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Abstract: Only two out of 23 Salish languages, St’át’imcets (Lillooet) and Nłeʔkepmxčin (Thompson River Salish), both of the Northern Interior branch, have genuine infinitives. In this paper, I take a closer look at one class of non-finite clauses in St’át’imcets: those involving the raising predicate číla ‘like, sort of’. I show that the infinitival complements of číla closely resemble finite (nominalized) complement clauses, differing only in lacking the nominalizer and associated possessive subject clitics, but allowing suffixal subject agreement, lexical (DP) subjects, and a full range of tense marking. I then examine subject-to-subject raising with číla, which takes the form of movement-type raising in infinitives, but also surfaces in nominalized finite clauses in the form of copy raising. The latter turns out to have a broader distribution both in St’át’imcets and more widely in the Salish family, since it is not dependent on the presence of an infinitival complement. Nevertheless, it must still be lexically specified for individual predicates.
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1 Introduction

I had originally intended this paper to cover the full range of infinitival structures in St’át’imcets (a.k.a. Lillooet; ISO 639-3: lil), which are rare and understudied in Salish. However, in the process of writing the paper, I have come to two conclusions which have made me shift its focus:

(i) There is variation in the structure as well as the interpretation of infinitival complements.
(ii) (Subject-to-subject) raising in St’át’imcets is not confined to infinitives.

Accordingly, I have decided to limit the current paper to a discussion of raising infinitives in St’át’imcets, leaving a broader treatment of the other types of infinitive for another occasion.

Happily, this enables me to do more justice to another understudied phenomenon in Salish, but this time, one that is not necessarily confined to one or two languages, since it is not dependent on infinitival syntax. The putative existence of ‘copy raising’ constructions in Salish has been noted in passing before: for example, Kroeber (1999:170), citing Kuipers (1967:184), gives the following Squamish example involving the predicate ?asḵʷəy ‘impossible’.

(1) čn ?asḵʷəy kʷ=n=s=tálʔ-nəxʷ-ən.
1SG.SUBJ impossible C/D=1SG.POSS=NMLZ=know-LCT-1SG.ERG
‘I cannot figure it out.’

*As ever, my deepest debt is to the St’át’imcets speakers, past and present, whose insights and wisdom pervade this work. For this paper, I am particularly grateful to Carl Alexander (Qwayʔan’ak) for his years of dedication to the documentation of his first language. I would also like to thank the members of the Salish Working Group and audiences at WECOL 2018 at CSU Fresno and the Memorial Workshop in Honour of Michael Rochemont at UBC. This work has been supported by SSHRC Insight grant #435-2015-1694 to the author. Author’s e-mail: henry.davis@ubc.ca.

1 This particular example is complicated by the fact that aside from the copy-raising construction, which copies a pronominal from the subordinate clause onto the matrix predicate, there is also copying within the
Here the subject clitic in the matrix clause bears no thematic relation to the matrix predicate, but instead appears to have been copied from the complement clause: the structure thus partially resembles ‘classic’ subject-to-subject raising, but differs in two ways: first, the subordinate clause is finite, and second, rather than movement (copy-and-delete), the configuration involves copying without deletion.

In this paper, I examine both movement raising and copy raising in St’át’ímcets. The former is confined to infinitives, as in English, and has a very restricted distribution, being limited to the infinitival complements of a single (though extremely common) predicate, číla ‘like, be alike, resemble’. The latter has a broader distribution, being possible with a number of impersonal predicates which take nominalized complement clauses, though copy raising must still be listed as a lexical property of particular predicates.

The paper is structured as follows. I begin in Section 2 by reviewing arguments for the existence of a distinctive class of infinitival clauses in St’át’ímcets, and then provide a brief survey of the three major classes of infinitive-selecting predicate in the language. In Section 3, I give some background on the raising predicate číla, before turning in Section 4 to examining the structure of raising-type infinitives in more detail. Section 5 gives the core data on movement raising in infinitives and its copy raising analogue in finite (nominalized) complement clauses. Section 6 concludes.

2 An overview of infinitives in St’át’ímcets

Infinitives are rare in Salish: in fact, as far as we know, only two languages, nleʔkepmxcín (Thompson) and St’át’ímcets (Lillooet), close relatives in the Northern Interior sub-branch of the family, possess ‘infinitive-like’ constructions (the term is from Kroeber 1999). To my knowledge, the brief remarks in Kroeber (1999:220–221) constitute the only published report of infinitives in nleʔkepmxcín. The situation is slightly better for St’át’ímcets: following up on Davis and Matthewson (1996), where infinitives were first identified, Matthewson (2005b) discusses non-finite clauses as part of her argument for the existence of syntactically represented Tense (and associated nominative Case) in the language.

In this section, I review the evidence that St’át’ímcets has genuine infinitives by comparing them with the two principal types of (non-relative) finite subordinate clause in the language (subjunctive and nominalized). I show that infinitives form a distinct third type, related to and probably derived from nominalized complement clauses, but crucially lacking the two crucial ingredients of finiteness: the nominalizer and an associated possessive subject clitic.

2.1 Finite subordinate clauses

There are two main types of non-relative finite subordinate clause in St’át’ímcets. Subjunctive clauses occur as interrogative complements and as conditional, temporal, and locative adjuncts. They are generally introduced by the complementizers l= or (in past tense temporal adjuncts only) ði=, though they may also occur as main clauses with the force of weak imperatives, with or without an accompanying circumstantial modal (see Matthewson 2010).

---

subordinate clause. The latter is a peculiarity of subject inflection in nominalized subordinate clauses in Squamish and is unconnected to copy-raising; see Davis (1999, 2000).
As their name suggests, subjunctive clauses are characterized by subjunctive (a.k.a. ‘conjunctive’) inflection, realized as subject enclitics that attach immediately after the first prosodic word in the clause, which may either be an auxiliary (if one or more are present) or the main predicate (if not). Typical examples are given in (2–4):2

(2) saw-an-cál-itas [(l=)nkáʔ=as] [(l=wáʔ=an skʷul)].
ask-DIR-1SG.OBJ-3PL.ERG [(COMP=)where=3SJv [COMP=IPFV=1SG.SJV go.to.school]]
‘They asked me where I went to school.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

(3) ?ámá=ka [(l=kíh=ás] ta=skʷúkʷmiʔ=t=a], plan wa? ?hlal.
good=IRR [COMP=go.put.on.lap=3SJv DET=child=EXIS] already IPFV cry
‘It would be good if the baby was picked up and put on somebody’s lap, it’s crying.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

(4) Ḵ̓ap-xál=lkaxʷ [(l=cúkʷ-alc=axʷ].
stack-ACT=2SG.SBJ [COMP=finish-food=2SG.SJV]
‘Stack the dishes when you finish eating.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

In (2), we see a subjunctive interrogative complement to the verb sáwən ‘ask’, optionally introduced by the complementizer l=; the embedded WH-predicate nkaʔ ‘(be) where’ in turn takes another subjunctive complement, again headed by l=, with the subjunctive subject enclitic attaching to the pre-predicative imperfective auxiliary waʔ. The example in (3) involves a subjunctive conditional l= clause subordinated to the modalized adjective ?ámá=ka ‘it would be good’, and the example in (4) features a subjunctive temporal adjunct, again introduced by l=.

