Not Just Saying: A Modal Analysis of *tsut* in Secwepemctsín*

Bruce Oliver
University of British Columbia

Abstract: This paper presents a semantic analysis of the predicate *tsut* in Secwepemctsín, which can be used to mean 'say', 'think', 'going to', 'thinking of', 'intend', 'want', and more. I investigate its uses with and without the goal-directed complementizer *e=*, and propose a compositional analysis in which *tsut* introduces a modal claim and the complementizer *e=* introduces prospective aspect, accounting for all of the meanings described so far.

Keywords: modality, attitude verbs, semantics, future, modal orientation, Secwepemctsín, Salish

1 Introduction

If you read a narrative in Secwepemctsín, you will encounter the word *tsut* very frequently.[1]

(1) **tsut** re núxwenxw: "nhé7en wes k mútecw?"

    tsut re=núxwenxw n-hé7en [w7ec]=wes   k=mút=ecw
    tsut DET=woman LOC-Q [IPFV]=3.SBJV DC.IRR=live.somewhere=2SG.SBJV

    'The girl **said**: "where do you live?"'   Kuipers (1974:117)

(2) yerí7 re **stsut.s** t̓7éne: "cuy̓ exték yem me7 tgwéy̓estsen, skú7pecen!"

    yerí7   re=s-**tsut**-s   t̓7éne   cuy̓ exték yem me7
    there.DEM.VIS DC=NMLZ-tsut-3.POSS this.MNNR ADH right PRT CIRC.NEC

        tgwéy̓e-s[-t]-ts-en   skú7pecen
        footrace-CAUS[-TR]-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG porcupine

    'Then he **said**: "Right, I'll run against you, Porcupine!"'   Kuipers (1974:104)

[1] Glosses used: ADH = adhortative, BEN = benefactive, CAUS = causative, CIRC = circumstantial modal, COMP = complementizer, COND = conditional, COP = copula, CSL = cislocative, CTR = control, CUST = customary, DC = determiner/complementizer, DEIC = deictic, DEM = demonstrative, DET = determiner, DIM = diminutive, EMPH = emphatic, ERG = ergative, EXCL = exclusive, IMP = imperative, INCH = inchoative, INCL = inclusive, IPFV = imperfective, IRR = irrealis, LC = limited control, LOC = locative, MID = middle, MNNR = manner, NEC = necessity, NEG = negative, NMLZ = nominalizer, OBJ = object, OBL = oblique, PASS = passive, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PREF = prefix, PRN = pronoun, PRT = particle, PST = past, Q = question particle, REFL = reflexive, REM = remote, RPRT = reportative, SBJ = subject, SBJV = subjunctive, SG = singular, STAT = stative, TR = transitive, VIS = visible.

(3) **tsut** len xpé7e, **tsut**: "me7 k̓úlem-ken tek t̓esllpél̓tcw".

 tsut le=n-xpé7e   **tsut** me7   k̓úl-m=ken
 tsut   DET.REM=1SG.POSS-grandfather tsut   CIRC.NEC prepare-MID=1SG.SBJ

   tek=t̓esllp-él̓tcw
   DET.OBL.IRR=spruce-sheet

 'My grandfather **said**: "I'll prepare some spruce-bark".'   Kuipers (1974:106)

(4) "qwestsétsecw t̓ri7 núne", **tsut**, "e e7llq-kt t̓ek scwicw es íllen-kt e r7áles", **tsut**, "me7 k̓úlctls
me7 q̓elstcítls re nexwnúxwnexw".

 qwetséts=ecw   t̓ri7   núne   **tsut** e=e7llq=kt
 leave=2SG.SBJV there.MNNR over.there.LOC tsut   COMP.IRR=dig.roots=1SG.PL

   t̓ek=scwicw   e=s-7íllen=kt   e=r7ál=es
   DET.OBL.IRR=wild.carrot COMP.IRR=NMLZ-eat.MID-1INCL.POSS COMP=evening=3.SBJV

     tsut me7   k̓úl-c-t-l-s   me7
     tsut   CIRC.NEC prepare-BEN-TR-1INCL.OBJ-3.ERG CIRC.NEC

       q̓elst-cí-t-l-s   re=nexw~núxwnexw
       steam.cook-BEN-TR-1INCL.OBJ-3.ERG DET=PL~woman

 '"Go over there", they **said**, "let's dig up some wild carrots to eat tonight", they **said**, "the
 women will prepare them and steam-cook them for us".'   Kuipers (1974:107)

