see-TR=3POSS besn't see him."	(HkM: Suttles nd: 108)
9.	?áwə NEG "I don"	k <sup>w</sup> ə=nə=s=t-qil D/C=1SG.POSS=NOM-partake-believe 't believe it."	(NSS: Montler 1986: 52)
10.	?ut and "…and	lut c-my-st-in NEG ASP-know-TR-1SG.TR.SU I don't know"	(Ok: Mattina 1985:16)
11.	k <sup>w</sup> a and "But it	lút wa? s-náŵ-lx-s NEG SPC NOM-run.sg-AUT-3POSS didn't run."	(Cm: M.D. Kinkade, pc)
12.	ta? NEG "He do	k <sup>w</sup> u-s-k <sup>w</sup> up-i-s ISG.OB-NOM-push-TR-3TR.SU bes not push me."	(Ka: Vogt 1940: 75)
13.	lút-e NEG "I did i	hi-s-ťap-sčént 1SG.POSS-NOM-shoot-INTR not shoot."	(Cr: Reichard 1939: 581)
standa	In all t rd infleo	hese examples, the complement of the negati ctional pattern for nominalized clauses, with	ve predicate shows the possessive clitic subjects in

original glosses and morpheme boundaries, with some minor changes for ease of cross-linguistic comparison and transparency.

intransitive clauses, and either subject suffix or possessive clitic subjects in transitive clauses (often varying with person), depending on the language. (See Kroeber 1999 and Davis 1999a, 2000 for details on subject inflection across the family).

#### 2.2 Pattern B

In a subset of Central Salish languages (Halkomelem, Comox, and Sechelt), one or more negative elements select a clause inflected for a conjunctive rather than a possessive clitic subject. In this pattern, there is no introductory determiner/complementizer. In addition, an indicative (main clause) subject clitic is optionally present adjacent to the negation itself. There is debate as to whether Pattern B involves a biclausal or a monoclausal structure: Suttles (nd: 107) assumes it to be biclausal in Downriver (Musqueam) Halkomelem, whereas Wiltschko (2000) argues for theopposite view in Upriver (Chilliwack) Halkomelem. The pattern is schematized in (14).

#### Pattern B. [NEG (SUCL) CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE] 14.

Examples are given below.

15.	?ǿwə=čəx <sup>w</sup> NEG=2SG.SU "You do/will not	ném=əx <sup>w</sup> go=2SG.CN.SU t go."	1	(HkM: Suttles nd: 107)
16.	?ówə=čəx <sup>w</sup> lí= NEG=2SG.SU AU "You do not like	=x <sup>w</sup> Xíls- UX=2SG.CN.SU wan me."	·θ-áx t-TR-1SG.C	(HkU :Galloway 1993: DBJ 186)
17.	xʷaʔ=č NEG=1SG.SU "I'm still not wo	qəjiy=an still=ISG.CN.SU rking."	þaðim work	(Cx: Kroeber 1999:155)
18.	x <sup>w</sup> ux <sup>w</sup> a?=č NEG=1SG.SU "I'm not finishec	huj=an finish=1SG.CN 1 yet."	I.SU	(Cx: Kroeber 1999:155)
19.	x <sup>w</sup> á≕čán NEG=1SG.SU "I'm not well."	?íy=an good=1SG.CN.	(SU	Se: Beaumont 1985: 22)
20.	?áwá=čən NEG=1SG.SU	sux <sup>w</sup> -t=an see-TR=1SG.CN.SU	čə ca DET la	əl?ᆠ(Se: Beaumont 1985:71) ake

"I do not see the lake yet."

As shown in (20), in Sechelt the negative element *?áwa*, obviously cognate with *?ówə* in Halkomelem and Straits, has acquired the specialized meaning of "not yet". In contrast, as shown in (18) the same meaning in Comox, is carried by the element

 $x^{w}ux^{w}a$ ?, a transparent reduplicant of the standard negator  $x^{w}a$ ?. The latter development also occurs in Squamish and Straits, where a negative element  $x^w u^2 a x^w$ ,  $x^w \neq w e$ , probably cognate with the Comox form, means "not yet" (Squamish) or "not yet/never" (Straits): see (23) and (32) below. Interestingly, unlike in Comox, neither Squamish nor Straits employs a derivative of  $x^{wa}$  as a simple negator; it is possible that the "not yet" forms were borrowed, or - more likely given its widespread distribution in Central Salish - that  $x^{wa}$ ? was supplanted by derivatives of ? $\delta w \delta$  in Squamish, Halkomelem and Straits.

The development of differentiated negative meanings is characteristic of Central Salish, and contrasts with the all-purpose negators of the interior; we shall investigate some of the syntactic consequences of this difference in Section 4.1 below.

## 2.2.1 Pattern B'

In Squamish, the principal means of negation involves an interesting intermediate pattern, in which a pre-predicative irrealis particle (q) introduces a clause inflected for a conjunctive subject.

21. Pattern B'. [NEG IRREALIS PARTICLE [CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE]]

Examples are given below.

22.	haw q=a NEG IRR⁼ "You folks	p =2PL.CN.SU did not work."	čičaṗ work		(Sq: Gillon 2001)
23.	x <sup>w</sup> u?áx <sup>w</sup> NEG	q=an IRR=1SG.CN.SU	J	?i¶n eat	(Sq: Kuipers 1967: 193)
	"I haven't e	eaten yet."			

This pattern resembles Pattern B in the use of conjunctive inflection, but differs in two ways: first, indicative subject clitics are never found adjacent to the negator; and second, the irrealis particle q (also used to introduce conditional clauses and embedded questions) is obligatory, and (usually) acts as a host for the conjunctive clitic. The etymology of q is obscure, but - as pointed out by Paul Kroeber - it is enticingly similar to the particle qe in Tillamook, which also appears with negation (see example (26) below). Moreover, it may be more distantly related to the conditional particle ka in Bella Coola, the irrealis particle s in Northern Straits (< PS \*k, cf. Klallam č) and the pervasive Southern Interior irrealis particle k(a)<sup>‡</sup>, suggesting a possible Proto-Salish origin (though, again as pointed out by Kroeber, the change of \*k -->q (or \*q -->k) remains unexplained).<sup>4</sup>

## 2.3 Pattern C

This pattern is clearly monoclausal. The negative element appears as a prepredicative particle, sometimes, as in Tillamook, Squamish, and Straits, followed by an additional irrealis particle. There is no introductory determiner/complementizer and no change in inflectional morphology. The pattern is schematized below:

## 24. Pattern C: [NEG (IRREALIS PARTICLE) INDICATIVE CLAUSE]

Pattern C is widespread, and particularly characteristic of languages spoken at the periphery of the Salish area, including Bella Coola, Tillamook, and most of the Southern Interior (including Okanagan, Coeur D'Alene, and Columbian). However, it also shows up in Central Salish, where it is the primary negation pattern in Straits, and a secondary pattern (with restricted meaning) in Lushootseed, Squamish, and Halkomelem.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The change of  $k \rightarrow q$  is not unattested in Salish, however: the irrealis proclitic qa(t) = in Kalispel is transparently related to ka(t) = in the rest of the Southern Interior, and the Kalispel first person plural proclitic  $qe^{2}$  has no other plausible source than the standard Salish first person plural possessive marker kat.

25. ?až<sup>w</sup> vanix-ic ti=?imlk-ťayx (Be: Davis and Saunders like-1SG.SU/3OB NEG DET=man=DET 1997: 170) "I do not like this man." 26. ae?š ae nš-tu(š)-šit-i (Ti: Kroeber 1999:142 cf. NEG PART in-believe-DITR-1SG.SU Edel 1939:41) "I do not believe him." 27. lút na-xad-n (Cm: Kinkade 1978: 16) in-pay-1SG.TR.SU NEG "I did not pay him." 28. lút ť=?əc-ylmix<sup>w</sup>4m-st-s-əlx (Ok: Mattina 1985: 166) NEG ATT-STA-boss-CAU-3TRA.SU-3PL i?=tk9milxw DET=woman "They don't have a woman as boss."<sup>5</sup> lút-e gwič-t-s 29. (Cr: Reichard 1939: 580) NEG see-TR-3SG.TR.SU "She did not see him." 30. ?ew-śwa-?aľ s-śv (NSS: Montler 1986: 192) LNK-NEG=LMT IRR-good "It is not good." 31. x<sup>w</sup>ówe ?ew-ve (NSL: Jelinek 1995: 515) NEG LNK-go "He's never/not yet gone." 32. x<sup>w</sup>i? lə-qawqs (Ld: Hess 1995:95) NEG ASP-raven "That is not a rayen." 33. haw=čən ćićaj (Sq: Gillon 2001) qat NEG=1SG.SU PART work "I don't work." 34. ?áwə-t=cən k<sup>w</sup>á:y (HkU: Galloway 1993: NEG=PST=1SG.SU hungry 321) "I'm never hungry."

Hess (1995: 95) claims that Pattern C negation in Lushootseed occurs only with negative identity statements such as that in (32), though Kroeber (1999:158) cites the following example from Hess (1976) as a counterexample to this generalization:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The particle t'in this example - and in virtually all other cases of negation in the long narrative text of *The* Golden Woman (A. Mattina 1985) - is glossed as 'emphatic' in A. Mattina (1985) but 'evidential' in N. Mattina (1996) and 'attributive' in A. Mattina (2000), indicating some uncertainty about its status (in particular, whether it is an optional proclitic adding another dimension of meaning to a negative statement, or a grammatical particle connecting negation to the negated clause). It is worth pointing out that its form is identical to one allomorph of the Shuswap oblique marker t/t' (Kuipers 1972), and quite close to that of the standard Okanagan oblique marker t.

(Ld: Hess 1976: 225)

tu-xwi?=əs 35. tíləb lə-d<sup>z</sup>íx FUT-NEG=3CN.SU at.once ASP-break "...so it does not break right away ... "

As for the Halkomelem and Squamish patterns, they show an intriguing formal resemblance, in that both involve the accretion of an unexplained -*t* suffix. Galloway treats the Halkomelem pattern as involving an instance of the past tense suffix  $-\partial t$ , but I am dubious about this, since the meaning of ?5wo-t is "never", rather than "not yet", as one might expect if the past tense morpheme were being interpreted compositionally with the negator. In both Halkomelem and Squamish, there is a proclitic subordinator (?a) t=, used primarily to introduce temporal adjuncts, which could be the source of the -*t* via reanalysis, though  $(?_{2})$  = induces either conjunctive inflection (in both Halkomelem and Squamish) or nominalized inflection (in Squamish), contrary to the indicative inflection in the Pattern C negative pattern. The meaning of the two patterns is also divergent. In Upriver Halkomelem, ?ówo-1 is generally translated as "never, whereas in Squamish, ga*t* appears to be used as an aspectual variant of ordinary negation, giving a habitual or generic cast to a negative sentence (Gillon 2001).

#### 2.4 **Historical considerations**

Given the three major patterns of negation outlined above, the question arises as to which, if any of them, represents the original situation in Salish.

Kroeber (1999: 248) plumps (somewhat hesitantly) for Pattern B, mainly on the grounds that there is no obvious etiology for the conjunctive negative construction in the history of Salish (see also footnote 3). However, it seems to me that a much stronger case for Proto-Salish status can be made for Pattern A, which is instantiated in all major branches of the family. Only in peripheral areas (the extreme northern sector of Central Salish, Bella Coola, and Tillamook) is it entirely absent.<sup>6</sup>

Pattern C is rather clearly innovative. It has arisen (presumably by separate developments) in every branch of the family save perhaps Tsamosan (which we don't know much about) and the Northern Interior (which in other respects - e.g. subject inflection - is also the most conservative branch of the family). The widespread development of monoclausal negation across Salish has typological implications: it suggests that the biclausal Pattern A is diachronically unstable, which is consonant with its cross-linguistic rarity (see Section 2.5 below).