Nominalized clauses, introduced by the proclitic nominalizer s=, occur exclusively in subordinate environments. Most types of complement clause are nominalized, as are certain kinds of clausal adjunct, including purpose and rationale clauses. In both argument and adjunct positions, nominalized clauses are usually introduced by the complementizer-like elements kʷ(u)= and t(a)= (the latter in factive contexts).3 These elements are diachronically related to but probably synchronically distinct from the homophonous determiners kʷ=u= and t(a)=/ti=; I have labeled them

---

2 Examples are given in the NAPA as employed in the Salish literature. All unattributed examples are from original fieldwork by the author. Unless explicitly mentioned, all examples are from the Upper (Northern) dialect of the language. Glossing abbreviations are as follows: ABSN = absent, ACT = active intransitive, AUT = autonomous intransitive (lexical reflexive), CAUS = causative transitivizer, CHA = characteristic, COMP = complementizer, CON = compound connective, COP = (equational) copula, CRED = consonant (CV) reduplication, D/C = determiner-complementizer, DEM = demonstrative, DET = determiner, DIR = directive transitivizer, EPIS = epistemic modal, ERG = ergative (transitive subject suffix), EXCL = exclusive, EXIS = existential enclitic, FRED = final (VC) reduplication, INCH = inchoative, INS = instrument, INTS = intensifier, IPFV = imperfective, IRR = irrealis modal, LCT = limited control, LOC = locative, MID = middle, NEG = negation, NMLZ = nominalizer, NTS = non-topical subject marker, OBJ = object suffix, PASS = passive, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PROS = prospective aspect, QUOT = quotative, RDR = redirecitive (applicative transitivizer, REM = remote in time, RLT = relational (applicative) transitivizer, SJV = subjunctive (‘conjunctive’) subject clitic, SUBJ = indicative subject clitic, TRED = total (VC) reduplication. An affix is marked with a hyphen (-), a clitic with an equal sign (=), an infix with angled brackets < >, a reduplicant with a bullet (*), and unsegmentable morpheme combinations with a plus sign (+).

3 Immediately preceding the clausal nominalizer s=, kʷu= usually reduces to kʷ= and t(a)= to t= (Davis & Matthewson 1996).
D/C here. Nominalized clauses are also common without D/C elements in ‘clause chaining’ contexts, where they are introduced by the equational copula *nil*; clause chaining creates sequences of temporally or logically ordered clauses across a discourse, and is particular common in narratives.

In intransitive nominalized clauses, subject agreement takes the form of possessive clitics; in transitive nominalized clauses, possessive clitics alternate with and sometimes co-occur with transitive subject suffixes, depending on the presence of an auxiliary and the person features of the clitic (see Section 4.1 below). The nominalizer and its associated possessive subject very frequently fuse with the imperfective auxiliary *waʔ* to yield special contracted forms whose components are not readily separable: see Kroeber 1999:115). Typical examples of nominalized clauses are given below:

(5) ʔáʔ•ʔz-áʔl=ʔuʔ [kʷ=n=s=ʔawáʔ-ʔn kʷu=sámʔ-ac
NEG•CRE-D-INTS=EXCL [D/C=1SG.POSS=NMLZ=know-DIR DET=white.person-mouth pináníʔ], nil [sas ?awáʔ-ac-ʔ[t]-cal-itas].
then] COP [NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS behind-mouth-RDR-1SG.OBJ-3PL.ERG]
‘I didn’t know any English at all in those days, so they interpreted for me.’
(Alexander et al. *in prep.*

(6) qíl=q-ʔanh=ʔkan [kʷ=n=s=ʔəʔuz
set.down-bottom-MID=1SG.SUBJ [D/C=1SG.POSS=NMLZ=PROS eat]
‘I sat down to eat.’
(Alexander et al. *in prep.*

(7) wáʔ=lkál Ṳáʔ-ʔmíʔ=ʔm [kʷ=ʔəkál
IPFV=1PL.SUBJ want-RLT-PASS [D/C=1NMLZ+IPFV+1PL.POSS LOC-follow-CAUS-PASS ta=ʔáʔ-ʔmíʔ=ʔm=s=kál+ʔəkál=ʔa].
DET=go-INS-3POSS=EXIS PL.DET=NMLZ-TRED•first=1PL.POSS=EXIS
‘We want to follow the path of our ancestors.’
(Alexander et al. *in prep.*

In (5), a negative predicate (*kʷ*ʔʔʔʔzú) takes a nominalized subordinate clause containing a transitive predicate marked by the first person possessive proclitic subject *n=*; this is followed by another nominalized clause, this time introduced by the copula *nil*, containing a contracted combination of nominalizer, imperfective auxiliary, and third person possessive subject (*sas*), doubling third person plural ergative marking (*-itas*) on the embedded main verb. In (6), we see a

---

4 Though it is tempting to treat D/C elements as ‘clausal determiners’, as in Davis and Matthewson (1996) and Arregui and Matthewson (2001), there are by now reasonably strong arguments that they should be classed as a separate functional category. These come from two sources. First, the range of determiner-like elements which introduce clauses is restricted in a way that cannot be entirely explained by the semantic differences between clauses and noun phrases: for example, it is unclear why ‘absent’ determiners, which assert the existence of a referent no longer present in the speech situation, cannot apply to events/situations as well as entities: see Kroeber (1999:126–127) for arguments along these lines. Second, the external distribution of DPs is different from that of D/CPS; for example, as Thompson (2012:163–164) points out, CPs in Salish (including D/CPS) can never occupy transitive subject positions, unlike DPs (in St’át’ímcets, including those referring to events/situations).

5 Passive morphology is used for first person plural transitive subjects in St’át’ímcets, as in most other Interior Salish languages; however, it is possible to disambiguate passive from first person plural when an auxiliary is present by adding a first person plural subject clitic, as here.
nominalized purpose clause with the auxiliary xʷuʔ hosting the nominalizer and associated proclitic possessive subject, while (7) contains a nominalized clause acting as complement to the verb x̣álmín ‘want’, again containing a contracted nominalizer+auxiliary+possessive clitic combination (kẉƛ̣iḳal).

2.2 Introducing infinitives

Now that we have had a quick look at how finite subordinate clauses work, we can contrast them directly with infinitives. In form, infinitives resemble nominalized clauses quite closely, with one crucial difference: they obligatorily lack a clausal nominalizer and associated possessive subject morphology.

