

A note on remote: The temporal enclitic *tu7* in St'át'imcets

Henry Davis and Lisa Matthewson
University of British Columbia

In this paper we show that St'át'imcets temporal enclitic *tu7* does not encode either perfect or perfective aspect. We further argue that it does not encode past tense. Instead, *tu7* is a distal demonstrative adverb (i.e., it marks 'remote in time'). This analysis accounts for the usual past tense readings of *tu7* as well as for its co-occurrence with the modal *kelh* 'will, might' to give a meaning of remote future. Our analysis provides indirect support for the idea that St'át'imcets possesses a phonologically null non-future tense morpheme.

1 Introduction¹

Van Eijk (1997: 200) gives the following description of the St'át'imcets temporal enclitic *tu7*, which he glosses as 'definite past'.

The enclitic *tu7* indicates that something is over and done with, that a time period has definitely been concluded:

- (a) *čək tu7* 'it is all gone'
- (b) *ʔwəlp tu7 ni čítx^w-s-a* 'his (-s) house (čítx^w)
burned (ʔwəlp) down'

This enclitic also indicates that a person or object was here recently but has now gone to perform the action referred to in the predicate. Compare (c) to (d) and (e) to (f):

¹ Thanks to St'át'imcets consultants Beverly Frank, Gertrude Ned, Laura Thevarge, and Agnes Rose Whitley, to the Upper St'át'imc Language, Education and Culture Society for supporting work on the teaching grammar of Upper St'át'imcets for which some of the data here was elicited, to Jan van Eijk for provoking us into thinking about this issue through stimulating discussion at the 2002 ICSNL, and to Dawn Bates and Thom Hess, whose 2001 paper on a Lushootseed future morpheme originally inspired us to think about aspectual vs. temporal meanings for *tu7*. Examples are given in the van Eijk orthography: a conversion chart to a standard North American phonemic alphabet is appended, together with a list of abbreviations used in the morpheme-by-morpheme glosses.

- (c) ʔwəw̥p-wít tuʔ 'they went to the meeting' (ʔwəw̥p 'to meet, gather')
- (d) ʔwəw̥p-wít 'they are (were) at the meeting'
- (e) nkaʔ tuʔ ni máw-a 'where (nkaʔ) did the cat (maw) go?'
- (f) nkaʔ ni máw-a 'where is the cat?'

Though *tu7* obviously has a temporal effect, it is not clear from the description above and the accompanying examples how exactly this effect is achieved. On the one hand, the gloss 'definite past' would seem to indicate that *tu7* is a (past) tense morpheme; on the other, 'over and done with' suggests an aspectual origin as a completive marker. The 'here then, gone now' meaning associated with the expression *nkaʔ tu7* further confuses the picture. Is it a secondary meaning which has developed as an offshoot from the main (tense or aspect-related) meaning of *tu7*, or should it be made to follow directly from the core meaning?

In this paper, we will try to get to grips with these questions, which have broader implications in light of the current lively debate over the correct representation of temporal information in so-called 'tenseless' languages - languages, like all those of the Salish family, which lack obligatory tense morphology in finite clauses. See Matthewson (2002, to appear), Shaer (2003), Smith et al. (2003), Wiltschko (2003) for various positions on the issue.

We will argue here for the following points:

- (i) *tu7* is not an aspectual marker.
- (ii) However, it is not a tense marker either (contra Matthewson 2002 and Davis in prep., Chapter 19).
- (iii) Instead, it is a distal demonstrative adverb.
- (iv) Nevertheless, it must be construed as modifying a tense relation (either past or future), indirectly supporting a 'tensed' analysis of St'át'imcets over a tenseless one.

Points (i) and (ii) will be addressed in Sections 2 and 3, respectively, and in section 4 we will argue for the claims in (iii) and (iv).

2 *Tu7* is not an aspect marker

Speakers of St'át'imcets usually translate sentences containing *tu7* into English using the past tense. Typical examples are given in (1).

- (1) a. táyt-wít *tu7*
 hungry-3PL *tu7*
 'They were hungry / * are hungry.'
- b. say'sez'-lhcán *tu7*
 play-1SG.SU *tu7*
 'I played / was playing / * am playing / * play.'

Occasionally, however, sentences containing *tu7* are translated into English in a way which could suggest an aspectual effect. For example, (2a) is translated using the aspectual auxiliary ‘have’ in the present tense, and (2b) uses ‘finished’.