This leaves us with the puzzle of how Pattern B might have developed from Pattern A. Here is one possible (though necessarily speculative) scenario. In most of Central Salish, conjunctive inflection is commonly induced by reflexes of the irrealis proclitic \*wa= (Kroeber 1999:147). This proclitic also shows up in negative contexts in Lushootseed (see example (6) above), which is conservative in retaining Pattern A as its principal means of negation. Since Pattern A involves nominalized rather than conjunctive inflection, this leads to a tension between the selectional requirements of the

?axॅ<sup>w</sup> itnuxalkmxaylayx\*(-s)

(i)

"This man does not know how to speak Bella Coola."

61

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Even in Be, Davis and Saunders (1997: 170) remark that of the two variants of intransitive third person predicates, only -s (historically derived from the third person possessive -s standardly employed in nominalized subordinate clauses) is allowed in negative contexts, whereas  $-\phi$  (historically derived from the  $-\emptyset$  third person universally employed in indicative intransitive main clauses) is ungrammatical:

ti=?imlk-ťayx (Be: Davis and Saunders know.how.to speak.Nuxalk-3SG.SU DET=man=DET 1997: 170) NEG

It is just possible, as suggested by Kroeber (1999: 248) that this -s is derived instead from the Proto-Salish third person conjunctive subject \*-(w)as. This would explain the absence of the nominalizer s-, otherwise pervasively present in subordinate environments in Bella Coola. However, since there is no other evidence for any vestige of the conjunctive in Bella Coola, this speculation, as Kroeber points out, is "tenuous at best".

negative predicate (or more likely, the determiner/complementizer which it selects) and the irrealis proclitic: the former requires a nominalized clause, the latter a conjunctive clause. The tension can be resolved in two ways: by suppressing the requirements of the irrealis particle, and retaining nominalized inflection (i.e., Pattern A); or by suppressing the requirements of the determiner, and retaining conjunctive inflection (i.e., Pattern B).<sup>7</sup>

There are a couple of potential objections to this story. Most obviously, we should find reflexes of the irrealis particle in negative structures in Pattern B languages: but they are unattested in negative environments in Halkomelem, Sechelt, and Comox, as far as I am aware. I do not think this is a fatal objection, however, particularly since this account does explain the otherwise anomalous Pattern B' characteristic of Squamish, where an irrealis particle (q) is indeed obligatorily present. I suspect that the loss of the irrealis proclitic in Pattern B languages is correlated with an independent change from biclausal to monoclausal status, signaled most obviously by the loss of any subordinating element and the appearance of indicative subject clitics adjacent to the negator (recall that this is impossible in Squamish which, by hypothesis, retains a biclausal pattern of negation).

In any case, it does seem clear that two independent developments conspired to create Pattern B negation: the collapse of biclausal negation, and the conversion of nominalized to conjunctive inflection. Both developments are attested independently in Salish. The collapse of biclausal negation is found in all cases of Pattern C negation. The conversion of nominalized to conjunctive inflection is less conspicuous, but observable in contemporary Lower (Mount Currie) Lillooet, where in nominalized subordinate clauses with an elided progressive auxiliary (including but by no means confined to those selected by negation) conjunctive subject enclitics are acceptable alternatives to possessive subject clitics, as shown in (36-37).<sup>8</sup>

- x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>=ət=wá ?ac'x-ən-twál  $d=nuk^w=as$ . 36. NEG DET=(NOM)=1PL.CN.SU=PROG see-TR-REC IRR=other=3CN.SU la<sup>°w</sup>-ílx wá?=tkat=tu? knáti? PROG=1PL.SU=PAST DEIC hide-AUT "We couldn't see each other sometimes, we hid ourselves."
- 37. čúk<sup>w</sup>-š=kan n=šk<sup>w</sup>zúšm=a t=š**=án**=a finish-CAU=1SG.SU ISG.POSS-work=EXIS DET=NOM=(PROG)1SG.CN.SU=EXIS káľəm wait "I finished my work while I was waiting."

Before leaving the arena of diachronic speculation, it is worth making one additional point, namely that there is rather a poor fit between the form of a negative element and its syntactic behavior.<sup>9</sup> Setting aside Tsamosan and Tillamook, there are only four main negative etyma in Salish, two centred on the coast ( $*x^wa$ ? and \*?awa) and two in the interior (\*ta? and \*lut). None of them is uniquely associated with a particular pattern of negation, as shown in the table in (38).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The reader may be wondering what happens in Lushootseed. The answer seems to be that there is a loosening of the selectional requirements of the irrealis proclitic  $g^{w}$  =, which appears not only with conjunctive and nominalized complements, but also with indicative clauses. See Kroeber (1999: 149).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Strang Burton informs me that he has observed a similar phenomenon in Upriver Halkomelem.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The same point is made for Central Salish by Kroeber (1999: 159).

B B' C A \*x<sup>w</sup>a?  $\sqrt{}$  $\sqrt{}$  $\sqrt{}$ \*?áwa  $\sqrt{}$ V  $\sqrt{}$  $\sqrt{}$ \*ta --\*lut \_ -

The missing cells in Patterns B and B' simply reflect the fact that these two patterns do not occur in the interior, where the negative etyma \*ta? and \*lut are exclusively found.

At this point, I have established the primacy of Pattern A negation across Salish, and (I hope) made a strong case for its existence in Proto-Salish. In the next sections, I will conduct a more thorough examination of the syntax of Pattern A negation, using Lillooet as the language of investigation, before returning to the issue of the relation between the different negation patterns in Salish, and their broader typological and theoretical import.

## **3** Pattern A negation in Lillooet (St'át'imcets)

My goals in this section are to provide a more detailed picture of how Pattern A negation works in Salish, and to provide the beginnings of a formal account. I will employ data from Lillooet to exemplify the discussion; as far as I can ascertain, both Thompson and Shuswap show similar behaviour.

I will proceed as follows. In Section 3.1, I will present evidence that propositional (simple) negation in Lillooet is indeed biclausal. In 3.2, I will show that the negator in Lillooet is also used productively in negative existential constructions. I will then provide the outline of a unified analysis of propositional and existential negation, employing Arregui and Matthewson's (2001) analysis of nominalized clauses as (characteristic functions of) sets of minimal situations. In 3.3 I will discuss two pieces of evidence which seem to show that the clausal boundary in Lillooet negative constructions is 'permeable': demonstrative clitic pronouns may climb out of the subordinate clause, and ergative subjects in a subordinate clause must take scope over a higher negator. Finally, in 3.4, I will deal with two negative aspects of negation in Lillooet (and, indeed, throughout the family): the absence of constituent negation and the absence of focus-related negation.

## 3.1 Evidence for biclausality in Lillooet negation

Lillooet, like its Northern Interior relatives Thompson and Shuswap, exemplifies Pattern A negation. In propositional negative contexts, the negative element  $x^{w}az$ precedes a nominalized subordinate clause introduced by the determiner/complementizer  $k^{w}$ .<sup>10</sup>

39.	x*?az	k <sup>w</sup> =a=š	č?aš"
	NEG	DET=(NOM)=PROG=3POSS	come
	"S/he's no	t coming."	

40.	x*?az	<b>k™=š=</b> ?áċx-ən-aš	ti=šqáyx <sup>w</sup> =a
	NEG	DET=NOM=know-TR=3.TR.SU	DET=man=EXIS
	"S/he didn	i't see the man."	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Davis and Matthewson (1996) argue that  $k^w$  is a prosodically conditioned allomorph of the non-referential determiner  $k^w u$ .

38.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Subject clitics, determiners and the nominalizer  $\breve{s}$ = frequently fuse with the progressive auxiliary wa(?), as in (39) and (40); see also (36) and (37).

41. š=wa?-min-túmut-aš, Χu? **x<sup>w</sup>?uz k<sup>w</sup>=n=š=**wa nit FOC NOM=be-REL-1.PL.OBJ-3TR.SU but NEG DET=1SG.POSS=NOM=PROG ləxláx-š t=k<sup>w</sup>ín=aš mága? remember-CAU IRR=how.many=3CN.SU snow "So then she stayed with us, but I don't remember for how many years." (literally, "snows")

Three types of evidence lead to the conclusion that negation involves a biclausal structure in Lillooet. First, the negative element  $x^{w?az}$  behaves morphologically and syntactically like an (impersonal) intransitive main predicate. Second, the nominalized clause which accompanies sentential negation is the standard means of finite complementation in Lillooet. And third, quantificational expressions in the negated clause normally take only narrow scope with respect to negation; this follows immediately if Quantifier Raising is clause-bound (as is normally assumed) and negation is in a higher clause.

We will look at these three types of evidence in 3.1.1 - 3.1.3, respectively.

#### **3.1.1** Negation is predicative in Lillooet

The following evidence shows us that the negative element  $x^{w}az$  is predicative:

(i)  $x^w ?az$  participates freely in derivational processes characteristic of other intransitive verbs, including inchoative formation by glottal infixation (42), out-of-control formation with the clitic combination ka...a (43), and affixation of regular causative and directive transitivizers (44-45).

42.	kama†=á=həṁ but=EXIS=ANTI <b>x™d-?-əż</b> =iż	?ay⁴ then	†k <sup>w</sup> únša now tákəm	plan already	wa? PROG
	NEG+INC=PL.DEM		all		
	"But today they hav	e all dis	appeared." (i.	e. "Today they	have all become not")
43.	ka= x <sup>w</sup> áż=a=tú?=a				(van Eijk 1986: 203)
	<b>OOC=NEG=OOC</b> =F "He disappeared, he	AST=EXI e passed	S away." (i.e.	"He became n	ot.")
44.	<b>x<sup>w</sup>?av-š-</b> tumút-aš		k <sup>w</sup> =a≕š		núk <sup>w</sup> ?-an-čim
	NEG-CAU-1PL.OB-3 "He wouldn't let us	TR.SU help you	DET=(NOM) 1." (i.e. "He c	=PROG=3POSS aused us to not	help-TR-2SG.PAS thelp you.") <sup>12</sup>
45.	<b>x<sup>w</sup>aż-ań</b> láti?	i=š-m	∋č-xál-šw=a!		
	NEG-TR there	PL.DE	T=NOM-write	-ACT-2SG.POS	S=EXIS
	"Erase what you wi	ote there	!" (i.e. "Caus	e what you hav	ve written to be not.")

(ii)  $x^{w}az$  can be modified by sentence level auxiliaries (46-47), just like any other main predicate, while it cannot be an auxiliary itself (48).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Note z --> y / \_\_š regularly in Lillooet. The basic negative morpheme  $x^w?az$  (probably borrowed from a coastal language, either Comox or Sechelt) has a large number of allegro and casual speech variants, including  $x^w?ay$ , ?az, ?ay, and ?a.

46. lan x<sup>w</sup>?αz k<sup>w</sup>=n=š=?álṣ∧m already NEG DET=1SG.POSS=NOM=sick "I've finished being sick."

- 47. plán=tu? x<sup>w</sup>?az already=PST NEG "It's already gone."
- 48. \* **x<sup>w</sup>?dz=tkan** x<sup>w</sup>uż naš NEG=1SG.SU gonna go "I'm not going to go."<sup>B</sup>

## 3.1.2 $k^{w}$ +nominalization is the standard means of clausal subordination in Lillooet

There is nothing exceptional about the subordinate clause that follows the negative predicate in Lillooet.  $k^{w+s}$  clauses are used in almost all cases where English would employ a *that* clause (49-50), as well as in a variety of less familiar contexts, such as the complements to impersonal interrogative, quantificational and manner predicates (51-53, respectively). (See also van Eijk 1997: 233 ff, Davis and Matthewson 1996).