(8) lák=ka ʔi=q̣ə̕iṇp-wí-palʔ-as-zánuxʷ=an ʔi=kalʔ=án
be.there=EPIS when.PAST=ten-plus-one-CON-year=1SG.SJV when.PAST=first=1SG.SJV
zəwát•s [kʷu=wáʔ suqʷ].
know•FRED-CAUS [D/C=IPFV skin.and.bone]
‘It must’ve been when I was about eleven years old when I first learned how to skin and bone a deer.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

(9) “well, ćíla [kʷu=ƛ̣ú-p Łaʔ n-S*əlin=a]” cún=łkan.
well like [D/C=GET.twisted-AUT 1SG.POSS-stomach=EXIS] say+DIR=1SG.SUBJ
“Well, my stomach is kind of twisting,” I told him. (Mitchell in prep.)

(10) xʷuʔ x̣aʔ [kʷu=wáʔ záxəm tákam ʔiʔ ʔi=scúqʷaʔ =a].
PROS hard [D/C=IPFV get.carried all those PL.DET=fish=EXIS]
‘It’s going to be hard to pack all those fish.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

(11) kín•kn–t [kʷa lúm-un-táli kʷu=lakʷá
dangerous•TRED-CHA [D/C+IPFV install-DIR-NTS DET=crucifix
l=ki=lam-xl–áxʷ=a], ?alasʔuł cmixʷ-laqin!
on=PL.DET=pray-ACT-place=EXIS] really-too.much peaked-top
‘It’s dangerous to install crucifixes on churches: their roofs are too steep!’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

As shown in (8–11), infinitives are invariably introduced by the D/C element kʷ(ų)=, which often fuses with a following imperfective auxiliary to yield the contracted form kʷa, as in (11). I assume this introductory element is identical to the D/C kʷ(ų)= which introduces finite (nominalized) clauses. This means that infinitival clauses are CPs, though defective in the sense that they invariably lack nominalization and associated subject clitics.

---

6 In contrast to St’át’imcets, infinitives in nleʔkepmxcln may be introduced either by a D/C element homophonous with the referential determiner (h)e= or one homophonous with the non-referential determiner k=, with the former occurring in “realis” and the latter in “irrealis” environments (Kroeber 1999:221).
2.3 The distribution of infinitives

In this subsection, I give a brief overview of the inventory of infinitival clauses in St’át’imcets, before turning more specifically to raising-type infinitives.

Infinitives in St’át’imcets are confined to complement positions; there are no infinitival adjunct clauses. Furthermore, all predicates which take infinitival clauses also take finite (nominalized) complement clauses. Both of these points likely relate to the fact that infinitives are a comparatively recent development in St’át’imcets (and Salish overall, as observed by Kroeber 1999:221).

The overwhelming majority of infinitival clauses appear as complements to three types of predicate:

(ii) **Evaluative predicates** (‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘hard’, ‘easy’, ‘fun’, ‘dangerous’; ‘like’, ‘dislike’, ‘enjoy’, ‘have a hard time with’); this class also includes complex nominal predicates with an evaluative component (‘easy/hard work’, ‘(take) a lot of thought’)
(iii) **Approximative predicates** (‘like/kind of’)

Examples of each of these types are given in (12–23):

(i) **Epistemic predicates**:

(12) lanʔaywaʔ zwát-an-əm [kʷa kʷukʷ].
already then IPFV be.known-DIR-PASS [D/C+IPFV cook]
‘We already knew how to cook.’
(Matthewson 2005a:479)

(13) zwát•at-s-as [kʷa piƛəm].
be.known+FRED-CAUS-3ERG [D/C+IPFV hunt]
‘He has learned how to hunt.’
(Alexander et al. in prep.)

(14) xʷúʔ=łkan zwát•at-xal [kʷa čáw-xal kʷu=sqλáw].
PROS=1SG.SUBJ be.known+FRED-ACT [D/C+IPFV wash-ACT DET=gold]
‘I’m going to learn how to pan for gold.’
(Alexander et al. in prep.)

(15) plán=ƛuʔ ?az kʷas zwát [kʷa]
already=EXCL NEG D/C+NMŁZ+IPFV+3POSS be.known [D/C+IPFV mays-ən-táli [ʔi=sq§ip=a].
fix-DIR-NTS PL.DET=black.tree.moss=EXIS]
‘It’s no longer known how to prepare black tree moss.’

(ii) **Evaluative predicates**:

(16) ƛ̓aʔ [kʷa qʷaz-ən-táli kʷu=k̓əɬ̓h- álʔaʔ]
hard [D/C+IPFV use-DIR-NTS DET=rock-flesh l̕=kiʔats-ank álʔxʷ=a].
on=PL.DET=attached-lower.surface-place=EXIS
‘It’s hard to use gyprock on the ceiling.’
(Alexander et al. in prep.)
While the infinitival complements to these three classes of predicate all share the same basic design (they are all introduced by k*u= and all obligatorily lack a nominalizer and subject clitic morphology), they otherwise differ both syntactically and semantically. At this point, I set aside the first two classes to focus on the third, which contains the single ‘approximative’ predicate čila ‘like, kind of, sort of’. Before returning specifically to infinitives, however, I take a slight detour to provide some general background on čila.

(iii) Approximative predicates:

20. čila=Ikán=ʔu? [k*u] šak ka-n-zâx*=-xn-a
like=2SG.SUBJ=EXCL [D/C+IPFV continue CIRC-LOC-stumble-foot-CIRC
=̓k*ʔ=š̓ʔ̓st̓ʔ̓taq] ??=x*ʔ̓la̓p-an-č̓al̓m=as.
in=PL.INV.DET=NMLZ-hole•TRED] when.PAST=ghost-DIR-1SG.PASS=3SJ
‘It felt like I kept stepping into holes when I got ghosted.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

21. šak=matq, nil s-čila=s [k*u=s-x*əl̓ x*úl
continue=1SG.SUBJ walk COP NMLZ=like=3POSS [D/C=STA-rut•TRED
ta=tmix*=a].
DET=ground=EXIS]
‘I kept walking, and then it was like the ground was rutted.’
(Alexander et al. in prep.)

22. čila [k*u=ka-ʔ̓jáy-ləx-a ta=n-sq*əl̓ʔ̓=a], ʔu?
like [D/C=CIRC-jump-AUT-CIRC DET=1SG.POSS-story=EXIS but
x*ʔ̓y̓=lk̓an=ʔu?] ʔ̓ʔ̓aat.
PROS=1SG.SUBJ=EXCL return
‘My story has kind of run away, but I’ll get back to it.’ (Jackson in prep.)

23. wa? q*c•ś-c-ləc čila [k*u=cwás-əm] ??=w•ʔwp-lik=ʔa.
IPFV move•CRED-AUT like [D/C=measure-MID PL.DET=hairy•CRED-skin=EXIS
‘Caterpillars wriggle around like they’re measuring something.’
(Alexander et al. in prep)
3 The approximative predicate čila

In both its semantic flexibility and syntactic versatility, čila resembles English ‘like’. Its core meaning is ‘be alike, be the same as’, as shown in (24–25). In this function, it is syntactically intransitive, but requires two semantic arguments: its semantic requirement may be satisfied either by a plural subject, which typically induces (CVC plural) reduplication on the predicate, as in (24), or by a subject and an overt (but non-agreeing) object, as in (25).