- (2) a. qwatsáts *tu7* tákem i sk’wem.k’úk’wm’it-a
 leave *tu7* all DET.PL children-DET
 ‘All the children have left.’
- b. tsew’-n-ás *tu7* ta máw-a ta smúlhats-a
 kick-DIR-3ERG *tu7* DET cat-DET DET woman-DET
 ‘The woman finished kicking the cat.’

These sentences suggest an alternative aspectual role for *tu7*, as a perfect aspect marker (2a) or a completive aspect marker (2b).

Of course, English translations are not reliable semantic diagnostics. We therefore need to develop more accurate tests to distinguish a tense from an aspectual analysis of *tu7*. In the following subsections, we will do just that. Section 2.1 will be devoted to the possibility that *tu7* is a marker of perfect aspect, and Section 2.2 to the possibility that it is a marker of completive aspect.

2.1 *Tu7* is not a perfect aspect marker

In this section, we will consider the possibility that the English translation of (2a) yields an accurate representation of the meaning of *tu7*: that is, that *tu7* is the St’át’imcets equivalent of the English aspectual auxiliary ‘have’. We will give three arguments against such an analysis: first, unlike perfect marking, *tu7* is insensitive to lexical aspect (*aktionsart*); second, *tu7* occurs in none of the environments identified by Dahl (1985) as prototypical for perfect aspect; and third, that *tu7* acts like a tense marker rather than a perfect aspect marker in its interaction with other aspectual auxiliaries.

2.1.1 Absence of *aktionsart* effects

The most obvious difference between tense and aspect markers is their (in)sensitivity to lexical aspect or *aktionsarten*. Aspect markers typically have varying temporal effects, depending on the *aktionsart* of the predicate with which they are associated; tense markers do not. A simple example will serve to illustrate the difference: the English perfect, constructed using the aspectual auxiliary ‘have’, has different effects on stative and eventive predicates:

- (3) a. I have lived here for twenty years. [stative]
- b. I have written this paper. [eventive]

The time at which the state in (3a) holds extends into the present (i.e., I am still living here) whereas the time of the event in (3b) does not (i.e., I am not still

writing this paper). On the other hand, the English past tense puts both types of predicate into the past:

- (4) a. I lived here for twenty years. [stative]
 b. I wrote this paper. [eventive]

Applying this argument to St'át'imcets, if *tu7* is a perfect aspect marker, we should expect it to display interactions with the aspectual classes (aktionsarten) of the predicates it attaches to. On the other hand, if *tu7* is a tense, it should not display such effects, but should simply place any type of predicate into the past. In this subsection we show that the latter is the case.

Like English, St'át'imcets possesses a set of aspectual auxiliaries (though the English and St'át'imcets sets do not have exactly the same temporal effects). The most common are *wa7* 'imperfective', *plan* 'already', and *cuz'* 'going to, about to', whose interactions with different aktionsarten are discussed in detail in Davis (in prep., Chapter 18). Here we will focus on *plan*.

With states and activities, *plan* allows either a present tense or a past tense reading (as shown in (5a,b)), while with achievements and accomplishments, it induces either a present or past perfect reading (5c,d).

- (5) a. *plán-lhkan* *sáy'sez'* [activity]
 already-1SG.SUBJ play
 'I am / was already playing.'
- b. *plán-lhkan* *t'alál* [state]
 already-1SG.SUBJ tired
 'I am / was already tired.'
- c. *plán-lhkan* *qayt* [achievement]
 already-1SG.SUBJ reach.summit
 'I have / had already reached the summit.'
- d. *plán-lhkan* *máys-en* [accomplishment]
 already-1SG.SUBJ fix-DIR
 'I have / had already fixed it.'

Now, compare the temporal effects of *tu7* to those of *plan*. Unlike *plan*, *tu7* has a uniform effect on predicates of all aspectual classes; it invariably places them in the past, as shown in (6a-d):

- (6) a. *say'sez'-lhkán* *tu7* [activity]
 play-1SG.SUBJ *tu7*
 'I was playing / played.'
- b. *t'alál-lhkan* *tu7* [state]
 tired-1SG.SUBJ *tu7*
 'I was tired.'