In all of the above examples, *tsut* is used to convey 'say.' Its cognates in Nłeʔkepmxcín (Thompson and Thompson 1996) and St'át'imcets (Van Eijk 2013) share this usage. However, in Secwepemctsín, *tsut* also has a variety of uses marking intention or desire:

(5) **tsútst**-ken ens qwetséts.

 tsú<ts>t=ken[2]   e=n-s-qwetséts
 tsut<DIM>=1SG.SBJ   COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-set.out

 'I'm **of the mind** to leave.'   (sf, vt | RI | 11.21.2023)

(6) cuy̓, púmce, **tsut** kucw es t̓eys!

 cuy̓ pú-m-ce   **tsut** kucw   e=s-t̓ey-s
 ADH drum-MID-IMP tsut   1PL.EXCL COMP=NMLZ-traditional.dance-3.POSS

 'Come on, play the drum, we **want** to dance!'   Kuipers (1974:232)

In this paper, I will explore the uses of *tsut* and propose a semantic analysis. I argue that *tsut* is a necessity modal compatible with doxastic (relative to beliefs) and circumstantial (relative to ways the world could be) modal bases. The analysis will include a partial semantics for the *e=*

---

[2] First-person forms (including possessed objects) take diminutive reduplication in several dialects of Secwepemctsín.

'goal-directed' complementizer, which I argue composes with *tsut* to provide future orientation to the modal claim, similar to Matthewson (2012)'s analysis.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 gives details about the language of investigation, Secwepemctsín, and the methodology used. In Section 3, I discuss the unembedded uses of *tsut* and what it can mean when it appears as the main predicate of the sentence. Section 4 goes over the use of *tsut* in conditionals, where some of its more unexpected meanings appear. In Section 5, I present a preliminary analysis of *tsut* that unifies the uses discussed. In Section 6, I discuss some remaining unanswered questions about *tsut* and conclude.

2   Language and methodology

The language of study in this paper is Secwepemctsín, a Northern Interior Salish language. Spoken by communities in the Central and Southern Interior of British Columbia between the Fraser River and the Rocky Mountains, Secwepemctsín was estimated to have at most 160 first-language speakers by Ignace and Ignace (2017) and Gessner et al. (2022), but this number has shrunk since then, and the language is critically endangered. The primary dialects are Western and Eastern (Ignace and Ignace 2017; Kuipers 1974); the original data in this paper come from speakers of the Western dialect.

Where no citation is given, the Secwepemctsín data come from my own fieldwork. The parenthetical on the right side of original data gives some information about how the data was collected. The abbreviation 'vf' stands for 'volunteered form,' indicating that the Secwepemctsín sentence was volunteered by the consultant; 'sf' stands for 'suggested form,' indicating that I proffered the Secwepemctsín form and asked for the consultant's judgment and/or translation. 'vt' stands for 'volunteered translation', indicating that the consultant was given the Secwepemctsín form and asked to translate it into English. These abbreviations are followed by the consultant's initials and the date that the datum was recorded. Elicitations took place either virtually over Zoom or in-person. Standard semantic fieldwork methodologies, following Matthewson (2004) and Bochnak and Matthewson (2020), were employed. In short, this means that sentences were almost always provided with a context of use to ensure that the researcher and consultant have the same situation in mind: these contexts are provided above the data where relevant.

Secwepemctsín sentences are written in the community orthography, which was developed to require no special characters when typing. Notable differences between <orthography> and [NAPA] include: <t̓> = [ƛ̓], <ts> = [č], <t̓s> = [c̓], <ll> = [ɬ/l̓], <c> = [x], <r> = [ɣ], <x> = [x̌/χ], <g> = [ʕ], <7> = [ʔ]. Labialization is indicated by a following w (kw), rather than a superscript w (kʷ). Words written with initial vowels in the orthography actually begin with a glottal stop (<7>/[ʔ]): words cannot begin with a vowel in Secwepemctsín, so the glottal stop is implied and not written. Both [ə] and [e] are rendered as <e>, generally distinguished by stress, but not always: notably for this paper, the *e=* complementizer is pronounced [ʔe], not [ʔə]. Sequences of letters that could be interpreted as digraphs are disambiguated using a period: for example, <t.s> indicates a sequence of [t] followed by [s], and is pronounced [ts] rather than [č].

3   Unembedded uses of *tsut*

I divide the following section into three parts based on three fairly distinct uses of *tsut*: *tsut* without the *e=* complementizer, *tsut* with the *e=* complementizer, and the transitive form of *tsut*, *tsun*.

447

3.1 *tsut* without *e=*

As the initial examples showed, *tsut* can be used to mean 'say', with an embedded quote following it. I have not found any 'say' uses of *tsut* followed by the *e=* complementizer, although I have not had a chance to confirm whether this is impossible or just due to a lack of data.