(24) čəčila=lkál=ƛu?.
   TRED=like=1PL.SUBJ=EXCL
   ‘We are alike.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

(25) čila=lkán=ƛu?       ta=n-sqáćasʔ=a.
    like=1SG.SUBJ=EXCL  DET=1SG.POSS-father=EXIS
    ‘I am just like my father.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

In addition, čila is often employed as a quasi-prepositional element, as in (26). In this role, it acts as an adjunct predicate, and signals a relation of approximate semantic equivalence between its argument and the subject of the main predicate.

(26) waʔ látíʔ s-lák l=ta=n-ʃ^úyt-tan-s=a čila
    IPFV there STAT-flop.down on=DET=LOC-sleep-INS-3POSS=EXIS like
    kʷu=l’onkaya.
    DET=cast.iron.pot
    ‘He’s lying in his bed motionless, like a cast-iron pot!’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

Again, like English ‘like’, čila is also very frequently employed as an adverbial qualifier with the meaning ‘sort of, kind of’.

(27) kəl-q čilaʔi=sikil-s=a nîl=ƛuʔ sas
    come.off-bottom like PL.DET=bark-3POSS=EXIS COP=EXCL NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS
    kʷəʔən-ás.
    peel-DIR-3ERG
    ‘The bark sort of came off at the bottom and then she peeled them (the hemp stalks).’ (Mitchell in prep.)

(28) kalás s=qonmp=s wi=ćulakaʔ máqáʔ kʷənswá kʷukʷpiʔ,
    Three NMLZ=ten=3POSS plus=seven snow D/C+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+IPFV chief
    plán=lkán qa<u>ʔ=ʔəz -mín čila.
    already=1SG.SUBJ tired<INCH>-RLT like
    ‘I was chief for thirty-seven years, and then I got tired of it, sort of.’ (Edwards et al. in prep.)

Of most direct interest to us, however, čila often appears with clausal complements. To start with, it is standardly used in equative constructions, where its direct argument is a nominalized clause denoting the target of comparison, and its oblique argument (introduced by the preposition ʔə=)
denotes the standard of comparison (see Davis & Mellesmoen 2019 on comparative syntax and semantics in St’át’imcets).

(29) \(c̓ila=\ddot{a}̓u?\) \([s=\dddot{z}̓a̓x-{\text{alq}}^{*}\text{am}^{*}=s\text{ s-Bill}]\) \(ʔo=s\text{-Mary.}\)

\(\text{like}=\text{EXCL.} \quad [\text{NMLZ}=\text{tall-appearance}=3\text{POSS NMLZ-Bill}]\) \(\text{to}=\text{NMLZ-Mary}\)

‘Bill is as tall as Mary.’ (‘the degree to which Bill is tall is the same as Mary’)

(Alexander et al. in prep.)

Just as with individual arguments (29), both semantic degree arguments can be represented by the same (plural) syntactic argument, as in (30).

(30) \(c̓al\cdot c̓ila=k̓á=\ddot{w}=p=\ddot{a}̓u?\) \([k^{*}=\dddot{p}̓ɜ̓l̓p̓ɜ̓l̓\text{-}t=\text{k̓al}].\)

\(\text{TRED} \cdot \text{like}=\text{EPIS} \cdot \text{EMPH}=\text{EXCL} \quad [\text{D/C}=\text{NMLZ}=\text{stubborn} \cdot \text{TRED} \cdot \text{CHA}=\text{1PL} \cdot \text{SUBJ}].\)

‘We must have been just as stubborn as each other.’ (‘the degree to which we were stubborn was the same’)

(Edwards et al. 2017:48)

Aside from equatives, \(c̓ila\) also takes a nominalized clausal complement when acting as an impersonal main predicate with an approximative meaning close to that of its adverbial usage:

(31) \(c̓ila=\ddot{a}̓u?\) \([k^{*}=\dddot{p}̓tinus\text{-}\text{min-an}=\dddot{ʔi}̓l̓] \quad \text{ta}=\text{s-wáʔ}=s=a=\dddot{a}̓u?\)

\(\text{like}=\text{EXCL.} \quad [\text{D/C}=\text{NMLZ}=\text{think}\text{-RLT} \cdot \text{1SG} \cdot \text{ERG}=\text{those DET}=\text{NMLZ}=\text{IPFV}=3\text{POSS}=\text{EXIS}=\text{EXCL} \quad s=\dddot{ʔ}̓ál̓l̓us \quad ʔi=\dddot{ʔ}̓ux=\text{almix}=a \quad \text{sk̓̓om}=\text{k̓úk}=\text{miʔ}].\)

\(\text{STAT} \cdot \text{gather} \quad \text{PL} \cdot \text{DET} = \text{indigenous.person}=\text{EXIS} \quad \text{TRED} \cdot \text{child}\)

‘I kind of think of them as places where Indian children were gathered together.’

(Matthewson 2005a:366)

(32) \(c̓ila=k^{*}=\ddot{ʔ}=\dddot{a}̓u?\) \([\text{ta}=\text{s}=\dddot{p}̓l̓ά̓n}=s=a=\text{tu}?] \quad 1=\dddot{c}=\dddot{ʔ}̓a\text{ wa} \quad ʔ=\text{aylám}\]

\(\text{like}=\text{QUOT} \cdot \text{EXCL.} \quad [\text{D/C}=\text{NMLZ}=\text{already}=3\text{POSS}=\text{EXIS}=\text{REM} \quad \text{from}=\text{here} \quad \text{IPFV} \quad \text{recently}] \quad \text{piʔam}=k^{*}=\ddot{ʔ}=\text{ti}?] \quad \text{ta}=\text{twit}=a,\)

\(\text{hunt}=\text{QUOT} \cdot \text{that} \quad \text{DET}=\text{professional.hunter}=\text{EXIS}\)

‘Kind of not too long after this, this professional hunter went out hunting.’

(Mitchell in prep.)

The use of \(c̓ila\) with nominalized complement clauses is very close if not identical in meaning to its use with infinitival complements. Syntactically, however the two differ in a now familiar fashion: as shown in (20–23) above, and (33–34) below, infinitives lack the nominalizer and associated possessive subject clitics.

(33) \(c̓ila \quad [k^{*}=\dddot{ʔ}̓us-[c]-\text{tuʔ̓n}].\)

\(\text{like}=\text{[D/C}=\text{get.thrown.out}=[\text{CAUS}]\text{-PASS} \quad \text{ABSN.DET}=1\text{SG.POSS-grandmother}=\text{EXIS}\)

\(\text{ki}=\text{n̓ks̓áytkən}=s=a \quad \text{na}=n=\text{sp̓ápoz}=a\)

\(\text{PL} \cdot \text{DET}=\text{relative}=3\text{POSS}=\text{EXIS} \quad \text{ABSN.DET}=1\text{SG.POSS-grandfather}=\text{EXIS}\)

\(ʔi=\text{zúʔ}=\text{as}=\text{tuʔ}\),

\(\text{when.PAST}=\text{die}=3\text{SJ} \cdot \text{REM}\)

‘My grandmother was sort of thrown out by my grandfather’s relatives when he died.’