- c. qáy-t-lhkan tu7 [achievement]
 reach.summit-1SG.SUBJ tu7
 ‘I reached the summit.’
- d. mays-en-lhkán tu7 [accomplishment]
 fix-dir-1SG.SUBJ tu7
 ‘I fixed it.’

This is strong evidence against an analysis of *tu7* as a perfect aspect marker.

2.1.2 Prototypical perfect contexts

A second argument against an analysis of *tu7* as a perfect marker can be constructed by showing that *tu7* has none of the properties associated cross-linguistically with perfect aspect.

Dahl (1985) gives a set of prototypical contexts for perfect aspect: examples are given in (7).

- (7) a. I have eaten rutabagas since I was a child.
 b. I have lived here for five years.
 c. Have you been to Seattle?
 d. I want to give your brother a book. Has he read this one
 already?

If *tu7* were a perfect marker, we would expect it to be present in the St’át’imcets versions of these sentences: but in these contexts, speakers always volunteer utterances without *tu7*, as shown in (8-11). Sometimes, as in (8) and (9), *tu7* is rejected on the relevant interpretation; in other cases (10-11), it is simply dispreferred.

- (8) a. wá7-lhkan ts’áqw-an’ i ts’wán-a
 IMPF-1SG.SUBJ eat-DIR DET.PL dry.salmon-DET
 lhél-n-s-wa7 sk’úk’wm’it
 from-1SG.POSS-NOM-IMPF child
 ‘I have eaten dried salmon since I was a child.’ [VOLUNTEERED]
- b. ? wá7-lhkan tu7 ts’áqw-an’ i ts’wán-a
 IMPF-1SG.SUBJ tu7 eat-DIR DET.PL dry.salmon-DET
 lhél-n-s-wa7 sk’úk’wm’it
 from-1SG.POSS-NOM-IMPF child
 ‘I have eaten dried salmon since I was a child.’

Consultant’s comment: “Awkward.”

- (9) a. plan wa7 tsilkst s-máqa7 kw-en-s
 already IMPF five NOM-year DET-1SG.POSS-NOM
 wa7 lts7a
 IMPF DEIC
 'I have lived here for five years.' [VOLUNTEERED]
- b. tsilkst tu7 máqa7 kw-en-s wa7 lts7a
 five tu7 NOM-year DET-1SG.POSS-NOM IMPF DEIC
 'It was five years that I was here.'
- Consultant's comment: "But not just the previous five years."
- (10) a. plán-lhkacw ha tsicw áku7 Seattle-a
 already YNQ get.there DEIC Seattle-DET
 'Have you been to Seattle?' [VOLUNTEERED]
- b. tsicw-kacw há tu7 áku7 Seattle-a²
 get.there-2SG.SUBJ YNQ tu7 DEIC Seattle-DET
 'Have you been to Seattle?'
- (11) cúy'-lhkan úm'-en ku pukw
 going.to-1SG.SUBJ give-DIRDET book
 ta qéqtsek-sw-a ...
 DET older.brother-2SG.POSS-DET
 'I'm going to give your older brother a book ...'
- a. ...kán-as k'a ts7a kw-s plan-s
 YNQ-3CONJ APPAR DEM DET-NOM already-3POSS
 áts'x-en-as
 see-DIR-3ERG
 '...has he seen this one already?' [VOLUNTEERED]
- b. ...kán-as k'á tu7 ts7a kw-s áts'x-en-as
 YNQ-3CONJ APPAR tu7 DEM DET-NOM see-DIR-3ERG
 '...did he see this one?'

We take the data in (8-11) to be further evidence against an analysis of *tu7* as a (perfect) aspect marker. Notice that in fact the pattern displayed by *tu7* is quite similar to the behaviour of the English plain past tense, as illustrated in (8'-11').

(8') ?? I ate dried salmon since I was a child.

(9') I lived here for five years.
 (= not the immediately preceding five)

² (10b) was volunteered by the consultant in the context of being asked for other ways to say (10a).

- (10') Did you already go to Seattle?
(grammatical; more neutral / better to use the perfect)
- (11') I want to give your brother a book. Did he read this one already?
(grammatical; more neutral / better to use the perfect)

This suggests that *tu7* may be a marker of simple past tense, an analysis that we will discuss in Section 3 below.