What follows *tsut* in 'say'-contexts can either be a direct quote or an indirect quote. Although quotation marks are a (Western) orthographic invention, we can tell when *tsut* embeds a direct quote by the person agreement in the embedded clause.

(7) **tsut** len xpé7e, **tsut**: "me7 k̓úlem-**ken** tek t̓esllpél̓tcw".

    tsut le=n-xpé7e   **tsut** me7   k̓úl-m=**ken**
    tsut DET.REM=1SG.POSS-grandfather tsut CIRC.NEC prepare-MID=1SG.SBJ

       tek=t̓esllp-él̓tcw
       DET.OBL.IRR=spruce-sheet

    'My grandfather **said**: "I'll prepare some spruce-bark".'   Kuipers (1974:106)

In (7), repeated from above, *k̓úl-m=ken* (prepare-MID=1SG.SBJ) has first person agreement, but does not refer to the storyteller's actions, but rather the subject of *tsut* (the speaker's grandfather). Compare to the below example:

(8) re Sander **tsut**-ekwe xwent rí7 es cwent**és** re xyum te stsk̓uy te tsrep.

    re=Sander **tsut**=ekwe xwent rí7   e=s-cwe-n-t-**és**   re=xyum
    DET=Sander tsut=RPRT CIRC EMPH COMP=NMLZ-lift-CTR-TR-3.ERG DET=big

       te=s-ts-k̓uy   te=tsrep
       DET.OBL=NMLZ-STAT-lie(long.object) DET.OBL=tree

    'Sander said he can lift the big fallen tree.'   (vf | GD | 10.31.2023)

In (8), the embedded clause is an indirect quote, as it has third-person agreement even though its subject is the person who uttered the embedded report. As Sander is talking about his own abilities in (8), we would see first-person agreement if it was a direct quote.

Another use of *tsut* is to express the thoughts of the speaker, as in (9) and (10).

(9) *Context: Your friend is looking for someone to take her nephew to Kamloops. But you know that that friend has a car and a day off tomorrow.*
    tsútst-ken héqen enwí7 me7 kwenc.

    tsú<ts>t=ken   héqen 7-enwí7   me7   kwen[-n-t]-c
    tsut<DIM>=1SG.SBJ maybe 2SG.POSS-EMPH.PRN CIRC.NEC take[-CTR-TR]-2SG.ERG

    'I **thought** you could take him.'   (vf | MJ | 6.15.2022)

(10) **tsut**-ken ṫek sneḱu7s cú7tsem ṫek skeṁcís ṫk7éne k sṫ7ek, wel yeske le Moses, Moses Dixon sṫ7ek...

tsut=ken   ṫek=s-neḱu7-s   cú7tsem ṫek=skeṁcís
tsut=1SG.SBJ DET.OBL.IRR=NMLZ-one-3.POSS again   DET.OBL.IRR=grizzly.bear

   ṫk7éne   k=s-ṫ7ek   wel   ye=ske   le=Moses   Moses
   this.way.DEIC DC.IRR=NMLZ-go.along until/so COP=COND DET.REM=Moses Moses

      Dixon s-ṫ7ek
      Dixon NMLZ-go.along

'I **thought**, there's yet another grizzly coming up there, but it was Moses, Moses Dixon coming...'   (Kuipers 1974:108)

Thoughts are also commonly expressed with a nominalized and possessed form of *tsut*, shown in (11). I will not analyze the nominalized form of *tsut* in this paper, but I do discuss it futher in Section 6.

(11) **ren stsutst** w7ec re séysus re Ruby.

re=n-s-tsu<ts>t   w7ec re=séyse=us   re=Ruby
DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-tsut<DIM> IPFV DC=play=3.SBJV DET=Ruby

'I **think** Ruby is playing.'   (vf | RI | 11.21.2023)

Finally, there does not need to be any quoted material, direct or indirect, after *tsut* for it to mean 'say': it can also have an anaphoric quote, as the below example shows.

(12) kénem wel **tsut ṫri7**?

kénem wel   **tsut ṫri7**
Q   until/so tsut

'Why did she **say that**?'   (MJ, First Voices)

In the examples in this section, there has been no complementizer following *tsut*. Other predicates that embed beliefs have an optional *te=* complementizer: see (13) below, with parentheses indicating optionality.

(13) tslexemstéten **te** m-wíkt.s.
ts-lexem-s-té<t>-n   **(te=)**m=wík[-n]-t-s
CUST-know-CAUS-TR<DIM>-1SG.ERG (DC.OBL=)PST-see[-CTR]-TR-3.ERG

'I know that he saw him.'   (Kuipers 1974:203)

There may therefore be a *te=* complementizer that has been deleted in the preceding *tsut* cases as well, but I have not yet had a chance to elicit *tsut* with *te=* following it.