- 49. qanı́m=tkan **k<sup>w</sup>=š**=núk<sup>w</sup>?-an-ax<sup>w</sup> ni=n-šqácəz?=a hear=1SG.SU **DET=NOM=**help-TR-2SG.TR.SU DET=1SG.POSS-father=EXIS "I heard that you helped my father." (van Eijk 1997: 233)
- 50. zewát-ən=tkan k<sup>w</sup>=š=<sup>3</sup>kiq=š know-TR=1SG.SU DET=NOM=get.here=3POSS "I know that he's arrived." (van Eijk 1997: 233)
- 51. kan **k<sup>w</sup>=**á=šu k<sup>w</sup>ú†ən-š-tumx is.it.the.case **DET=(NOM)=**PROG=2SG.POSS borrow-CAU-1SG.OB ta=káh-šw=a DET=car=2SG.POSS=EXIS "Can you lend me your car?"
- 52. cw?it=ka k<sup>w</sup>=š=kak=š many=MOD DET=NOM=go.by=3POSS "It seems that she went by a bunch of times." (van Eijk 1997: 233)

53. š-kənkin **k**<sup>w</sup>=a=š tq-álk-əm k=Mary STA-slow **DET=(NOM)=**PROG=3POSS touch-string-MID DET=Mary "Mary drives slowly."

<sup>13</sup> I have one textual example (from a Lower Lillooet speaker) of a subject clitic appearing adjacent to  $x^w$ ?az:

(i) paq<sup>w</sup>u?=tkán=žu?, (nit) š=?dz=kan š=tsicw ?i?wa? múta?. afraid=1SG.SU=PART (FOC) NOM=NEG=1SG.SU NOM=go.there accompany again "I was scared, so I didn't go along (with him) there again."

Occasionally, this type of structure is also produced by Lower Lillooet speakers in elicitation contexts:

(ii)	?á=kan	ka=?™úỷt=a
	NEG=1SG.SU	OOC=sleep=OOC
	"I can't sleep."	-

However, the same speakers reject this construction as substandard. The consultant who produced (ii) later commented: "No. It's not a very good sentence. You probably can say it but... probably cutting things short."

# 3.1.3 Negation takes scope over quantifiers in Lillooet

In St'át'imcets, non-quantified DPs with the assertion-of-existence determiners ti/ta (singular) and 2i (plural) generally take maximally wide scope, as shown in (54): see Matthewson (1998, 1999) for analysis. However, when DPs (normally of type e) are type-shifted into generalized quantifiers (of type <et, t>) by the addition of an overt quantifier (e.g. takam "all"), they then take *low* scope with respect to negation (55). The only way to get the quantifier to take scope over the negator is to left-dislocate it overtly, as in (56).

- 54.?áy=žu?k<sup>w</sup>=š=ćaq<sup>w</sup>-aň-ítaš?i=šyeqyáqč?=aNEG=PARTDET=NOM=eat-TR-3PL.TR.SUPL.DET=women=EXIS?i=mikiláwšxən=aPL.DET=bannock=EXIS"(All) the women did not eat the bannock." (i.e. none of them did)
- 55. ?áy=žu? k<sup>w</sup>=š=čaq<sup>w</sup>-aň-ítaš
  NEG=PART DET=NOM=eat-DIR-3PL.TR.SU all
  ?i=mikiláwšxən=a
  PL.DET=bannock=EXIS
  "Not all the women ate the bannock."
- 56. tákəm ?i=šyeqyáqč?=a, ?áy=žu? k<sup>w</sup>=š=ċaq<sup>w</sup>-a'n-ítaš
  all PL.DET=women=EXIS NEG=PART DET=NOM=eat-DIR-3PL.TR.SU
  ?i=mikiláwšxən=a
  PL.DET=bannock=EXIS
  "All the women didn't eat the bannock."<sup>14</sup>

## 3.2 Negative predicates are negative existentials in St'át'imcets

In addition to normal sentential negation with a nominalized  $k^w$  clause, Lillooet freely forms negative existentials with  $x^w?az$  plus a DP introduced by the polarity determiner  $k^wu$ 

- 57. **x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>u=šx<sup>w</sup>əlá†p** NEG **DET=ghost** "Ghosts don't exist."
- 58. x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>u=wá? č?as
   NEG DET=PROG come
   "Noone is coming." (literally: "One who is coming doesn't exist.")
- 59. **x<sup>w</sup>?az** ?aył **k<sup>w</sup>u=**šćúq<sup>w</sup>aż l=ta=ščwáwx<sup>w</sup>=a **NEG** now **DET=fish** in=DET=creek=EXIS "There are no fish left in the creek now."
- 60. **x<sup>w</sup>?áy**=žu? **k<sup>w</sup>u**=?ačx-ən-táli **k<sup>w</sup>u**=štám NEG=PART DET=see-DIR-TOP DET=what "Noone saw anything." (literally: "There does not exist one who saw anything.")

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> The option of left dislocation is not possible for all speakers. Those who reject sentences like (56) simply give a plural DP (without *tákəm*) when asked to produce a sentence with a universal quantifier taking scope over negation.

What could be contributing the negative existential force to these sentences? There are only two possibilities (setting aside an unmotivated zero existential quantifier): the polarity determiner  $k^{w}u$  and the negative predicate itself. I assume that  $k^{w}u$  contributes no quantificational force of its own: see Davis (1999b).

But, now what about cases of propositional negation, such as those in (39-41)? We might say that the negator  $x^w?az$  is ambiguous between being a simple propositional operator and a negative existential quantifier. But that would simply be restating the facts. A more fruitful hypothesis, I suggest, is to treat  $x^w?az$  uniformly as a negative existential quantifier, and to treat cases of propositional negation as quantification over *events* rather than over *individuals* (or to be more precise, over *situations*, which contain both individuals and events).

This hypothesis has one immediate advantage: it provides a uniform treatment for the  $k^w$  in sentential nominalization and the polarity determiner  $k^w u$  found in negative existential constructions. Since by hypothesis,  $k^w u$  is semantically vacuous, so is  $k^w$ . The claim that the two are identical has been made previously by Davis and Matthewson (1996, 1997). Under their analysis,  $k^w u \dots k^w / \__clitic$ , where "clitic" includes the nominalizer as well as proclitic possessive subject clitics such as n = "first person singular".

### **3.2.1** Prolegomena to a formal account of negation in Lillooet

While a full formal semantic treatment of predicate negators as negative existential quantifiers will have to await future work, I give some pointers here as to what such an account might look like. The framework is that of Arregui and Matthewson (2001), adapting work of Zucchi (1989) on nominalization.

Arregui and Matthewson make use of the following elements in their analysis:

61. a set of possible situations S (corresponding to the semantic type s) a set of possible individuals I (corresponding to the semantic type e) a partial ordering on the set of situations and individuals < the set of maximal elements with respect to the ordering relation, or the set of possible worlds

Of foremost interest to us is the fact that the set I contains both ordinary individuals and events (in other words, events are a subtype of individuals). This clears the way for a unified analysis of negation as negative existential quantification over variables of type e. However, before such a move can be made, it is necessary to give a semantic representation for nominalized clauses. As Arregui and Matthewson point out, nominalized clauses in Salish contain full propositions, which, by hypothesis, denote sets of possible situations. They propose that the function of the sentential nominalizer in Lillooet is to strip away all *non-minimal* situations, as schematized in (62).

62.  $[[s]] = \lambda P < s, t > \lambda s [P(s) \& \forall s'[P(s') \& s' < s] \rightarrow s' = s]$ (abbreviated to:  $\lambda P \lambda s [P(s) \& min(s)]$ )

Once the non-minimal situations are stripped away from the denotation of the embedded proposition, the situation is effectively indistinguishable from the event itself, since minimal situations that contain a particular subevent will have no proper subpart that also contains the event. As Arregui and Matthewson put it,

In fact, the minimal situations that contain such events will turn out to be extensionally indistinguishable from the events themselves. When we talk about a minimal situation containing an event we are, in a sense, referring to one individual twice, once under the guise of an event, and once under the guise of a situation. Given this view of situations and events, a property of minimal situations turns out to be extensionally equivalent to a property of events. (Arregui and Matthewson 2001).

We can now define  $x^{w}az$  as in (63):

63.  $[[\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}}] = \lambda p < s, t > \forall s[p(s) = \emptyset]$ 

i.e. no situation is such that p.

Since situations contain both minimal individuals and minimal events,  $x^{w}az$  is treated uniformly as a negative existential quantifier, which 'unselectively' quantifies over events or individuals, by quantifying uniformly over minimal situations.<sup>15</sup>

## 3.3 Monoclausal aspects of biclausal negation in Lillooet

So far, I have motivated a biclausal analysis for Lillooet and provided a uniform account for the predicate negator  $x^{w?az}$  as a negative existential quantifier. In this section, I will discuss some evidence that shows that the clausal boundary between the higher negative predicate and its complement clause is permeable to certain syntactic processes. I will present two such cases. First, in negative structures, demonstrative pronominal enclitics clitics may climb from the complement clause into the main clause (3.3.1); and second, ergative subjects in the complement clause must take scope over a predicate negator in a higher clause (3.3.2). Both these phenomena point to a certain instability in Pattern A (biclausal) negation, which has implications both for the collapse of Pattern A in Salish, and, from a broader typological perspective, for its overall cross-linguistic scarcity (see Section 4.2 below).

## 3.3.1 Clitic climbing

In Lillooet, demonstrative pronouns either occupy argument positions, just like regular DPs, as in (64) or alternatively (and more frequently) they encliticize to the first predicative element in the clause, as shown in (65); see Matthewson and Davis (1995) for details.

64.	wa? PROG "So the	wa? ?ayf ka=?an PROG then OOC=b "So then those ones go		?iź those		
65	հմմ–4ե	can=?i	nas	?uížwaľ-š	?skw?ií	š?íš

65.	húỷ=†kan <b>=?iż</b>	nas	?úžwaľ-š	?əkʷ?ú	š?íštkən=a
	going.to=1SG.SU=those	go	home-CAU	over.to	pit.house=EXIS
	"I'm going to take those	home t	o the pit-house."		

(Both examples are from the van Eijk and Williams 1981).

In negative clauses, however, demonstratives typically encliticize to the higher negative predicate, as in the (a) examples in (66-67) below, though they may also attach to the lower negated predicate, as in the (b) examples.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> I continue to treat the determiner  $k^{wu}$  as semantically vacuous: it therefore has no effect on negative existential quantification.

- 66. (a) x<sup>w</sup>?áz**=ti**? k<sup>w</sup>=š=wənáx<sup>w</sup> NEG**=that** DET=NOM=true
  - (b) x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>=š=wənáx<sup>w</sup>=ti? NEG DET=NOM=true=that "That's not true."
- 67. (a) x<sup>w</sup>?áz**=?iž** k<sup>w</sup>=š=šlalíltəm-š NEG**=that** DET=NOM=parent-3POSS "Those aren't his parents."
  - (b) x<sup>w</sup>?áz k<sup>w</sup>=š=šlalíltəm-š=**?iž** NEG DET=NOM=parent-3POSS=that "Those aren't his parents."

In the (a) cases, the demonstrative clitic has 'climbed' out of the lower clause, indicating that the clause boundary is not a barrier to clitic movement.

Interestingly, this possibility is only available to demonstratives. First and second person subject clitics cannot in general appear adjacent to the negator, as discussed in footnote 11; and DP subjects cannot climb out of the negated clause either, as shown in the contrast between (68a) and (68b).