2.2.3 Interaction with other aspectual markers

Yet further evidence against an analysis of *tu7* as a perfect aspect marker can be found when we look directly at its interaction with other aspectual elements, in particular the auxiliary *cuz'* 'be going to'. In English, a language with both past tense and perfect aspect, we can combine either one of these with 'be going to', with the results in (12):

- (12) a. I was going to fix the fence. PAST > GOING TO
b. I have been going to fix the fence. PERFECT > GOING TO
c. I am going to have fixed the fence. GOING TO > PERFECT

In (12a), there is an implicature that I am no longer going to fix the fence (I have changed my mind). That this is an implicature rather than an entailment is shown by its cancelability: 'I was going to fix the fence; in fact, I still am.' In (12b), on the other hand, I am still planning on fixing the fence. There is no combination 'GOING TO > PAST', for the simple reason that tenses are structurally higher than aspects (see Kratzer 1998, Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 2000, among others).

Now let us turn to St'át'imcets. Sentences containing both *tu7* and *cuz'* 'be going to' only have the reading corresponding to (12a); that is, they unambiguously mean that something *was going to* happen, rather than that it *has been going to* happen, or that it *is going to have* happened. Some simple examples are given in (13).

- (13) a. *cuz' tu7* qwatsáts ti sqáycw-a
going.to *tu7* leave DET man-DET
'The man was about to leave.' (Davis in prep.)
- b. *cúy'-lhkan tu7* guy't³
going.to-1sg.subj *tu7* sleep
'I was about to go to sleep.' (Davis in prep.)

(14a,b) illustrate the implicature of *cuz' tu7* that the action is not going to happen. The clause 'I was going to fix the fence' must be joined to 'I'm going to fix it now' by *t'u7* 'but' rather than by the neutral conjunction *nilh*.

³ *cuz'* often surfaces as *cuy'*, particularly in Upper St'át'imcets.

- (14) a. cúy'-lhkan tu7 máys-en ta q'láxan-a, t'u7
 going.to-1SG.SUBJ tu7 fix-DIR DET fence-DET but
 máys-en-lhkán kelh lhkúnsa
 fix-DIR-1SG.SUBJ MODAL now
 'I was going to fix the fence, but I'll do it now.'
- b. ? cúz'-lhkan tu7 máys-en ta q'láxan-a, nilh
 going.to-1SG.SUBJ tu7 fix-DIR DET fence-DET FOC
 s-mays-en-án kelh lhkúnsa
 NOM-fix-DIR-1SG.CONJ MODAL now
 'I was going to fix the fence, and I'll do it now.'

Consultant's comment: "You've got two separate sentences there because you put *nilh*. But if you wanted to join them then you'd use *t'u7*."

In short, the results presented in this subsection show once again that *tu7* does not have the meaning of a perfect aspect marker, since it combines with 'be going to' to create a past tense combination 'was going to' rather than an aspectual combination like 'have been going to' or 'going to have been'.

2.3 *Tu7* is not a completive aspect marker

An alternative aspectual analysis for *tu7* reflects the English translation of (2b), where it seems to mean 'finished'. Under this analysis, *tu7* would be a marker of completive aspect, entailing that the predicate which it is associated with denotes a completed or 'over and done with' event.

It is easy to show that this is an inaccurate characterization of the meaning of *tu7*. There is no entailment of completion in sentences with *tu7*, as can be seen from the examples in (15-16):

- (15) a. púlh.elh tu7 ta qú7-a
 boil(REDUP) tu7 DET water-DET
 'The water was boiling.' (hadn't finished boiling yet).
- b. s-pulh tu7 ta qú7-a
 STA-boil tu7 DET water-DET
 'The water was boiled.' (had finished boiling).
- (16) a. wá7-lhkan tu7 mets-cál ta
 IMPF-1SG.SUBJ tu7 write-ACT DET
 n-púkw-a i-zánucwm-as...
 1SG.POSS-book-DET when(past)-year-3CONJ
 'I was writing my book last year...'
- b. ...wa7-lhkan hém' t'u7 mets-cál lhkúnsa
 ...IMPF-1SG.SUBJ ANTI still write-ACT now
 '...and I'm still writing it now.'