(Matthewson 2005a:393)
Infinitives with čila test systematically as raising rather than control structures, as I will show in Section 5 below. However, they also show a number of correlated differences in the specification of tense and agreement features, which indicate that they may be syntactically ‘larger’ than the other two types of infinitive. I address these in the next section.

4 The structure of infinitives with čila

In this section, I examine the structure of čila infinitives in more detail. I show that the only way in which they are defective is in missing nominalization and associated subject marking: otherwise they may be fully specified for agreement (Section 4.1) and tense (Section 4.2). I give a tentative structure for čila infinitives in Section 4.3.

4.1 Subjects in čila-type infinitives

We have already seen that subject clitics are systematically absent in infinitives. However, it has been known since Davis (1999, 2000) and Kroeber (1999) that there are two subject agreement positions in St’át’imcets (as in most other Salish languages from the Central and Northern Interior branches of the family). The higher ‘outer’ subject is the one represented by the three series of subject clitics; the lower ‘inner’ position is confined to transitive clauses, and represented by ergative subject suffixes.

In transitive clauses with an auxiliary, a subject clitic (null in the indicative) may co-occur with a subject suffix, as shown in the subjunctive clause in (35) and the normalized clause in (36).7

(35) wa? qiʔ-sút-miʔ-c-as ta=n-máw=a l=waʔ=as
IPFV suck.up-OOC=RLT-1SG.OBJ=3ERG DET=1SG.POSS-cat=EXIS COMP=IPFV=3SJ
kʷ=n=sʔám-c-aʔ.wá
want=RLT-3ERG D/C=1SG.POSS=NMLZ=feed-mouth=DIR
‘My cat sucks up to me when he wants me to feed him.’ (Alexander et al. in prep.)

(36) cámaʔ=ɬuʔ? nil=ɬuʔ? [s=xʷu̱ʔ=s ɬ=xʷun-x[i]-túmul-as
after.a.while=EXCL COP=EXCL [NMLZ=PROS=3POSS win-RDR-1PL.OBJ=3ERG
ʔi=sámʔ=a ʔi=n-qʷ-alut-tən=ʔl̕ú=a].
PL.DET=white.person=EXIS PL.DET=LOC-speak-INS-1PL.POSS=EXIS]
‘After a while the white people began to suppress (literally, ‘conquer’) our languages.’
(Edwards et al. in prep.)

---

7 If no auxiliary is present, either the subject clitic or the subject suffix is realized on the main predicate, but not both. As a rule, the subject suffix takes precedence over the subject clitic, except in the first person singular of nominalized clauses, where the possessive proclitic n= may be used as an alternative to suffixal -an.
These cases both involve third person subjects; with first or second persons, subject clitics usually supplant rather than supplement subject suffixes in subjunctive and nominalized subordinate clauses with auxiliaries.\(^8\)

Returning now to infinitives, it turns out that while subject clitics are systematically missing in *čila* infinitives, subject suffixes are not. In transitive infinitives, third person -as (37), third person plural -itas/-twitas (38), passive -om (39), and first/second person subject suffixes (40) are all permitted:

(37) nił n-pańt-úš-miñ-c-as,  
\[ \text{COP LOC=} \text{return-face-RLT-1SG.OBJ-3ERG like=} \text{EXCL} \]
\[ \text{[k*}a \text{ n-qs-ánk-mín-c-as].} \]
\[ \text{[D/C+IPFV LOC-laugh-belly-RLT-1SG.OBJ-3ERG]} \]
‘Then he turned around to face me, as if he was laughing at me.’  (Matthewson 2005a:158)

(38) wa? nuk*?-an-táñemwit ?α=kìʔux*almix*=a  
\[ \text{IPFV help-DIR-3PL.PASS by=} \text{PL.DET=indigenous.person=EXIS D/C=NMLZ=} \text{like=} \text{3POSS} \]
\[ \text{[k*u}=\text{stlipt-s-twitas ta}=\text{ház-i} \text{=ha ptak} \]
\[ \text{[D/C=go.over.hill-CAUS-3PL.ERG DET=} \text{canoe-3PL.POSS=EXIS past} \]
\[ \text{l}=\text{látìʔ ta}=\text{waʔ pa}=\text{púl*ʔal].} \]
‘They were helped by the people to kind of carry their canoe over to past where the rapids were.’  (Mitchell in prep.)

(39) nił=łuʔ? (s=)sníłh-c  
\[ \text{COP=} \text{EXCL (NMLZ=} \text{3SG.INDP=} \text{3POSS DET=} \text{accuse-DIR-PASS=EXIS but} \]
\[ \text{ta}=\text{ʔáw}t=a \text{ ta}=\text{waʔ n}=\text{s-qaníʔm k*as} \]
\[ \text{DET=} \text{last=EXIS DET=} \text{IPFV 1SG.POSS=NMLZ-hear D/C+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS} \]
\[ \text{čila}=\text{łuʔ? [k*}a \text{lum-šút-ən-ám} \text{like=} \text{EXCL [D/C+IPFV} \text{accuse-OOC-DIR-PASS} \]
\[ \text{tswáša} \text{ʔux*almix*].} \]
\[ \text{D/C+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS+EXIS indigenous.person]} \]
‘So he was the one that was accused, but last I heard, it was like he was falsely accused just because he was an Indian.’  (Edwards et al. 2017:168)

(40) čila=łużʔ?  
\[ \text{[k*}a \text{ ʔix*}l-om-nún-alap} \]
\[ \text{like=} \text{EXCL [D/C+IPFV different-MID-DIR-2PL.ERG} \]
\[ \text{ta}=\text{ssàq*ən} \text{láp} =\text{a}. \]
\[ \text{DET=} \text{younger.sibling-2PL.POSS=EXIS} \]
‘It’s like you’re treating your younger sibling as a stranger.’

The most important point about the presence of subject suffixes in *čila* infinitives is that there is nothing incompatible between infinitives and subject agreement *per se*: it is only subject clitics

---

\(^8\) In a relic pattern more characteristic of neighbouring nleʔkepmxcin, a first or second person subject suffix in a nominalized clause also sometimes co-occurs with a third person (‘expletive’) possessive clitic on a pre-predicative auxiliary (Davis 1999, 2000).
which are systematically absent. This indicates that ćila infinitives are missing particular subject agreement features or their projections, rather than being radically subject-less.

This in turn raises the question of whether overt DP subjects are also permitted in ćila infinitives, on the general assumption that agreement is responsible for licensing argument DPs. The answer is yes, as shown in (41–42):

(41) ćila [kʷa ḳap-en-itas n-snəkʷənúkʷʔ=a
   like [D/C+IPFV get.forgotten-DIR-3PL.ERG 1SG.POSS-TRED•friend=EXIS
ta=ćuʔʔ-i=ha n-qʷalút-tan].
   DET=own-3PL.POSS=EXIS LOC-speak-INS]
   ‘It’s like my friends have forgotten their own language.’