68.	(a) ??	x <sup>w</sup> ?az	ti?=k <sup>w</sup> u=k <sup>w</sup> úk <sup>w</sup> pi?	k <sup>w</sup> =š=?áma
		NEG	that=DET=chief	DET=NOM=good

(Consultant's comment: "Awkward. I wouldn't say it. If it's a good speaker, you'd understand it.")

(b) x<sup>w</sup>?áz=ti? k<sup>w</sup>=š=?áma k<sup>w</sup>u=k<sup>w</sup>úk<sup>w</sup>pi? NEG=that DET=NOM=good DET=chief "That chief is no good."

In the (a) case, the whole DP, including the demonstrative, has been raised to a position adjacent to the negator: the result is clumsy at best, and never produced spontaneously. In (b), just the demonstrative has clitic-climbed to the higher negative clause, stranding the DP which it is associated with in the argument position of the embedded clause: the result is perfectly grammatical, and is in fact the usual form volunteered for this kind of sentence.

There is one other type of nominal element which can sometimes appear in the negating rather than the negated clause: the class of independent pronouns. The following examples show the independent pronoun šnuwa, used for emphasis, appearing adjacent to the negative predicate.

- 69. x<sup>w</sup>?az šnúwa k<sup>w</sup>=a=šu nkyap NEG you DET=PROG=(NOM)=2SG.POSS coyote "YOU're not a coyote." (van Eijk and Williams 1981: 3)
- 70. x<sup>w</sup>?áz=həm šnúwa k<sup>w</sup>=á=šu NEG=ANTI you DET=PROG=(NOM)=2SG.POSS xáλ-min k<sup>w</sup>=n=š=naš want-RED DET=1SG.POSS=NOM=go "But YOU don't want me to go."

These examples are interesting because here, unlike with demonstrative enclitics, the independent pronoun doubles a clitic subject in the lower negated clause. These cases thus formally resemble Pattern B negation (though in Pattern B a clitic rather than an independent pronoun doubles the embedded subject). As such, they provide a conceivable 'missing link' between Pattern A and Pattern B, though it should be pointed out that there is a plausible alternative analysis where the independent pronouns (which are inherently contrastive) are inserted parenthetically into the higher clause rather than being raised syntactically.

## 3.3.2 Ergative subjects under negation

The determiner  $k^{w_u}$  is licensed in a variety of non-argument environments in Lillooet (see Matthewson 1998, Davis 1999b), but in argument positions, its distribution is limited to the c-command domain of a set of non-factual operators, including modals (71), question operators, intensional verbs, and negation (72) (hence the name 'polarity determiner'). In the absence of a licensing operator, polarity  $k^{w_u}$  is ungrammatical (73).

- 71. č?áš=**kə† k<sup>w</sup>u=**zúš-xal come=might **DET**=tie-ACT "A policeman (literally, "one who ties people up") might come."
- 72. **x<sup>w</sup>?az** k<sup>w</sup>=š=č?aš **k<sup>w</sup>u=**zúš-xal NEG DET=NOM=come **DET=**tie-ACT "No policeman came."
- 73. \* č?aš **k<sup>w</sup>u=**zúš-xal come **DET=**tie-ACT "A policeman is coming."

Though quite capable of licensing  $k^{w}u$  on an intransitive subject, as shown in (72), negation has the peculiarity that it cannot license  $k^{w}u$  on a lower transitive (ergative) subject, as illustrated in (74-76).<sup>16</sup>

74. \* ?áy=žu? k<sup>w</sup>=š=?áčž-ən-č-aš k<sup>w</sup>u=šqáyx<sup>w</sup> NEG=PART DET=NOM=see-TR-1SG.OBJ-3TR.SU DET=man "No man saw me."

(Consultant's comment: "Doesn't make sense...with  $k^w u$ , you don't even know if there's such a man.")

75. \* **x<sup>w</sup>?áz**=<sup>x</sup>u? k<sup>w</sup>=š=q<sup>w</sup>uš-xit-ítaš k<sup>w</sup>u=míža† **k<sup>w</sup>u=**šáma? NEG=PART DET=NOM=shoot-IND-3TR.SU DET=bear DET=white.person "No white people shot a bear."

(Consultant's comment: "I think that  $k^w u = \tilde{s} a ma n r r$  throws it off.")

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> The judgements here are delicate, but speakers rarely accept the starred sentences in (74-76). Moreover, even speakers who sometimes accept these sentences never volunteer them spontaneously: they either produce paraphrases with subjects marked by the plural existence-asserting determiner ?i, or alternatively maintain a  $k^{wu}$  subject but use an active intransitive instead of a transitive predicate.

 76. \* ?áy=<sup>x</sup>u? k<sup>w</sup>=š=k<sup>w</sup>ánən-š-aš k<sup>w</sup>u=šcúq<sup>w</sup>aż k<sup>w</sup>u=?úx<sup>w</sup>almix<sup>w</sup> NEG=PART DET=NOM=catch-CAU-3TR.SU DET=fish DET=person "Nobody caught a fish."

Continuing to assume that polarity  $k^w u$  is licensed by a c-commanding operator, it must be the case that ergative subjects raise at Logical Form to a position outside the ccommand domain of the negator. There is evidence that this movement is unbounded: inserting an intermediate intransitive predicate between the negator and the ergative subject does not enhance grammaticality (77); neither does inserting a  $k^w u$  subject higher in the tree and coindexing it with a lower ergative *pro*, as in (78).

- 77. \* ?áy=Xu? k<sup>w</sup>=n=š=čut k<sup>w</sup>=š=k<sup>w</sup>ánən-š-aš
  NEG=PART DET=NOM=say DET=NOM=catch-CAU-3TR.SU k<sup>w</sup>u=šcúq<sup>w</sup>aż k<sup>w</sup>u=?úx<sup>w</sup>almix<sup>w</sup> DET=fish DET=person "I didn't say anybody caught a fish."
- 78. \* ?áy=žu? k<sup>w</sup>=š=čut k<sup>w</sup>u=?úx<sup>w</sup>almix<sup>w</sup> k<sup>w</sup>=š=k<sup>w</sup>ánən-š-aš
   NEG=PART DET=NOM=say DET=person DET=NOM=catch-CAU-3TR.SU k<sup>w</sup>u=šcúq<sup>w</sup>aż
   DET=fish
   "Nobody said they caught a fish."

It turns out, however, that this behaviour is not confined to negative clauses. If we substitute the interrogative predicate *kan* "is it the case that?" for negation, we get the same results:

79. \* kan k<sup>w</sup>=š=k<sup>w</sup>ánən-š-aš k<sup>w</sup>u=šċúq<sup>w</sup>aż k<sup>w</sup>u=?úx<sup>w</sup>almix<sup>w</sup> INT=PART DET=NOM=catch-CAU-3TR.SU DET=fish DET=person "Did anybody catch a fish?"

(Consultant's comment: "Not too clear.")

Similarly for kán=as=ka "I wonder if...":17

80. \* **kán=aš=ka** k<sup>w</sup>=š=k<sup>w</sup>ánən-š-aš k<sup>w</sup>u=šċúq<sup>w</sup>aż **INT**=3CN.SU=APPAR DET=NOM=catch-CAU-3TR.SU DET=fish **k<sup>w</sup>u=**?úx<sup>w</sup>almix<sup>w</sup> **DET**=person "I wonder if anybody caught a fish."

(Consultant's comment: "It would have to be a specific person.")

In other words, the ungrammaticality of an ergative  $k^wu$ -marked subject is not a property of negation, but reflects the broader generalization that ergative subjects must take wide scope with respect to all operators, whereas DPs marked with polarity  $k^wu$  must be licensed by a c-commanding operator. In this case, therefore, negation acts the same way as other biclausal structures containing non-factual operators.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> As far as I can tell, the same generalization holds for modal enclitics such as ka "apparently", kat "will, might", ka "should, would", and (more tenuously) for the question enclitic *ha*. This finding is contrary to Matthewson (1998: Chapter 4). More work is needed here.

### 3.4 Other aspects of Pattern A negation

In this section I will discuss two other important (negative) aspects of Pattern A negation: the lack of constituent negation and the lack of focus-related negation.

## 3.4.1 No constituent negation

There is no constituent negation in Lillooet, nor in any other Pattern A language (nor, as far as I can tell, in any other Salish language). There is thus no direct equivalent of English *no X*, *not every X*, *not a single X*, and so on; these are translated into Lillooet with periphrastic constructions involving the clausal negator  $x^w?az$  (see (57-60) for some examples).

There is an obvious connection between this lacuna and another more famous one: the absence of determiner quantifiers in Salish (Jelinek 1995, Matthewson 1998). In fact, he absence of negative determiner quantifiers such as *no X* simply falls out from this broader generalization. The only cases of constituent negation not accounted for by the general absence of determiner quantifiers are those where a quantifier is adjoined to the whole DP, as described by Matthewson (1998). This option, however, is limited to strong (presuppositional) quantifiers such as *tákəm* "all", and strong (presuppositional) readings of weak quantifiers such as *x<sup>w</sup>?it* "many". If negation in Lillooet acts like a weak rather than a strong quantifier (as is standardly assumed for existential quantifiers, including negative existentials) the only relevant case is the strong reading of weak quantifiers, where a weak quantifier adopts both the syntax and semantics of a strong quantifier.

In view of this, examine the paradigm in (81-84).

- 81. x<sup>w</sup>?it [?i= $\lambda$ íq=a šqayx<sup>w</sup>] many [PLDET=came=EXIS man] "There were many men who came."
- 82. x<sup>w</sup>?az [k<sup>w</sup>u= Xiq k<sup>w</sup>u=šqáyx<sup>w</sup>] NEG [DET=came DET=man]
   "There were no men who came."
- 83. [x<sup>w</sup>?it ?i=šqáyx<sup>w</sup>=a] Xiq [many PLDET=man=EXIS] came "Many (of the) men came."
- 84. \* [x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>u=šqáyx<sup>w</sup>] <sup>\*</sup>Xiq [NEG DET=man] came "No(ne of the) men came."

(Consultant's translation: "Any man didn't come.")

In (81-82) I use the quantifier  $x^{w}?it$  "many" to illustrate the 'weak' reading of weak quantifiers, where the quantifier is the main predicate of the sentence (i.e., a cardinality predicate) and its single argument is a (head-final) relative clause. As (82) shows, negation is quite happy in this structure. In (83-84), in contrast, I show the 'strong' reading of weak quantifiers, where the quantifier takes two arguments, one acting as its restriction, the other its nuclear scope, and the quantifier and the restriction are obligatorily fronted to a position before the main predicate. Negation is ungrammatical in this structure, as shown in (84).

What this seems to show is that the negative existential quantifier in Lillooet is *always* weak. Semantically, this means it can never be part of a generalized quantifier, nor have a presuppositional reading (i.e., as "none of the...").

Nevertheless, there is one place where negation behaves rather differently. When paired with a WH-phrase such as *šwat* "who" or *štam* "what", it does appear with a restriction, as shown in the paradigm in (85-87):

85.	?a NEG "Noc	[k <sup>w</sup> u= šwát DET=who one saw any de	k <sup>w</sup> u=?aċx̃-ən-t DET=see-TRA- er."	táli •TOP	k <sup>w</sup> u=ćí?] DET-deer	
86.	?a NEG "No	[kʷu=šqáyxʷ DET=man man saw any d	k <sup>w</sup> u=?aćx-ən- DET=see-TR-T eer."	táli TOP	k <sup>w</sup> u=čí?] DET-deer	
87.	?a NEG "Not	k <sup>w</sup> u=šwát DET=who	[k <sup>w</sup> u=šqáyx <sup>w</sup> DET=man any deer "	k <sup>w</sup> u=? DET=s	acx-ən-táli ee-TR-TOP	k <sup>w</sup> u=cí?] DET-deer

The crucial case is in (87). By hypothesis, negation as a weak quantifier takes a single argument, which of course may be a relative clause. In (85) and (86) it is possible to bracket the strings following negation as relative clauses (more specifically, head initial relatives or 'REL1's, in the terminology of Demirdache and Matthewson 1995 and Matthewson and Davis 1995). However, there is no way of constructing a relative clause including  $k^w u = \delta w \delta t$  in (87): it follows that the latter must form a restriction for the negation, and as such, create a structure involving a negative generalized quantifier.