In fact, *tu7* can occur in sentences which specifically state that an event has not been completed (17), or hasn't even been started (18):

- (17) plan *tu7* cuz' tsu-7-c na máq7-a
 already *tu7* going.to melt(INCH) ABS.DET snow -DET
 i-tsícw-wit-as qít'-am
 when(past)-went-3PL-3CONJ hook-MID
 i ucwalmícw-a
 PL.DET native.person-DET
 'The snow was already starting to melt when the people went fishing
 (with hook and line).'
- (18) nilh s-e-s *tu7* cuz' tsunam'-en-túmulh-as
 COP NOM-IMPF-3POSS *tu7* going.to teach-DIR-1PL.OBJ-3ERG
 kw-et-wá n-q'áy-lec
 DET-1PL.CONJ-IMPF LOC-jump-AUT
 'So she was going to teach us to swim.'

And finally, when asked to translate English sentences where an event *has* been completed into St'át'imcets, speakers invariably use an aspectual predicate such as *tsukw* 'to finish, to stop' rather than (or sometimes in addition to) *tu7*.

- (19) *tsukw* kw-n-s mets-cál
 finish DET-1SG.POSS-NOM write-ACT
 'I've finished writing.'
- (20) plan wa7 *tsukw* kw-s qelh-n-ás i
 already IMPF finish DET-NOM put.away-DIR-3ERG DET.PL
 s7áy'tseqw-a n-skícez7-a cuz'
 raspberry-DET 1SG.POSS-mother-DET going.to
 qwez-en-ém lh-sútik-as
 use-DIR-1PL.ERG HYP-winter-3CONJ
 'My mother had already finished putting away the raspberries that we
 were going to use in winter.'

In summary, there are compelling reasons to assume that *tu7* is not a completive aspect marker. Since we have already shown that it is not a marker of perfect aspect, we can safely conclude that it is not an aspect marker at all.

3 *Tu7* is not a tense marker

As mentioned above, Matthewson (2002, to appear) gives a formal analysis of *tu7* as a past tense morpheme, following the descriptive/pedagogical account in Davis (to appear, Chapter 19). Matthewson argues that St'át'imcets has two tense markers: *tu7*, which is lexically restricted to pick out a past reference time; and a zero (phonologically null) tense morpheme, which denotes a reference time provided by the discourse context, and does not restrict the reference time with respect to whether it precedes or overlaps with the utterance

time. This means that while *tu7* can only have a past tense reading, null tense is compatible with a time either in the present or in the past. For details, see Matthewson (2002).

This analysis accounts for all the data we have seen so far. However, there are some additional data which suggest that it is not quite right. The relevant construction is the combination of *tu7* with the modal *kelh* ‘might, will’. If *tu7* were a past tense marker, we would expect the combination *kelh tu7* to mean something like ‘was possible’ or ‘would’, as illustrated for English in (21):

- (21) a. Last week, it was possible that I would go to France.
 b. A week ago, Ann said that she would meet Sue in two days.

This is not the meaning that obtains for *kelh tu7*. Van Eijk (1997:210) observes that sentences containing *kelh tu7* ‘generally express a more remote possibility than *kelh* by itself.’ In terms of translations into English, there is often no detectable difference between plain *kelh* and *kelh tu7*; both are translated as ‘might’. Examples are given in (22).

- (22) a. *ao|gem-lhkálh kelh tu7*
 sick-1PL.SUBJ MODAL *tu7*
 ‘We might get sick.’ (van Eijk 1997:210)
- b. *qyax-kal’áp kelh tu7*
 drunk-2PL.SUBJ MODAL *tu7*
 ‘You folks might get drunk.’ (van Eijk 1997:210)
- c. *qwatsáts kelh tu7 ti sqáycw-a*
 leave MODAL *tu7* DET man-DET
 ‘The man might leave.’ (Davis in prep.)
- d. *guy’t-kan kélh tu7*
 sleep-1SG.SUBJ might *tu7*
 ‘I might go to sleep.’ (Davis in prep.)
- e. *wáz’-am kélh tu7 knáku7 ku sqáxa7*
 bark-MID might *tu7* around.there DET dog
 ‘A dog might bark over there.’ (Davis in prep.)

Further support for the claim that there is no past tense component to *kelh tu7* comes from what happens when one tries to elicit sentences that express ‘past possibility’. *kelh tu7* is not used in these situations, as illustrated in (23). (23a) was volunteered by the consultant (without *kelh tu7*); when asked whether (23b) (with *kelh tu7*) would be possible, she corrected it to (23c), which again does not contain *kelh tu7*.