(42) ćila=ʔu? [kʷu= pópt waʔ xík-ən-as kʷ=s-Bill
   like=EXCL [D/C=always IPFV miss-DIR-3ERG DET=NMLZ-Bill
   ?i=ćiʔ=a waʔ qʷús-xi-tas].
   PL.DET=deer=EXIS IPFV shoot-RDR-3ERG]
   ‘It’s like Bill always misses the deer he shoots at.’

In these examples, the subject of the infinitival is trapped inside the embedded clause by the object, precluding an alternative analysis where it can be construed as a main clause subject. This reinforces the conclusion we have reached on the basis of agreement: nothing is missing in ćila infinitives except nominalization and outer (clitic) subject agreement.

4.3 Tense marking in ćila infinitives

Cross-linguistically, infinitives are often associated with missing or defective tense; and indeed, Matthewson (2005b:34) specifically claims that St’át’imcets infinitives cannot bear independent tense marking. However, she did not consider ćila infinitives, which, it turns out, are fully specified for tense features.

The most reliable place to find tense marking in St’át’imcets is in the future, since the language has unmarked present/past tense, but is obligatorily marked for future tense (Matthewson 2006). Future may be marked by the modal enclitic =kəl, the prospective auxiliary xʷuʔ, or both. The following examples show ćila infinitives with the full range of future tense marking. (Note also the first person subject suffixes in 44.)

(43) a. kʷa[kʷ]-ən̓, ćila [kʷu=xʷuʔ kʷ=is].
   stagger•CRED-MID like [D/C=PROS fall]
   ‘He staggered, like he was going to fall.’

b. kʷa[kʷ]-ən̓, ćila [kʷu=kʷis=kəl].
   stagger•CRED-MID like [D/C=fut=FUT]
   (same)

c. kʷa[kʷ]-ən̓, ćila [kʷu=xʷuʔ=kəl kʷ=is].
   stagger•CRED-MID like [D/C=PROS=FUT fall]
   (same)
The existence of both tense and inner subject agreement marking in čila infinitives provide important clues as to their structure, to which we turn next.

4.4 A structure for čila infinitives

The easiest way to approach the structure of čila infinitives is to compare them directly to their closest finite analogues, nominalized subordinate clauses. Accordingly, I will begin by sketching a picture of the latter. First of all, I assume that the D/C elements which introduce nominalized clauses are the head of a projection in the outermost layer of the C-domain. Next, I situate the clausal nominalizer s= in a Finiteness Phrase (FP) lower down in the C-domain (Rizzi 1997). I further assume that FP is selected by D/C, which for nominalized clauses is specified by the matrix predicate as [+Fin]. As we have seen, the presence of s= is correlated with the presence of outer subject agreement, in the form of possessive subject clitics. I assume the latter are generated as sets of phi-features on the [+Fin] head of FP, with post-syntactic morphological adjustments to derive their surface positions.

I further assume F selects for T, and that T in turn licenses an overt DP or pro subject in its specifier. Below T, we find at least one and up to three aspectual projections, headed by aspectual auxiliaries, occupying the zone between T and Voice (the Asp* notation below is meant to express the variable number of aspect phrases). Following previous work (see, e.g., Davis 2019), I locate inner (suffixal) subject agreement in Voice. I assume that passive object agreement (in complementary distribution with suffixal subject agreement) is also generated in the Voice head; this means that in St’át’imcets, passive involves ‘partial’ promotion to Voice, but not to T.

This results in the following structure for a finite (nominalized) clause:

\[
\text{(44) a. ka-qʷáý-}a \quad \text{ta=sqáx?=a, } \text{čila=ǜu\,? [kʷu=xʷúz \ cəw-q-án-an].}
\]

CIRC-yelp-CIRC \text{ DET=dog=EXIS like=EXCL} [D/C=PROS kick-bottom-DIR-1SG.ERG]

‘The dog yelped, like I was going to kick it in the butt.’

\[
\text{b. ka-qʷáý-}a \quad \text{ta=sqáx?=a, } \text{čila=ǜu\,? [kʷu=cəw-q-án-an=kəl].}
\]

CIRC-yelp-CIRC \text{ DET=dog=EXIS like=EXCL} [D/C=kick-bottom-DIR-1SG.ERG=FUT]

(same)

\[
\text{c. ka-qʷáý-}a \quad \text{ta=sqáx?=a, } \text{čila=ǜu\,? [kʷu=xʷúz=kəl}
\]

CIRC-yelp-CIRC \text{ DET=dog=EXIS like=EXCL} [D/C=PROS=FUT}

\text{cəw-q-án-an].}

\text{kick-bottom-DIR-1SG.ERG]}

(same)
Now, let us turn to čila infinitives. As we have already seen, these differ very minimally from finite nominalized clauses: to be precise, they lack the nominalizer and possessive subject agreement, but are otherwise fully specified for tense and agreement. This strongly suggests that the difference between the clause types should be located in FP. There are two options for infinitives: we could generate FP with the value [-Fin], or we could leave it out altogether. I choose the first option here for čila infinitives, mainly to distinguish them from the other two types of infinitival clause (see Section 2.3), which are more restricted in their tense and agreement possibilities, and importantly, do not allow overt DP subjects. If we assume F selects for TP, and DP subjects are licensed by T, then it follows that FP is present in čila infinitives, leading to the structure in (46).

(46) čila-type infinitival clause:

The main claim embodied in (46) is that čila infinitivals are almost identical in structure to finite nominalized clauses: the only differences spring from the feature value of [±Fin].
5 Raising

Classic subject raising predicates like ‘seem’ and ‘likely’ are mostly absent in St’át’imcets; their meaning is covered by modal adverbs (e.g., səʔək ‘maybe’) and second-position clitics (e.g., =ka ‘possibly, apparently’); see Rullmann et al. (2008). However, čila is an exception: it allows both classic (‘movement’) raising out of an infinitival complement (Section 5.1) and ‘copy raising’ in finite complements (Section 5.2).

5.1 Movement raising with čila

In the infinitives below, either a full DP subject (47–48) or a pronoun subject (49–50) appears in a position adjacent to čila, outside the infinitive clause where it is thematically selected and whose boundary is delimited by the D/C element.

(47) níł=ƛ̓u? s=čila=s ta=kʷúkʷplʔ=a [kʷu=čá<ʔ>x].
   COP=EXCL NMLZ=like=3POSS DET=chief=EXIS [D/C=ashamed<INCH>]
   ‘Then the chief got kind of ashamed.’ (Jackson in prep.)

(48) čila=ƛ̓u? kʷu=ŋ-məzác=a [kʷu=qʷts-p].
   like=EXCL DET=1SG.POSS-body=EXIS [D/C=shake-INCH]
   ‘My body felt like it was shaking.’ (Mitchell in prep.)