In fact, it is quite striking that the structure in (87) is completely unavailable for other weak quantifiers, including those which receive strong readings. Certainly, part of the reason for this is that on their indefinite readings, WH-phrases are polarity items, but even when a licensing context is supplied, quantifiers such as  $x^{w?it}$  never appear with a WH-indefinite restriction, as shown in (88). In contrast, the strong quantifier *tákəm* readily appears with a WH-indefinite restriction, with or without a polarity licenser, and both in fronted 'quantifier raised' positions (89) and (less frequently) in post-verbal argument positions (90).

88.	*	x <sup>w</sup> ?it(=kə†) many(=FUT) "Many people	šwat who will en	(k <sup>w</sup> u=)x <sup>w</sup> uż (DET=)going.t ter."	0	?u <sup>4</sup> x <sup>w</sup> enter
89.		tákəm(=kə†) many(=FUT) "Everyone wi	šwat who ll enter.	x <sup>w</sup> uż going.to "	?u⁴x <sup>w</sup> enter	
90.		?ácxॅ-ən≕tkan see-TR-1SG.SU "I saw everyo	PL.DET	?i=tákəm=a ∑=all=EXIS	who	šwat

(Note that though it is possible to insert  $k^w u$  between  $t a k \partial m$  and its WH-restriction, speakers usually prefer to leave it out, as in (89) and (90)).

Though negation resembles strong rather than weak quantifiers in being able to take a WH-indefinite restriction, this option is much more restricted than with  $t\acute{a}k \partial m$ . In particular, we never find [negation + WH-indefinite] in a post-predicative argument position, as shown in the contrast between (91) and (92).

- 91. x<sup>w</sup>?az šwat k<sup>w</sup>u=?ú<sup>4</sup>x<sup>w</sup> NEG who DET=enter "Nobody went in."
- 92. \* ?ú<sup>†</sup>x<sup>w</sup> (k<sup>w</sup>u=)x<sup>w</sup>?az šwat enter (DET=)NEG who "Nobody went in."

There is also an important difference in the distribution of determiners between the two cases. With negation,  $k^{wu}$  is obligatory between the negative quantifier and its nuclear scope; with tákəm, a determiner is ungrammatical.

- 93. \* x<sup>w</sup>?az šwat ?ú<sup>†</sup>x<sup>w</sup> NEG who enter "Nobody went in."
- 94. \* tákəm šwat ?i=?ú†x<sup>w</sup>=a NEG who PL.DET=enter=EXIS "Everybody went in."

Strong negative quantifiers of the form [NEG + WH-INDEF] therefore have an odd intermediate status: though they take a restriction (the indefinite WH-phrase) like generalized quantifiers, they are restricted to predicate as opposed to argument positions, and behave like weak rather than strong quantifiers in needing a determiner to link them to their nuclear scope. Obviously, more work needs to be done here: I will leave it for future research.

#### 3.4.2 No focus related negation

It has often been pointed out in the theoretical literature that a simple 'atomic' account of negation as a propositional operator runs into immediate trouble with respect to the interaction between focus and negation. (See e.g. Herburger 2000 and references therein). Bluntly put, negation in English does not appear to negate a whole proposition, but only the focused part; presupposed material escapes its scope. This is easy to see with contrastively focused material, as illustrated in (95):

- 95. (a) I didn't see Bill (I heard John).
  - (b) I didn't see *BILL* (I saw John).
  - (c) I didn't SEE Bill (I heard him).
  - (d) *BILL* didn't see me (John did).
  - (e) *I* didn't *SEE BILL* (Jane heard John).

Even with 'neutral' intonation, as in (a), the subject is generally part of the presupposition, rather than the focus; in fact, the only way to negate a whole proposition is to use a highly marked 'all focus' intonation, as in (e), which needs a particularly convoluted prior discourse context to become felicitous.

The familiar paradigm in (95) is not at all familiar in Salish. First, it is unclear whether there is any Salish equivalent to the Nuclear Stress Rule, which places a sentence-level accent on the most deeply embedded constituent in VP (see Cinque 1990 and references therein). Second, in English the sentence level negator *not* takes scope over the VP but excludes the subject; there is thus an alignment of negation with the nuclear scope (focus) of the sentence. But as we have seen, in Lillooet intransitive subjects are within the scope of the negator (though ergative subjects are not, as discussed in 3.3.2 above). Third, a consensus seems to be emerging that Salish languages lack contrastive stress (though conclusive evidence is not yet forthcoming). If so, the question arises as to whether there are any Salish equivalents of (95b-e), and if so, what they are.

In fact, Lillooet speakers given English sentences with contrastive intonation and negation either produce periphrastic alternatives with clefts, as shown in (96-97), or simply use ordinary word order (and intonation), as in (98).

96.	xw?az	k <sup>w</sup> =š=nit=č	š=Bill	k <sup>w</sup> u=?ácx̆-ən-an,		
	NEG	DET=NOM=FOC=3POSS	NOM=Bill	DET=see-TR-1SG.TR.SU		
	nit	š=John				
	FOC	NOM=John				
	"I didr	n't see BILL, but John."				

- 97. x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>=š=ni<sup>1</sup>=č š=Bill k<sup>w</sup>u=?áčx-ən-č-aš, NEG DET=NOM=FOC=3POSS NOM=Bill DET=see-TR-ISG.OBJ-3TR.SU ni<sup>1</sup> š=John FOC NOM=John "BILL didn't see me, but John did."
- 98. x<sup>w</sup>?az k<sup>w</sup>=š=?áčx-ən-an k<sup>w</sup>=š=Bill Xu? qahím-ənš=kan NEG DET=NOM=see-TR-ISG.TR.SU DET=NOM=Bill but hear=TR=ISG.SU "I didn't SEE Bill, I heard him."

When an argument is being contrastively focused, the usual strategy is to employ the focusing predicate *nit* to form what Kroeber (1999) refers to as an 'introduced cleft', as can be seen in (96) and (97). If the predicate itself is being focused, this strategy is unavailable, and speakers generally employ simple clausal negation, often with an appositional phrase, as in (98). Notice in all these cases, negation retains its standard form as a main predicate selecting a nominalized subordinate clause, and contrastive intonation in English is either translated using a structural focusing device (a cleft) or is simply ignored.

Does this mean that unlike in English, Salish negation is insensitive to focus? A full answer to this question is beyond the scope of this paper, but I think the brief answer is no. While Salish languages clearly don't use intonation to mark focus like English, they can - unlike English - make extensive use of null anaphora (*pro*) to encode presupposed material. In other words, Salish languages employ exclusively *deaccenting* rather than *accenting* strategies to articulate information structure. Being bound by an earlier discourse referent, *pro* always takes scope over negation.<sup>18</sup> If deaccenting involves evacuating the VP (as generally assumed in the literature) this further entails that *pro* is either base-generated outside or moves outside of VP (and higher than negation) in Salish, while full (invariably accented) DPs remain low, inside VP.<sup>19</sup> This is in essence the phrase structure representation proposed in a number of recent works on Salish, including Demirdache (1997), Davis (1999a) and Wiltschko (2000b).

These remarks are speculative, and exploring their implications would take us too far afield from our central topic. Accordingly, now that we have built up a relatively detailed picture of a Pattern A negation system in Salish, let us return to a wider view of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> This conjecture might also apply to ergative subjects, which, as we have seen, must take higher scope than negation at LF, whatever their surface position.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Things are not as simple as this bipartite representation assumes, though. Recall that DPs with assertionof-existence determiners take very wide scope, in spite of their VP-internal position.

the relation between the various negation patterns in Salish, their place in a typology of negation, and their theoretical status.

## 4 Diachronic, typological, and theoretical implications

In the last section, I argued that biclausal negation in Lillooet (and by hypothesis, in other Salish languages exemplifying Pattern A) involves a single, generalized, negative existential quantifier which quantifies over minimal situations.

In 4.1 I will return to the other two (and a half) negation patterns in Salish, to see to what extent this analysis holds for them, and if not, what changes might have taken place from the original Pattern A system.

In 4.2, I will take a wider look yet, briefly situating Salish biclausal negation in a cross-linguistic context, and more specifically comparing it to the only other language family where it has been discussed in detail, Polynesian.

And finally in 4.3, I will (very) briefly engage with the theoretical negation literature, touching mostly on the extent to which biclausal negation can be assimilated to current models based on better known languages.

## 4.1 Back across Salish

Recall the four patterns of negation we have identified across Salish:

Pattern A. [NEG [D/C [NOMINALIZED CLAUSE]]]

Pattern B. [NEG (SUCL) CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE]

Pattern B'. [NEG IRREALIS PARTICLE [CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE]]

Pattern C. [NEG (IRREALIS PARTICLE) INDICATIVE CLAUSE]

We have investigated the characteristics of Pattern A negation in detail in Section 3. There, I concluded:

- (i) that the Pattern A negator is syntactically a predicate (an intransitive impersonal verb)
- (ii) that Pattern A propositional negation is biclausal (the negator selects a subordinate clause)
- (iii) that Pattern A negators may also quantify over nominal constituents (including relative clauses)
- (iv) that Pattern A negators are semantically existential quantifiers over minimal situations

The question now arises as to how the other patterns differ. Obviously, I am not going to be able to go into the kind of detail that is necessary to provide a full comparison of the syntax and semantics of Pattern A negation with other patterns, partly because of the limited data available, partly for reasons of space. Rather, I will confine myself to some somewhat speculative remarks on what I think are useful avenues of comparison, and directions which further research might take. I will begin with Pattern B.

## 4.1.1 Further remarks on Pattern B negation

By far the most comprehensive and detailed look at Pattern B negation (and indeed, at any negation Pattern in Salish) is provided by Wiltschko (2000) in her study of Upriver Halkomelem negation. Wiltschko comes to the following conclusions:

- (i) the UHk negator is non-predicative: it is a functional head below C and above Agr(eement) (or Person Phrase, in her version of UHk clause structure)
- (ii) propositional negation in UHk is monoclausal

Both these conclusions are at odds with Pattern A negation as I have presented it. Two questions then arise: first, are these conclusions justified? And second, if so, how did this very different syntax develop from Pattern A?

As far as (i) goes, Wiltschko adduces the following arguments:

- (a) Negation is subject to head movement
- (b) Negation is subject to the effects of the Head Movement Constraint (HMC)
- (c) Negation fails to show predicate-argument flexibility (in that it cannot appear as an argument preceded by a determiner)

I believe arguments (a) and (b) could go either way. Since verbs are heads, they are just as liable to undergo head movement as the heads of independent functional projections (more so, given the usual assumptions that verbs in V-initial languages 'climb' the functional skeleton of the clause via head movement); exactly the same considerations apply to HMC effects, which will apply to predicative negation just as much as to nonpredicative negation.

As for the failure of UHk negation to appear as an argument, I suspect that there is an independent explanation for this: clauses can never be predicative, and thus predicateargument flexibility never applies to predicates which select clausal complements. This is not limited to the complements of negation: the same generalization applies to any predicate which selects a propositional complement, as illustrated by the Lillooet examples in (99), which involve the impersonal predicate  $\check{c}uk^w$  "to finish". Notice that though Lillooet clausal negation is robustly predicative, it doesn't show any predicateargument flexibility, either, as shown in (100).