- (23) *kánem-lhkacw i t’aq’em’kst-ásq’et-as*
 do.what-2SG.SUBJ when(past) six-day-3CONJ
 ‘What did you do on Saturday?’

- a. nás-kan séna7 tawn, t'u7 wá7-lhkan
 go-1SG.SUBJ CONTRAST town but be-1SG.SUBJ
 t'u7 l-ta n-tsítcw-a
 just in-DET 1SG.POSS-house-DET
 'I could maybe have gone to town, but actually I stayed home.'
- b. ?? nás-kan kélh tu7 tawn, t'u7 wá7-lhkan
 go-1SG.SUBJ might tu7 town but be-1SG.SUBJ
 t'u7 l-ta n-tsítcw-a
 just in-DET 1SG.POSS-house-DET
 'I could maybe have gone to town, but I stayed home.'
- c. ka-nás-kan-a séna7 tawn, t'u7
 OOC-go-1SG.SUBJ-DET CONTRAST town but
 wá7-lhkan t'u7 l-ta n-tsítcwa
 be-1SG.SUBJ just in-DET 1SG.POSS-house-DET
 'I could maybe have gone to town, but I stayed home.'

The data in (22-23) suggest that *tu7* is not a past tense marker after all. However, there is a possible objection to this conclusion: it might be that the combination *kelh tu7* has been lexicalised, and its meaning is therefore not created compositionally from the meaning of *kelh* plus the meaning of *tu7*. Evidence against the suggestion that *kelh tu7* has been lexicalised comes from the fact that for at least some speakers, the antithetical enclitic *hem'* can be inserted between *kelh* and *tu7*, as illustrated in (24-25):⁴

- (24) ts7as kelh hém' tu7 áts'x-en-ts-as n-stún'c-a
 come MODALANTI tu7 see-DIR-1SG.OBJ-3ERG 1SG.POSS-niece-DET
 'My niece will come to see me.'
- (25) nás-kan kélh hém' tu7 áta7 Kamloops-a
 go.1SG.SUBJ MODAL ANTI tu7 to.there Kamloops-DET
 'I might be going to Kamloops.'

We conclude from this that *kelh* and *tu7* are acting separately when they appear in combination, and therefore that the meaning of the combination should be compositionally derivable from the meanings of *kelh* and *tu7* in isolation. This in turn militates against a past tense meaning for *tu7*, since in (22a-e), there is no past tense effect. On the contrary, *tu7* seems to make a future event or possibility even more remote.

⁴ There is SOME speaker variation on the preferred relative order of *kelh* and *hem'*: van Eijk (1997: 210) gives the following example from the Lower St'át'imcets speaker Adelina Williams, with *hem'* preceding *kelh*:

- (i) wa7-lhkan hém' kelh t'u7 lts7a, wa7 malh wa7-wi
 IMPF-1SG.SUBJANTI will just DEIC IMPF ADHORT be-PL.IMP
 'I'll just stay here, you folks go right along.'

4 *tu7* is a demonstrative adverb meaning ‘remote in time’

If *tu7* is not a past tense marker, yet nearly always has the effect of putting a sentence into the past tense, then what is it? In a nutshell, we claim that *tu7* is a distal demonstrative adverb which is associated with a null tense morpheme. In other words, we are analysing *tu7* as meaning something similar to English ‘then’. We will spell this out in more detail below.

In support of this analysis, the first thing to note is that the form and the syntactic behaviour of *tu7* are similar to other demonstrative elements in St’át’incets. More importantly, the analysis enables us to account for all the data given above about the semantic contribution of *tu7*. We will deal with these different types of evidence in the following two sub-sections.

4.1 Formal reasons to analyze *tu7* as a demonstrative adverb

Phonologically, *tu7* is very similar to the demonstrative *t7u* ‘that one over there’. In St’át’incets, as in other Salish languages, there is a close formal correspondence between temporal and locative demonstratives; other examples of the same phenomenon can be found in the demonstrative adverb paradigm, where the adverbs *láni7* ‘then, at that time’ and *pináni7* ‘in those days, around that time’ are clearly related to locatives such as *láti7* ‘there’. While a distinction must still be made between elements with purely temporal reference and those with locative reference, the former clearly derive from the latter. See van Eijk (1997: 171-176), Davis (in prep., Chapter 20) for further discussion.