(49) čila=lkán=ƛ̓u? [kʷa matq l=kʷu=sxát•xatq x.wal].
   like=1SG.SUBJ=EXCL [D/C+IPFV walk on=DET=hole•TRED road]
   ‘It was like I was walking along a road full of potholes’. (Alexander at al. in prep.)

(50) níł=ƛ̓u? ?ayɬ n=qʷacáč, ƛ̓=əm-an-cút, čila=lkən
   COP=EXCL then 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=leave fast-DIR-RFLX like=1SG.SUBJ
   [kʷu=xʷúləl-min].
   [D/C=run.away-RDR]
   ‘Then I left, in a hurry, I was kind of running away from it.’ (Mitchell in prep.)

These examples appear to be clear cases of (subject-to-subject) raising, directly parallel to raising in English with predicates such as ‘seem’ or ‘be likely’. However, there are a number of respects in which the constructions differ. Most obviously, raising in St’át’imcets takes place over a subordinating element (the C/D kʷu=); of course, subject-to-subject raising cases in English (and putatively, universally: see Landau 2013) never take place over a complementizer.

Second, and equally strikingly, raising in St’át’imcets infinitivals is optional, since as we have seen it is quite possible for subjects to remain inside the infinitival complements to čila (see, e.g., 41–42 above). In this respect, St’át’imcets raising bears some resemblance to (A-type) scrambling, though unlike the latter, but like classic raising, it is sensitive to lexical properties of the raising predicate. A minimal pair with and without raising (equally grammatical, and with identical meaning) is given in (51a–b). In contrast, raised and non-raised subjects cannot both be present at once, as shown in (51c): i.e., copy raising is blocked.
Recall that every predicate in St’át’imcets which takes an infinitival complement also takes a finite (nominalized) complement clause; ćila is no exception (see 31–32 above). Its finite complement shows an almost inverse pattern of raising to that which characterizes its infinitival complement: movement raising is forbidden, while copy raising is permitted. Relevant examples are given in (52), note that I give two versions of each finite clause, one with a possessive subject clitic attached to an imperfective auxiliary, the other with a subject suffix attached to the main verb.

(52) a. ćila=ƛuʔ [kʷa kaɪm-án-naxʷ ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].
    like=EXCL [D/C+IPFV despise-DIR-2SG.ERG DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS]
    ‘It’s like you despise my cooking.’

b. ćila=lk̓áxʷ=ƛuʔ [kʷa kaɪm-án ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].
    like=2SG.SUBJ=EXCL [D/C+IPFV despise-DIR DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS]
    (same)

  * ćila=lk̓áxʷ=ƛuʔ [kʷa kaɪm-án-naxʷ]
    like=2SG.SUBJ=EXCL [D/C+IPFV despise-DIR-2SG.ERG DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS]
    ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].

However, it turns out that copy raising is possible with ćila — just not in infinitives. We turn to this pattern next.

5.2 Copy raising with ćila

Recall that every predicate in St’át’imcets which takes an infinitival complement also takes a finite (nominalized) complement clause; ćila is no exception (see 31–32 above). Its finite complement shows an almost inverse pattern of raising to that which characterizes its infinitival complement: movement raising is forbidden, while copy raising is permitted. Relevant examples are given in (52), note that I give two versions of each finite clause, one with a possessive subject clitic attached to an imperfective auxiliary, the other with a subject suffix attached to the main verb.

(52) a. ćila=ƛuʔ [kʷásu kaɪm-án]
    like=EXCL [D/C+NMLZ+IPFV+2SG.POSS despise-DIR ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].
    DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS
    ‘It’s like you despise my cooking.’

b. ćila=ƛuʔ [kʷ=s=kɑm-án-naxʷ ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].
    like=EXCL [D/C=NMLZ=despise-DIR-2SG.ERG DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS]
    (same)

c. ćila=lk̓áxʷ=ƛuʔ [kʷásu kaɪm-án]
    like=2SG.SUBJ=EXCL [D/C+NMLZ+IPFV+2SG.POSS despise-DIR ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].
    DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS
    (same)

d. ćila=lk̓áxʷ=ƛuʔ [kʷ=s=kɑm-án-naxʷ]
    like=2SG.SUBJ=EXCL [D/C=NMLZ=despise-DIR-2SG.ERG ta=n-s-kʷukʷ=a].
    DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS
    (same)
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e.  *čila=likâxʷ=ƛ̓uʔ
dlike=2SG.SUBJ=EXCL  [kʷ=u=käng-án
  ta=n-s-kʷúkʷ=ʔa].
  DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-cook=EXIS

The table below compares the movement raising and copy raising patterns with čila: note that a non-raising (‘expletive’) pattern is grammatical with both finite and non-finite complements.⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-raising</th>
<th>copy raising</th>
<th>movement raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>finite</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitival</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 More on copy raising

While, as we have seen, movement raising in St’át’imcets is confined to čila, it turns out that copy raising is not. Interestingly, it occurs with predicates that do not normally take infinitival complements. One such predicate is cukʷ ‘stop, finish, quit’, as exemplified in (53):

(53) a. cukʷ [kʷ=n=s=mác-ʔn tiʔ kʷu=púkʷ].
  finished [D/C=1SG.POSS=NMLZ=write-DIR that DET=book]
  ‘I’ve finished writing that book.’

b. cukʷ [kʷ=s=mác-ʔn-án tiʔ kʷu=púkʷ].
  finished [D/C=NMLZ=write-DIR-1SG.ERG that DET=book]
  (same)

c. cúkʷ=kan [kʷ=n=s=mác-ʔn tiʔ kʷu=púkʷ].
  finished=1SG.SUBJ [D/C=1SG.POSS=NMLZ=write-DIR that DET=book]
  (same)

d. cúkʷ=kan [kʷ=s=mác-ʔn-án tiʔ kʷu=púkʷ].
  finished=1SG.SUBJ [D/C=NMLZ=write-DIR-1SG.ERG that DET=book]
  (same)

e.  *cúkʷ=kan [kʷ=s=mác-ʔn tiʔ kʷu=púkʷ].
  finished=1SG.SUBJ [D/C=NMLZ=write-DIR that DET=book]

---

⁹ The expletive subject is overtly realized when čila is embedded in a nominalized or subjunctive clause, since in these environments third person intransitive subjects are realized as =s or =as, respectively, rather than Ø, as in indicative environments. A nominalized case is shown in (i); another is in (38) above.

(i) níłʔúʔ  s=čila=s  [kʷu=ti<ʔčʷ=ʔití].
cop=EXCL  NMLZ=like=3POSS [D/C=free<INCH>=3PL]
  ‘Then they kind of got free.’  (Mitchell in prep.)
Copy raising with *cuk* is identical to copy-raising with *cila*: it is optional, occurs with either a possessive subject clitic or a subject in its clausal complement, and is ungrammatical with no subject in the subordinate clause.