99. čuk<sup>w</sup> k<sup>w</sup>=n-š=matq (a) finish DET=NOM=1SG.POSS=walk "I finished walking." (b) \* mátq=kan  $k^{w} = \check{s} = \check{c}uk^{w} (=\check{s})$ DET=NOM=finish(=3POSS) walk=1SG.SU "I finished walking." 100. x<sup>w</sup>?az (a) k<sup>w</sup>=n-š=matq DET=NOM=1SG.POSS=walk NEG "I didn't walk." (b) mátq=kan  $k^{w} = \check{s} = x^{w} ? az (=\check{s})$ DET=NOM=NEG(=3POSS) walk=1SG.SU

"I didn't walk."

However, in non-clausal cases of negation, it *is* possible to use negation as an argument in Lillooet, though the results are admittedly a little awkward, for semantic reasons.

- 101. (a) plan wa? x<sup>w</sup>?uz [nə†=šxatálam=a] kənč?áwna already PROG NEG [PL.DET=grizzly=EXIS] around.here "Grizzlies are already extinct (literally, "are already not") around here."
  - (b) šťatálam [nət=plán=a wa? x<sup>w</sup>?ɑz] kənč?áwna grizzly [PL.DET=already=EXIS PROG NEG] around.here "What are already extinct around here are grizzlies."

Thus, I do not think there is a convincing case against treating UHk negation as predicative. However, Wiltschko does provide a convincing case against auxiliary status for negation in UHk; which means that if it is a verb, negation must be the predicate of a higher clause, rather than occupying a monoclausal structure together with the main predicate and auxiliary. This takes us to (ii), where the bulk of Wiltschko's argumentation is directed. Her principal arguments for monoclausal negation are the following:

- (a) There is no determiner/complementizer intervening between negation and its complement
- (b) 'Doubled' subject inflection appears elsewhere in indubitably monoclausal structures in Uhk
- (c) Main clause rather than subordinate clause passive morphology appears on a negated passivized predicate

Argument (a) is obviously correct, and very clearly differentiates between Pattern A and pattern B negation. We will return to its implications below. Argument (b) is also correct, as far as it goes: monoclausal subject doubling structures are amply documented all across Salish, as pointed out in Davis (1999a). However, here I think Wiltschko has conflated two different types of subject doubling: the widespread doubling of subject clitics and subject suffixes which occurs in transitive clauses all across the family; and the doubling of two types of subject clitic (indicative and conjunctive) which is a unique (and puzzling) property of Pattern B negation. In fact, on a monoclausal account, Pattern B negation must involve *three*, not two, morphological instantiations of the subject in transitive clauses: a subject suffix associated with voice morphology, a conjunctive clitic generated in PerP, and the 'extra' indicative clauses in UHk, because the third person indicative subject clitic is Ø, and subject suffixes are confined to third person. Thus we get what appears to be a maximum of two subject inflections per clause, as shown in (102-103).

102.	?əwə≕čəx <sup>w</sup> NEG=2SG.SU "You don't like me.	li=x <sup>w</sup> AUX=2SG.CN.SU	X́ils-θ-àx like-TR-1SG.OBJ	(Galloway 1993: 186)
103.	?əwə=Ø NEG=3SU "S/he∕it/they doesn'	li=s AUX=3CN.SU t/don't like me."	X́ils-θ-àx-əs like-TR-ISG.OBJ-:	(Galloway 1993: 186) 3TR.SU

However, suppose we embed the entire structure in (103) beneath a complementizer or determiner which selects overt third person morphology. There are two possibilities here:

with a determiner which selects an embedded propositional complement, we will get nominalized inflection with third person possessive subject =s; on the other hand, with an irrealis complementizer such as w = or = t, we will get third person conjunctive subject =(a)s. Where will this subject inflection appear? The prediction is that it will replace the third person Ø-marked indicative subject in (103), either directly following negation or, if negation is modified by a preceding auxiliary, encliticized to the auxiliary instead. Here are the predicted sentences (the (a) cases with the enclitic attached directly to the negator, the (b) cases with the enclitic attached to a preceding auxiliary):

104. (a) ...kw=s=?ówə=s lí=s Xils-θ-áx-əs (predicted) ...DET=NOM=NEG=3POSS AUX=3CN.SU like-TR-1SG.OBJ-3TR.SU "...that he/she/it/they doesn't /don't like me."

(b) ...k<sup>w</sup>=s=li=s ?ówə lí=s Xils-θ-áx-əs (predicted) ...DET=NOM=AUX=3POSS NEG AUX=3CN.SU like-TR-1SG.OBJ-3TR.SU "...that he/she/it/they doesn't /don't like me."

105. (a) ...wə=?ówə=s li=s Xils-Θ-áx-əs (predicted) ...if=NEG=3CN.SU AUX=3CN.SU like-TR-1SG.OBJ-3TR.SU "...if he/she/it/they doesn't /don't like me."

(b) ...wə=li=s ?ówə lí=s Xils-O-àx-əs (predicted) ...if=AUX=3CN.SU NEG AUX=3CN.SU like-TR-1SG.OBJ-3TR.SU "...that he/she/it/they doesn't /don't like me."

Unfortunately, I have no data from UHk to either confirm or contradict this prediction. There are however some relevant Downriver (Musqueam) Halkomelem examples in Suttles (nd: Section 6.4.1), including one example involving a nominalized negated transitive predicate (106). Since there is no conjunctive negated transitive example in Suttles' data, I give a negated conjunctive intransitive example in (107).

106. k<sup>w</sup>téx<sup>w</sup>-t tə=sté?ex<sup>w</sup>ə<sup>†</sup> nem [?ə=]tə=sk<sup>w</sup>ul-éwtx<sup>w</sup>, ni=ct nem go [OBL=]DET=school-house AUX=1SG.SU go enter-TR DET=children Xa s=wə-?ówə=s k<sup>w</sup>ə́n-nəx<sup>w</sup>-əs ni=əs be.taken-TR-3TR.SU so NOM=EST-NEG=3POSS AUX=3CN.SU tə=s-və́0əs-s k<sup>w</sup>0=yawén-s-at DET=NOM-transmit-3POSS DET=ancestor-3POSS-PAST "We sent the kids to school so that they did not get the traditions of their ancestors."

107. wə=?śwé=əs əmi=əs x<sup>w</sup>ə-?ámət k<sup>w</sup>θə=?e-θiyéyə if=NEG=3CN.SU come=3CN.SU become-be.sitting DET=2POSS-friends ?əy yət and thereafter "If your friends do not come home, then..."

I think this data shows rather clearly that on a monoclausal analysis of Hk negation, not two but three separate loci of subject inflection will have to be identified. Moreover, two of those loci will host the *same* inflection – conjunctive enclitics, as shown in (107). On a biclausal analysis, neither of these undesirable consequences follows. Let us then turn to argument (c), the appearance of main clause rather than subordinate clause passive morphology in UHk negative clauses. As it stands, this is quite a compelling argument for a monoclausal analysis. Interestingly, however, there seems to be variation between Upriver and Downriver Halkomelem in this respect. Suttles (nd: 109) reports that in Musqueam (Downriver) Halkomelem, if there is no auxiliary, a passivized predicate under negation takes the subordinate passive marker, without the third singular conjunctive enclitic =(a)s, but if there is an auxiliary, =(a)s appears attached to the auxiliary, and the passivized predicate which follows receives *main clause* passive morphology. This curious pattern is illustrated in (108) and (109), from Suttles (nd: 109):

108. **?5w9**=ce?=me k<sup>w</sup>5c NEG=FUT=CERT look "I will not be seen..."

kʷə́c-n-é·l-t look-TR-ISG.OBJ**-SUB.PAS** 

109. **?śwə** ní⋅=s k<sup>w</sup>∋́c-n-è·l-əm NEG AUX=3CN.SU look-TR-1SG.OBJ-PAS "I am not seen..."

In this respect, it is noteworthy that the single example which Wiltschko provides is almost identical to (109), and involves both an auxiliary and main clause passive morphology:

109. **?śwa i=s** k<sup>w</sup>śc-l-èl-**ðm** (Wiltschko 2000:243) NEG AUX=3CN.SU look-TR-1SG.OBJ-PAS "I wasn't seen."

Summarizing, the status of negation in Hk is not as clearly monoclausal as claimed by Wiltschko. Of her three principal arguments, only one (the absence of a subordinating complementizer/determiner) goes through unconditionally. The second (the presence of double subject inflection elsewhere in the grammar) actually turns out to be an argument *against* monoclausal status, since not two but three separate subject inflections are detectably present in negative structures in Hk (demonstrably so in DHk, and by hypothesis, in UHk too). The third argument, based on the absence of subordinate passive morphology in negative structures, gives mixed results: here, the presence of an auxiliary on which to 'hang' conjunctive inflection seems to mitigate the need for subordinate passive in negative structures (again demonstrably in DHk, and by extension, also in UHk).<sup>20</sup>

Does this mean that we have run into a contradiction, with some diagnostics running one way, and some the other? I do not think so. Contemporary syntactic models actually provide us with a number of clausal projections of various 'sizes', and I think that what is at stake here is not an either/or issue of monoclausality versus biclausality, but a question of 'how big' the clausal projection beneath negation actually is. We can say with some confidence that it is not as big as a subordinate clause introduced by a determiner/complementizer, since the latter are systematically missing in Pattern B languages. But I think we should also say that it is big enough to hold a subject – hence the presence of the 'extra' subject inflection in Pattern B negation.

To make this concrete, let me provide an idea of the kind of clause structure I have in mind. I give my semi-biclausal version of the phrase structure of a Pattern B negative in (111), with Wiltschko's strictly monoclausal structure in (112) for comparison. (Note that I have re-christened Wiltschko's PersP IP, for ease of comparison; nothing crucial hinges on the label, as far as I can see).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> In this respect, it is worthy of note that auxiliaries in UHk seem to be becoming mere syntactic 'pegs', rather than semantically contentful elements. They are semi-obligatory and often interchangeable (Strang Burton, pc); and UHk seems to be developing its own version of Subject Auxiliary Inversion, most unusually for a Salish language.



In these diagrams,  $\phi_1$  stands for the optional subject clitic which surfaces adjacent to negation, and  $\phi_2$  stands for the obligatory conjunctive clitic which surfaces attached to the first verbal element below negation (either an auxiliary, if there is one, or the main verb, otherwise). EPP is the Extended Projection Principle, the condition that forces every clause to have a subject.

The most salient differences between the two representations are the following. First, whereas in (112) Wiltschko analyzes indicative subject clitics as inflected C(omplementizers), and conjunctive clitics as realizations of a lower I(nflectional) node, the model in (111) treats them both - along with possessive clitics - as realizations of I. Second, in Wiltschko's model, NEG(ation) heads a functional projection above I and below C. In the alternative model, negation is a V(erb) which selects a (fairly) small clausal complement (IP). The monoclausal versus (semi-)biclausal status of the two theories follows.

In terms of the empirical differences between the models, both account equally well for the absence of a determiner/complementizer in the complement to negation, but as I have argued above, the biclausal model handles the 'extra' subject inflection present in Pattern B more successfully than the monoclausal model. It is also worth pointing out that the two models deal with the optional nature of the higher subject clitic in a rather different fashion. In Wiltschko's model, the primary clausal inflection is the higher indicative ( $\phi_1$ ) subject, and the lower conjunctive ( $\phi_2$ ) subject is only inserted to 'save' the derivation when  $\phi_1$  is separated from the EPP subject by an intervening NEG projection. It is unclear, however, why  $\phi_1$  may subsequently delete. In the alternative biclausal model, the appearance of identical  $\phi$ -features in  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  is the result of an optional 'copy-raising' operation which replaces the impersonal (third person) subject (EPP subject<sub>2</sub>). This operation is thus a species of subject-to-subject raising - a process known independently to occur with higher negative predicates, as discussed in 4.2 below.