Syntactically, *tu7* is one of about fifteen second position enclitics (also including *kelh* and *hem’*) which follow the first predicative element of a clause (either an auxiliary, if there is one, or the main predicate, if not) in a more or less fixed order. The clitics and their ordering are given in (26), from Davis (in prep., Chapter 38; see also van Eijk (1997: 207) for a slightly different ordering).

(26) Second position clitics in St’át’incets

an’	a	cwilh	ha qa7	ku7	k’a ka	malh wi7	t’elh kelh or hem’	hem’ or t’elh kelh	<i>tu7</i> or t’u7	t’u7 or <i>tu7</i>
-----	---	-------	-----------	-----	-----------	-------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The important point here is that *tu7* occurs at the end of the second-position clitic string, and varies in its position with respect to the other string-final clitic, *t’u7*.⁵ Examples are given in (27).

- (27) a. weq’w *tu7* t’u7
 washed.away *tu7* t’u7
 ‘So he got carried away by the water.’ (van Eijk 1997:211)

⁵ The enclitic *t’u7* is extremely common and commensurably hard to gloss: it can mean ‘still’, ‘but’, ‘so’, ‘yet’ or ‘just’, but more often than not remains untranslatable into English.

- b. cw7áoz-as ká t'u7 tu7 áti7 kw-s
 NEG-3CONJ should t'u7 tu7 that DET-NOM
 xílh-ts-an
 do-CAUS-1SG.ERG
 'I wish I had not done that.' (van Eijk 1997:211)
- c. plan tu7 t'u7 wa7 ts'ek nelh s-7ilhen-lhkálh-a
 already tu7 t'u7 IMPF gone DET.PL NOM-eat-1PL.POSS-DET
 'We've almost already run out of food.' (Davis in prep.)
- d. plan t'u7 tu7 wa7 ts'ek nelh s-7ilhen-lhkálh-a
 already t'u7 tu7 IMPF gone DET.PL NOM-eat-1PL.POSS-DET
 'We've almost already run out of food.' (Davis in prep.)

The only other elements which display this variable ordering with respect to *t'u7* are the demonstrative pronouns, which can optionally form part of the clitic string, as shown in (28). This gives us further reason to suspect a connection between *tu7* and demonstratives.

- (28) a. kán t'u7 ti7 aylh wa7 qvl-s
 1SG.SUBJ t'u7 DEMON then IMPF bad-CAUS
 'I dislike him.' (van Eijk 1997:213)
- b. kán ti7 t'u7 aylh wa7 qvl-s
 1SG.SUBJ DEMON t'u7 then IMPF bad-CAUS
 'I dislike him.' (van Eijk 1997:213)
- c. tsukw t'u7 ti7
 finish t'u7 DEMON
 'Well, that is finished.' (Davis in prep.)
- d. tsukw ti7 t'u7
 finish DEMON t'u7
 'Well, that is finished.' (van Eijk 1997:213)

4.2 Semantic reasons to analyze *tu7* as a demonstrative adverb; support for a tensed analysis

Recall the semantic problem introduced above: *tu7* induces past tense readings in all cases except when it is combined with the modal *kelh*, in which case we have 'remote possibility' or 'remote future'. In this section we show that the problem can be solved if we assume that *tu7* denotes not 'past' but simply 'remote in time'.

The analysis works as follows. Following Matthewson (2002, to appear), we assume that 'tenseless' sentences (sentences with no overt tense morphology) contain a phonologically null tense morpheme, which denotes either a past or present reference time. If future time reference is intended, it is obligatory to mark this overtly, as shown in (29) and (30).

- (29) a. táyt-wit \emptyset_{tense}
hungry-3PL
‘They were hungry / are hungry / * will be hungry.’
- b. táyt-wit *kelh*
hungry-3PL MODAL
‘They will be hungry.’
- (30) a. say’séz’-lhcán \emptyset_{tense}
play-1SG.SUBJ
‘I played / was playing / am playing / play / * will play.’
- b. say’séz’-lhcán *kelh*
play-1SG.SUBJ MODAL
‘I will play.’

Now, in Matthewson’s previous analysis, *tu7* replaced the zero tense morpheme, and specified past tense. In order to solve the problem of *kelh tu7*, we argue instead that *tu7* co-occurs with either the zero tense or with *kelh*, and in each case adds the meaning ‘remote’.