However, not all potential raising predicates allow copy raising: the adjective *ʔiʔaʔ* ‘enough’, for example, meets the semantic criteria for a raising predicate (it selects a clausal complement and lacks an external argument) but is rejected in copy raising contexts (and less surprisingly, in movement raising contexts as well):

(54) a. *ʔiʔaʔ* [kʷású ʔas-páqʷ-s ta=TV=ha].
   enough [D/C+C+NMlZ+IPFV+2SG.POSS STAT-watch-CAUS DET=TV=EXIS]
   ‘You’ve watched enough TV.’

b. *ʔiʔaʔ* [kʷ=s=ʔas-páqʷ-s-axʷ ta=TV=ha].
   enough [D/C=NMLZ=STAT-watch-CAUS-2SG.ERG DET=TV=EXIS] (same)

c. *ʔiʔaʔ* [kʷású ʔas-páqʷ-s ta=TV=ha].
   enough=2SG.SUBJ [D/C+C+NMlZ+IPFV+2SG.POSS STAT-watch-CAUS DET=TV=EXIS]

d. *ʔiʔaʔ* [kʷ=s=ʔas-páqʷ-s-axʷ ta=TV=ha].
   enough=2SG.SUBJ [D/C=NMLZ=STAT-watch-CAUS-2SG.ERG DET=TV=EXIS]

e. *ʔiʔaʔ* [kʷ=s=ʔas-páqʷ-s ta=TV=ha].
   enough=2SG.SUBJ [D/C=NMLZ=STAT-watch-CAUS DET=TV=EXIS]

In other words, there is an irreducible lexical component to copy-raising in St’át’imcets, as has often been pointed out with respect to raising more generally.\(^{10}\)

Summarizing, we can deduce the following one-way implications:

(i) If a predicate allows copy-raising, it selects for a clausal complement and occurs with an expletive subject (e.g., *cuk*). However, not all predicates with these selectional properties allow copy-raising (e.g., *ʔiʔaʔ*).

(ii) If a predicate allows movement raising in infinitives, it also allows copy raising in finite clauses (*cila*). However, not all predicates allow copy-raising occur in infinitivals (e.g., *cuk*).

---

\(^{10}\) It is worth mentioning that though it is lexically restricted, copy raising in St’át’imcets is nevertheless more freely available than its English counterpart, which only occurs with predicates which take finite clausal complements introduced by *like* or *as if/ as though*, as in (i). The direct English equivalent of St’át’imcets copy-raising is ungrammatical, as shown in (ii):

(i) You seem *like/as if you* have seen a ghost.

(ii) *You* seem (that) you have seen a ghost.
5.4 Implications

I have now outlined the basic properties of subject-to-subject raising in both infinitival and finite complements in St’át’imcets. Obviously, there is a great deal more to do: for example, well-known syntactic characteristics of raising in better-studied languages, including reconstruction for scope and binding, as well as locality effects such as the (im)possibility of ‘super-raising’ constructions, have yet to be investigated.\(^\text{11}\)

Nevertheless, there are lessons we can draw from the raising patterns identified here. The first is that raising is not a property of infinitives \textit{per se}: rather, it is a general property of predicates which select a clausal complement but not an external argument, including both finite and infinitival clauses.

The second is that not all predicates which meet the preconditions for raising actually undergo it. As has often been observed for better-studied languages, raising is partly a lexically-specified property of individual predicates. Within the Salish family, where copy raising has been reported sporadically in a number of languages, this is almost certainly also true, and should act as a stimulus for a more systematic investigation of potential raising predicates in individual languages.

Third, the crucial factor in St’át’imcets which distinguishes finite from infinitival clauses, and therefore triggers the difference between movement raising and copy raising, is neither the initial D/C element (which is identical in both) nor features of T (which are as fully specified in \(čīla\) infinitives as they are in finite clauses), but specifically a functional head which encodes finiteness features, and is responsible for licensing outer (clitic) subjects.\(^\text{12}\) It is the [+Fin] specification of this head which blocks movement raising, and forces copy raising to take place instead.

Fourth, there is nothing intrinsic to the structure of infinitives which \textit{forces} movement raising in St’át’imcets: the process is optional. This is a challenge to older GB-style theories of NP-movement, which essentially appeal to a conspiracy between (abstract) Case (which forces an argument to move out of a Caseless subject position) and the Theta Criterion (which allows it to move into a non-thematic subject position). However, at least in principle, contemporary Agree-based theories allow for the possibility of optional raising; since they are based on feature matching mediated by the Probe-Goal mechanism, it is always possible simply not to generate a feature on the Probe, thereby obviating the need to move.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{11}\) The difficulty of applying these tests in St’át’imcets should not be under-estimated. The absence of generalized quantifiers makes scope-based tests particularly challenging (see Davis 2010), and binding reconstruction is hampered by the fact that Condition C does not hold across clauses (Davis 2009). In addition, St’át’imcets lacks idioms of the type standardly used to motivate reconstruction in languages like English.

\(^{12}\) It is unclear to me what the semantic contribution of finiteness (in the form of the clausal nominalizer \(s=\)) actually is, or indeed if it has any. See Arregui and Matthewson (2001) for the proposal that \(s=\) is a ‘situation minimizer’, though their account is limited to factive nominalized clauses introduced by the D/C element \(ta=\), and does not obviously extend to nominalized clauses introduced by \(kʷu=\). Another possibility — motivated by the role of the nominalizer in cases of predicate nominalization, where it is a prefix, not a proclitic — is that \(s=\) does not head a functional projection but is a marker of abstraction over a semantic argument. The problem here is it is unclear \textit{which} argument is being abstracted over in a nominalized complement clause. I leave this issue open here.

\(^{13}\) Of course, this entails that an expletive subject is allowed to satisfy the EPP even when movement is a possibility; I leave the technical details aside here.
6 Conclusion

As I mentioned at the outset of this paper, I had originally hoped it would cover the entire spectrum of infinitive constructions in St’át’imcets. I have ended up, I discover, hardly covering one of them.

This is both intriguing and alarming. Intriguing, because what appeared at first to be an obscure corner of the grammar of St’át’imcets turns out to be a larger and more important space than I had imagined, and – like infinitives in better known languages – has the potential to shed some crucial light on clause structure. Alarming, because, frankly, we’re running out of time to do the necessary fieldwork, and this is only one of many apparently obscure areas to investigate in Salish grammar, any or all of which could prove just as fruitful.

In terms of the next steps to take in the investigation of infinitives specifically, a thorough examination of the other two major classes of infinitival complement is a priority. Of particular pertinence to the current paper, evaluative predicates (the equivalents of ‘good’, ‘difficult’, ‘funny’, etc.: see 2.3 above) exhibit another type of raising, which is the functional equivalent of English tough-movement, but targets unaccusative and passive patients rather than objects. In addition, control in St’át’imcets infinitives needs to be looked at more closely: preliminary findings indicate that obligatory control is missing entirely, and all control relations are therefore non-obligatory. I look forward to reporting on these questions in the near future.
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