As for the puzzling passive data, it is unclear to me how either model is going to handle the auxiliary/non-auxiliary difference. Intuitively, when present in a negated passive clause, an auxiliary seems to mark the complement to negation as subordinate via a conjunctive clitic, alleviating the need for subordinate passive morphology on the main predicate; in the absence of an auxiliary, subordinate passive morphology is needed instead. While this seems to hint at biclausal status, it is quite hard to capture within the kind of model I have proposed in (111); on the other hand, I see no ready way to adapt the monoclausal model in (112) to accommodate this generalization, either. It would be interesting to see what happens in parallel cases in the other Pattern B languages Sechelt and Comox, both of which also have a main clause/subordinate clause distinction in passive morphology; unfortunately, I have no data from either language bearing on this issue.

To conclude: in this section I have argued in some depth that a strictly monoclausal analysis of Pattern B negation is too strong to handle the Hk facts. Instead, I have proposed that Pattern B involves a weakening of the strictly biclausal status of Pattern A negation via a reanalysis of the complement to the negative predicate, from a full CP to a bare IP, with subsequent optional raising of features of the subject of the complement clause to the subject of the main (negative) clause.

## 4.1.2 The development of negative existentials

Before leaving Pattern B, I would like to point out one other set of salient facts, which may be significant in accounting for the development of Pattern B (and Pattern C) negation from the strictly biclausal Pattern A.

In a number of Central Salish languages (including all the Pattern B languages, as well as Straits, whose primary mode of negation falls into Pattern  $C^{21}$ , a separate negative existential predicate has developed out of the all-purpose negator of Pattern A languages. In Halkomelem, the negative existential is ?dwate?, formed from the regular negator ?dwa plus te?, glossed by Suttles (nd) as "perhaps present, existent". Suttles remarks:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> The same is true of Tillamook, according to Paul Kroeber (pc).

Followed by a noun standing as a predicate complement (with no article or demonstrative), ?ówəte? has the sense *be none, be non-existent*, providing the negative counterparts of existential noun predicates..." (Suttles nd: 115)

Here are some examples from Suttles (nd: 115):

- 113. ?ówəte? strí•tkà• none streetcar "There was no streetcar."
- 114. ?ówəte? nə-sq<sup>w</sup>əméy none ISG.POSS-dog
  "I don't have a dog." (literally: "There is no my dog.")
- 115. ?ówəte? k<sup>w</sup>t=?ítət none DET=sleep "Nobody slept." (literally: "There was no that slept.")

The same pattern exists in Sechelt, where an element  $x^{wa} i x^{wa} i$  is used in negative existential clauses, distinct from the regular negators  $x^{wa} i$  and  $i x^{wa} i$ (Beaumont 1985).

116.	x <sup>w</sup> ák <sup>w</sup> ət	nə-tála	(Beaumont 1985: 52)
	none	1SG.POSS-money.	
	"I have no m	oney." (literally, "There is no my money.")	

117. x<sup>w</sup>á. x<sup>w</sup>ák<sup>w</sup>ət nə-táčtən (Beaumont 1985: 52) no none 1SG.POSS-knife.
"No. I don't have a knife." (literally, "No. There is no my knife.")

Straits Salish (Montler 1986, Galloway 1990) has also developed a negative existential, *?źwənə?*, from its regular negative predicate *?źwə*. The latter either takes a nominalized or a plain clause and thus appears to be in the process of changing from Pattern A to Pattern C, without passing through Pattern B.

118. ?ówənə?=qə? stén (Montler 1986: 215) none=EMP what "There *is* nothing."

119. ?śwənə? nə-s-čč-ít (Galloway 1990: 31) none 1SG.POSS-NOM-TR "I don't know him." (literally: "My knowing him doesn't exist.").

In contrast, the neighboring Central Salish language Lushootseed, which, recall, has maintained Pattern A negation, uses its regular negator  $x^{wi}$ ? freely in negative existential contexts, as in Lillooet.

120.	x <sup>w</sup> i?	k <sup>w</sup> i=g <sup>w</sup> ə-sq <sup>w</sup> əbay	?al	ti?a	(Hess 1995:94)	
	NEG	D/C=IRR=dog	at	here		
	"Ther	e are no dogs around	here."			

## 121. x<sup>w</sup>i? k<sup>w</sup>i=g<sup>w</sup>ə-scqi ?al ti?ə? stulək<sup>w</sup>(Hess 1995:94) NEG D/C=IRR=sockeye at this river "There are no sockeye in this river."

These facts seem to show that development of a separate negative existential quantifier presumably with concomitant loss of existential force for the regular (propositional) negator - correlates with the change from Pattern A negation to less strictly biclausal patterns (Patterns B, B', and C). Why might this be?

Recall the analysis of Section 3.2.1 in which Pattern A sentential negation is dependent on negative existential quantification over minimal situations, which include both individuals and events. Recall also that on Arregui and Matthewson's analysis, the nominalizer is responsible for 'minimizing' situations, thereby allowing the negator to quantify over events as well as individuals. Now, nominalization in sentential negation is lost in Patterns B, B', and C: therefore, by hypothesis, in languages showing these patterns the negator should no longer able to act as a negative existential quantifier over minimal situations. It will follow that the semantics of propositional negation should work rather differently in these languages than in those showing Pattern A negation (though I will remain agnostic here as to exactly how it does work). Moreover, if the propositional negator is no longer semantically a negative existential quantifier in Pattern B, B' and C languages, then it will not be able to quantify over individuals either, spurring the development of a separate negative existential quantifier whose domain is restricted to individuals. I speculate that this is exactly what has happened in Halkomelem, Sechelt, Straits and other languages which have developed separate negative existentials.

In this respect it is significant that across Salish, if a language employs nominalization at all to introduce subordinate clauses, it will always do so in quantificational clauses referring to a plurality of events. As far as I can ascertain, this is an exceptionless generalization across the family. It thus really does appear that quantification over situations in Salish is dependent on nominalization, as conjectured by Arregui and Matthewson.

Notice also that according to this story, the development of separate negative existentials is not contingent on the loss of biclausal status for negation, but more specifically on the loss of nominalized negated propositions. This means that even under a biclausal or semi-biclausal analysis of Pattern B negation, we still expect negative existential predicates to develop.

## 4.1.3 Further remarks on Pattern B'

I will have less to say about Pattern B', which, recall, is limited to Squamish. In fact, much of the preceding discussion of Pattern B negation applies a fortiori to Pattern B'; in particular, if Pattern B negation involves a small clause complement to a negative predicate, as I have claimed, then clearly Pattern B' negation must have a biclausal structure, since it occupies a middle ground between Patterns A and B. More specifically, since Squamish negation does involve a subordinating 'complementizer' (q), we can assume that there is some kind of CP projection between the higher negative verb and its complement clause; and since there is no copying of the features of the lower subject to the higher subject position, we can assume that the clausal boundary between negation and its complement is less porous than in Pattern B. This means that the change from nominalized to conjunctive inflection is not necessarily combined with loss of biclausal status – a conclusion we have already reached in our discussion of Pattern B, but which is more obviously forced by a consideration of Pattern B'.

Interestingly, the second major conclusion that we reached in our discussion of Pattern B also receives rather striking support from Pattern B'. This is the correlation of the loss of nominalization in negative construction with the development of a separate

84

negative existential predicate. The negative existential in Squamish is hawq, identical in form to the propositional negator haw plus the subordinating complementizer q; however, in the negative existential construction, the two have fused to yield a separate lexical item. Kuipers is quite specific about this:

The element /q/ has assumed the status of a suffix in /haw-q/ 'there is not'...That /q/ is a suffix rather than a clitic here is proved by the fact that the clitic /?u/, which in interrogative sentences always is the second word from the beginning, follows the combination /haw-q/, e.g. /háw-q=u? na=s-níčim-s/ 'didn't he say anything?' (*versus* Type IIIa /háw=u? q?=ax<sup>w</sup> ?ifn/ 'didn't you eat?'' (Kuipers 1967: 195)

Some examples of negative existential hawq follow (all from Kuipers 1967: 195):

- 122. hawq yi?ut NEG firewood "There is no firewood."
- 123. hawq cicáp-s
  NEG work- 3POSS
  "He has no work." (literally "There is no his work.")
- 124. hawq n-sq<sup>w</sup>úy-nəx<sup>w</sup>
  NEG ISG.POSS -catch-TR
  "I caught nothing." (literally "There is no my catch.")

## 4.1.4 Further remarks on Pattern C

Finally, we return to Pattern C, where negation forms a single clause with the negated constituent, at least according to surface morphological diagnostics. Pattern C languages are widely diffused around the Salish family (as opposed to Pattern B and B' languages, which occupy a limited area of Central Salish territory), and share little in terms of shared development save the abandonment of Pattern A negation in favour of a simpler monoclausal system. Moreover, data on Pattern C systems is harder to adduce than elsewhere, so my remarks in this section will be briefer and more speculative than elsewhere. I will concentrate on the question of whether separate negative existentials have developed in any of these languages, which we might expect since, like Pattern B and Pattern B' languages, Pattern c languages either have or are in the process of losing nominalization in the complement to propositional negation.

Aside from Straits and the secondary Pattern C negative constructions in Squamish, Upriver Halkomelem and Lushootseed (see Section 2.3 above), Pattern C is attested in the outliers Tillamook and Bella Coola, and in (most of) the Southern Interior. I have nothing to add concerning the former, mostly because I do not have sufficient data to draw any further conclusions. As far as the Southern Interior is concerned, it is possible to glean some information on negative existentials, though nothing very systematic. As far as I can see, no Southern Interior language has developed a distinct negative existential quantifier; in the negative existential constructions I have been able to find, the regular (all purpose) negator is employed, just as in Pattern A languages, though without an introductory determiner, and only sporadically with nominalization:

125. lut ?i?=t=s-qilx<sup>w</sup> kəm t=stim k<sup>w</sup>u=tə=c-k<sup>w</sup>ən-nu-st-s NEGDET=OBL=NOM-man or OBL=what ISG.OBJ=EMP=STA-get-NCT-CAU-3TR "There is no person or anything that can catch me." (Ok: A. Mattina 1985: 153)

126.	lut NEG	ťə=kt-t-kə.kət-m-ən-cùt-(t)n EMP=FUT-to-near(redup)-MID-TR-RFL-INS						
	"Nobody goes near it."				Mattina 1985: 123)			
127.	lut stim-s NEG what-3POSS "Nothing in the water wa		l=siw <sup>†</sup> k <sup>w</sup> c-tka-n in-water STA-to touching it." (Ok: A		x <sup>w</sup> ich-TR Mattina 1985: 137)			
128.	tg <sup>w</sup> əl stim because what "Why don't I have a fathe		čn=lut ISG.SU=NEG r?"	pípɛ? father	(Cr: Doak 1997: 275)			
129.	tám=čé NEG=y "There	? x <sup>w</sup> ?it et many are not many India	tu?=sqélix DET=Indiai ans left."	w n	(Ka: Vogt 1940: 75)			

It is hard to know how to analyze this sporadic data, though I have the feeling that negation works rather differently in the southern Interior than in other branches of the family; in fact, the Okanagan examples in (125) and (127) look rather suspiciously like cases of constituent negation. Clearly, this is one area where much more work is needed.