When *tu7* co-occurs with zero tense, it specifies that the reference time of that zero tense is remote. Notice that it is impossible for the present time to be remote from the utterance time. This automatically explains why the combination $\emptyset_{tense} + tu7$ leads to a past tense reading. On the other hand, when *tu7* co-occurs with *kelh*, which already puts the reference time into the future, we automatically predict the meaning ‘remote future’.^{6,7}

It is important to realize why the presence of the null tense morpheme is crucial in predicting the correct results for *tu7*, under its analysis as a remote marker. It is the independent fact that the zero tense denotes only a past or present reference time that accounts for the inability of *tu7* to give a future reading unless *kelh* is present.

5 A residual problem

One outstanding issue which arises from our account of *tu7* relates to the ‘was here, is now gone’ reading found in van Eijk’s example (e) above. The relevant example is repeated below as (31a), together with a minimally different sentence lacking *tu7* (31b):

- (31) a. nka7 *tu7* ni máw-a
where *tu7* DET cat-DET
‘Where did the cat go?’ (van Eijk 1997:200)

⁶ This raises the question of what happens when *láni7* ‘then, at that time’ co-occurs with *kelh* (or whether it even can). We are investigating this issue at the time of writing.

⁷ There is further research to be done with respect to *kelh*, its status as a possibility modal meaning ‘might’, and the predictions when its combines with *tu7* on its possibility reading.

simple account of the curious *kelh tu7* construction, where *tu7* combines with the modal *kelh* to yield an unexpected meaning of 'remote future'.

Appendix

Abbreviations

ABS = absent, ACT = active intransitivizer, ADHORT = adhortative enclitic, ANTI = antithetical enclitic, AUT = autonomous intransitivizer, CAU = causative transitivizer, CONJ = conjunctive subject clitic, DET = determiner, DIR = directive transitivizer, ERG = ergative (transitive) subject suffix, IMPF = imperfective auxiliary, MOD = modal, NOM = nominalizer, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRES = present SG = singular, STA = stative prefix, SUBJ = indicative subject clitic, YNQ = yes-no question enclitic.

Conversion chart for American Phonemic and van Eijk St'át'imcets Practical Orthography

orthography	phonemic	orthography	phonemic
p	p	x	ǰ
p'	p̣	xw	ǰ ^w
m	m	r	y
m'	ṃ	r'	ỵ
t	t	g	ʃ
ts	č, c	g'	ʃ ^o
ts'	č̣	gw	ʃ ^w
s	š, s	g'w	ʃ ^w
n	n	h	h
n'	ṇ	w	w
t'	ǰ	w'	ẉ
lh	ʃ	y	y
l	l	y'	ỵ
l'	ḷ	z	z
k	k	z'	ẓ
k'	ḳ	ʔ	ʔ
kw	k ^w	a	æ
k'w	ḳ ^w	ao	a
c	x	e	e
cw	x ^w	v	ʌ
q	q	i	i
q'	q̣	ii	e
qw	q ^w	u	u
q'w	q̣ ^w	o	o

References

- Bates, D. and T. Hess 2001. Tense or aspect? A prefix of future time in Lushootseed. *Papers for the 33rd ICSNL*, University of Washington.
- Dahl, O. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davis, H. in prep. *A Teacher's Grammar of Upper St'át'imcets*.
- Demirdache, H. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria 2000. The primitives of temporal relations. In R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Papers in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Klein, W. 1994. *Time in Language*. London: Routledge.
- Kratzer, A. More structural analogies between pronouns and tenses. *SALT VIII*, 92-110.
- Matthewson, L. 2002. Tense in St'át'imcets and in Universal Grammar. *Papers for the 37th ICSNL*, UBC Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Matthewson, L. to appear. An underspecified tense in St'át'imcets. *Proceedings of WECOL*.
- Shaer, B. 2003. Toward the tenseless analysis of a tenseless language. Paper presented at Semantics of Under-represented Languages in the Americas 2, UBC.
- Smith, C, T. Fernald and E. Perkins 2003. Temporal interpretation in Navajo. Paper presented at Semantics of Under-represented Languages in the Americas 2, UBC.
- van Eijk, J. 1997. *The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Wiltschko, M. 2003. On the interpretability of tense on D and its consequences for case theory. *Lingua* 113:659-696.

henryd@interchange.ubc.ca, lisamatt@interchange.ubc.ca