## 4.2 Brief typological notes

We have seen that in Salish, Pattern A negation (with a negative predicate selecting a nominalized subordinate clause) is the basic pattern from which contemporary Salish languages have to a greater or lesser extent diverged.

Interestingly, it turns out that in a larger cross-linguistic context, biclausal negation is highly marked. In his typological survey of negation, Payne (1985: 207) (citing Mulder 1978), points out that 'negative verbs' are entirely absent from verb medial languages, and highly marked even in verb initial and verb final systems. Outside of Salish, indeed, they are well-established only in certain Polynesian languages (e.g. Maori (Bauer 1993) and Tongan (Chung 1970)). Example (130) is from Tongan (Churchland 1953: 56, cited by Payne 1985: 208) and (131) from Maori (Bauer 1993: 140).

130.	na'e 'ik ASP NE "Charlie d	ai [ke G [ASP idn't go."	'alu go	'a ABS	Siale] 5 Charlie]			
131.	kaahore	e	[tipu	te	hua	whenua	ki	reira]
	NEG	T/ASP	[grow	the	fruit	land	to	there]

"Fruit won't grow there."

The Tongan example is particularly clearly a case of bilingual negation, in that separate aspect markers appear in the higher (negative) clause and the lower (negated) clause.

Aside from their rarity, there are a number of other interesting generalizations that appear to be common to all languages with 'negative verbs'. First, just as in Salish, Polynesian languages with biclausal negation tend to avoid constituent negation (Bauer 1993: 146-147). Second, the propositional negator is also used as a negative existential quantifier, as can be seen by comparing the Maori examples in (132) and (133).<sup>22</sup>

 $<sup>^{22}</sup>$  Maori does however have a separate negator for equational and attributive constructions: see Bauer 1993:143-145).

132.	kaahore	he	taniwha	(Bauer 1993: 78)		
	NEG	а	taniwha			
	"There are	no taniw	na."			

133. kaahore a Hera i te whakarongo (Bauer 1993: 141) NEG PERS Hera T/A listen "Hera is/was not listening."

(133) also illustrates a third significant aspect of Maori negation: a strong tendency to raise the subject out of the negated clause to occupy the matrix clause subject position. (Recall that Polynesian languages are predicate initial, like Salish, so the subject *Hera* in (133) is in the matrix negating clause, not the subordinated negated clause where it originated). (134-135) show the same phenomenon:

134.	kaahore NEG "Nobody	kaahore anoo he NEG yet a "Nobody has arrived		tangata kia people SUBJ yet."		tae arrive	mae hither	(Bauer 1993: 141)
135.	kaahore	taatou		e	haere	ana	apoopoo	(Bauer 1993: 141)

NEG IPI.EXCL T/A move T/A tomorrow "We are not going tomorrow."

(Note the separate aspect markers in the matrix and subordinate clauses in (135), as in the Tongan example in (130)).

The subject-to-subject raising process shown here (studied in some detail across Polynesian in Chung 1978) has obvious analogues in Salish, though there, as we have seen, pronominal clitics rather than full DPs are involved. Nevertheless, the comparison is highly suggestive, and – if the generalization is a true one – hints that weakening of biclausal negation structures might universally take place via subject raising processes. For the moment, however, we will leave this suggestion at the level of a wild surmise.

## 4.3 Theoretical issues

Last, but not least, I turn very briefly to some theoretical issues raised by the analysis of Salish negation presented here.

The first thing to observe is that though biclausal negation is easily translated into a standard Boolean propositional calculus by treating the negator as a propositional operator (as in most introductory semantics textbooks), this is precisely what *doesn't* happen in Salish. Rather, as we have seen, biclausal (Pattern A) negation involves a negative existential quantifier ranging over minimal situations. It turns out that as far as contemporary semantic treatments of negation are concerned, this is just as well. For example, Ladusaw (1996: 322) notes that "there is no formal necessity of giving propositional negation primacy in linguistic analysis", and furthermore opines that "achieving results...requires going beyond the simplistic view of negation as a propositional operator inherited from 'baby logic', to examining the multiple notions of negation in algebras of interpretation" (ibid: 340).

While escaping the charge of 'baby logic', however, Salish negation still poses some challenges to treatments of negation based on more familiar (generally European) languages. Two aspects in particular require further theoretical attention.

The first is the total or near total absence of constituent negation in Salish – in semantic terms, the limitation of negation to a single denotational domain, that of the proposition (see 3.4.1 above). This seems to run counter to "the multiple notions of negation in algebras of interpretation" approach championed in particular by Keenan and

87

Faltz (1985), who develop a view of negation as a complement operation which can be generalized across any denotational domain.

The second challenge (which I suspect may well be related to the first) is the apparent lack of sensitivity to information structure shown by Salish negation (see 3.4.2). In more familiar languages, negation is interpreted with respect to a set of presuppositions, and operates only on the non-presupposed portion of an utterance (see e.g. Herburger 2000, and references therein). However, biclausal negation seems to operate over a whole proposition rather than just the focused part (generally, but not always, the VP). Is this a superficial property of (Pattern A) Salish syntax, or is there a deeper semantic difference underlying the surface variation?

I have answers to neither of these questions, but in both cases, I believe further research is warranted, as we move from the superficial examination of surface morphosyntactic patterns in Salish towards a deeper understanding of the syntactic and semantic parameters underlying them.

## 5. Conclusion

It is high time to conclude. Here are the principal findings of this investigation:

- (i) Across Salish, there are three major negation patterns and one minor pattern
- (ii) Of these, the original proto-Salish pattern (A) probably involved a biclausal structure, with a negative predicate selecting a nominalized propositional complement
- (iii) A detailed investigation of this pattern in the Northern Interior language Lillooet reveals that it is best analyzed as involving a negative existential quantifier, which 'unselectively' quantifies over individuals and events
- (iv) I have proposed a preliminary analysis of this pattern as involving quantification over minimal situations, following work of Arregui and Matthewson (2001)
- (v) Pattern B negation (where an optional pronominal copy of the subject of the negated predicate appears adjacent to the negator) is best analyzed as a kind of copy raising from a small clause complement to a negative predicate
- (vi) The abandonment of propositional nominalization in the complement to the negative predicate correlates with the development of separate negative existential predicates in a number of languages with Pattern B, B', and C negation

Nit ti?!

#### References

- Arregui, Ana and Lisa Matthewson 2001. A Cross-linguistic Perspective on the Expression of Manner. This volume.
- Beaumont, Ronald (1985). *she shashilhalem: The Sechelt Language*. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books.
- Bauer, Winifred 1993. Maori. London: Routledge.
- Chung, Sandra 1970. Negative Verbs in Polynesian. Unpublished Senior Honor's Thesis, Harvard.

- Chung, Sandra 1978. Case Marking and Grammatical relations in Polynesian. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Churchward, C. N. 1953. Tongan Grammar. London: Oxford University Press.

Davis, Henry 1999a. Subject Inflection in Salish. UBC Working Papers in Linguistics I: 181-240.

- Davis, Henry 1999b. Pronominal Determiners. Colloquium, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Davis, Henry 2000. Remarks on Proto-Salish Subject Inflection. International Journal of American Linguistics 66: 499-520.
- Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 1996. Subordinate Clauses and Functional Projections in St'át'imcets. Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, 59-74. Vancouver, B.C.
- Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 1997. Definiteness, Finiteness, and the Event/Entity Distinction. In P.N. Tamanji and K. Kusumoto (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 28*. Amherst, MA: GLSA, 95-109.
- Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1997. A Grammar of Bella Coola. Missoula, MN: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No.13.
- Demirdache, Hamida 1997. Condition C. In Hans Bennis, Perre Pica, and Johan Rooryck (eds.) *Atomism and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Demirdache, Hamida and Lisa Matthewson 1995. On the Universality of Syntactic Categories. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 25*. Amherst, MA: GLSA, 79-93.
- Doak, Ivy 1997. Coeur D'Alene grammatical Relations. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Edel, May M. 1939. The Tillamook Language. International Journal of American Linguistics 10: 1-57.
- Galloway, Brent 1990. A Phonology, Morphology and Classified Word List for the Samish Dialect of Straits Salish. Ottawa: National Museum of Man Mercury Series Canadian Ethnology Paper #116.
- Galloway, Brent 1993. A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem. Berkeley, CA: University of California Publications in Linguistics 96.

Gillon, Carrie 2001. Negation and Subject Agreement in Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish Salish). Paper presented at the Victoria Conference on Grammatical Structures in Languages of the North/West, University of Victoria.

- Herburger, Elena 2000. What Counts: Focus and Quantification. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hess, Thomas M. 1976. Dictionary of Puget Salish. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Hess, Thomas M. 1995. A Lushootseed Reader with Introductory Grammar .Volume 1: Four Stories from Edward Sam. Missoula, MN: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No.11.
- Jelinek, Eloise 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer and Barbara Partee (eds.) *Quantification in Natural Language*: 487-540. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Keenan, Edward and L. Faltz 1985. Boolean Semantics for Natural Language. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Kinkade, M. Dale 1976. The Copula and Negatives in Inland Olympic Salish. International Journal of American Linguistics42: 17-23.
- Kinkade, M. D. 1978. Coyote and Rock (Columbian Salish). In William Bright (ed.) Coyote Stories: 15-20. IJAL-NATS 1.
- Kroeber, Paul 1999. The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Kuipers, Aert 1967. The Squamish Language. The Hague: Mouton.

Kuipers, Aert 1974. The Shuswap Language. The Hague: Mouton.

Ladusaw, William 1996. Negation and Polarity Items. In Shalom Lappin (ed.) The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory: 321-341. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Matthewson, Lisa 1999. On the Interpretation of Wide Scope Indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 7: 79-134.

Matthewson, Lisa and Henry Davis 1995. 'The Structure of DP in Stát'imcets (Lillooet Salish)'. Victoria, BC: Papers for the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages 55-68.

Mattina, Anthony 1985. *The Golden Woman: The Colville Narrative of Peter J.* Seymour. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Mattina, Anthony 2000. Okanagan Sandhi and Morphophonemics. Vancouver, BC: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics 3: Papers for the 35th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages 147-158.

Mattina, Nancy 1996. Aspect and Category in Okanagan Word Formation. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Simon Fraser University.

Montler, Timothy 1986. An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. Missoula, MN: University of Montana Occasional Paper in Linguistics No. 4.

Mulder, J.G. 1978. Universal Grammar and Dischronic Syntax: the Case of the Finnish Negative. Unpublished MA thesis, UCLA.

Payne, John 1985. Negation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description Volume I: Clause Structure: 197-242. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reichard, Gladys 1938. 'Coeur D'Alene.' In Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 3, ed. by Franz Boas, 519-707. New York: Columbia University Press.

Suttles, Wayne n.d. A Reference Grammar of Downriver Halkomelem. Ms.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson 1992. *The Thompson Language*. Missoula, MN: University of Montana Occasional Paper in Linguistics No. 8.

van Eijk, Jan 1986. Dictionary of the Lillooet Language. Ms.

van Eijk, Jan 1997. The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

van Eijk, Jan and Lorna Williams 1981. Cuystwí Malh Ucwalmícwts: Lillooet Legends and Stories. Mount Currie, BC: Ts'zil Publishing House.

Vogt, Hans 1940. The Kalispel Language. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps Akademi.

Wiltschko, Martina 2000a. Sentential Negation in Upriver Halkomelem. Vancouver, BC:UBC Working Papers in Linguistics 3: Papers for the 35th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages 227-248.

Wiltschko, Martina 2000b. Is Halkomelem Spilt Ergative? Vancouver, BC: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics 3: Papers for the 35th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages 249-267.

Zucchi, Alessandro 1989. The Language of Propositions and Events: Issues in the Syntax and Semantics of Nominalization. Ph.D dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.