3.2 *tsut* with *e=*

Frequently, *tsut* appears with a particular complementizer, *e=*, and a nominalized clause following it. These uses have distinct meanings compared the 'say' and 'believe' uses in the previous section.

(14) **tsut** kucw **es** k̓úlems tek st̓ek.

    tsut kucw   **e=s**-k̓úl-em-s   tek=st̓ek
    tsut 1PL.EXCL COMP=NMLZ-make-MID-3.POSS DET.OBL.IRR=fishing.platform
    'We're going to make a fishing platform.'   (Kuipers 1974:168)

The *e=* complementizer is called the 'goal-directed' complementizer when it embeds a nominalized clause.[3] *e=* + nominalization (shortened to *e=s*) is also used to convey purposives (as in (15)), as the complementizer for modals like *xelnwén̓/xelnwélln̓* (able to) (as in (16)), and for many other embedded clauses translated with infinitives in English (as in (17), (18), and (19)). Its uses have not been exhaustively studied.

(15)   nens-ken te skul **es** xepqenwéẃen **ens** tswewllcw tek tsitcw.
    ne<n>s=ken   te=skul   **e=s**-xepqe-nwé<ẃ>en[-n]
    go<DIM>=1SG.SBJV DET.OBL=school COMP=NMLZ-learn-LC.TR<DIM>[-1SG.ERG]
        e=n-s-tswe<w>-llcw   tek=tsitcw
        COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-build<DIM>-house DET.OBL.IRR=house
    'I'm going to school **to** learn how to build a house.'   (Lyon and Ignace 2021:217)

(16)   ta7 k sxenwén̓s **es** cwentés.
    ta7   k=s-xe[l]-nwén̓-s   **e=s**-cwe-n-t-és
    NEG DC.IRR=NMLZ-able-LC.TR-3.ERG COMP=NMLZ-lift-CTR-TR-3.ERG
    'He is unable **to** lift it.'   (sf | MJ | 2.16.2022)

(17)   me7 kwék̓wenelc-ken **ens** rérpelc me7 mestentsútstwen ens pelqíq̓elc.
    me7   kwé<k̓w>enelc=ken   **e=n-s**-ré<r>pelc   me7
    CIRC.NEC try.physically<DIM>=1SG.SBJ COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-climb<DIM> CIRC.NEC
        mesten-tsú<ts>t=wen   **e=n-s**-pelqí<q̓>elc
        try.out-REFL<DIM>=1SG.SBJV COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-return<DIM>
    'I'll try **to** go up there and do my best **to** return.'   (Kuipers 1974:86)

(18)   cetcét ri7 **es** élkst.s.
    cetcét   ri7   **e=s**-7élkst-s
    lively/energetic EMPH COMP=NMLZ-work-3.POSS
    'He's always willing **to** work.'   (Kuipers 1974:86)

---

[3] Goal-directed *e=* is homophonous with the conditional *e* 'if', but the former is always followed by a nominalized clause, and the latter never is.

(19) cw7ús-k **te7 s**qwetséts.

cw7ús=k   **te=7-s-**qwetséts[4]
eager=2SG.SBJV COMP=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-set.out
'You're eager **to** go.'   (Kuipers 1974:86)

Whereas *tsut* with no *e=* clause is only translated as 'say' or 'think', *tsut* with an embedded *e=* clause is translated as 'going to', 'thinking of', 'intend', or 'want'. I have not had a chance to determine whether *tsut e=* can mean something along the lines of 'X says X is going to...', but the most salient readings for speakers appear to be of the 'intend/want' type.

(20) **tsut es** nes te Tk̓emlúps re Sander.

tsut **e=s-**nes[-s]   te=tk̓emlúps   re=Sander
tsut COMP=NMLZ-go[-3.POSS] DET.OBL=Kamloops DET=Sander
'Sander is thinking of going to Kamloops.'   (sf | JA | 10.4.2023)

(21) **tsut es** qwetséts re Sander.

tsut **e=s-**qwetséts[-s]   re=Sander
tsut COMP=NMLZ-set.out[-3.POSS] DET=Sander
'Sander intends to go.'   (sf | RI | 11.21.2023)

(22) **tsútst**-ken **ens** íllen.

tsú<ts>t=ken   **e=n-s-**7íllen
tsut<DIM>=1SG.SBJ COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-eat
'I want to eat.'   (Kuipers 1974:79)

Broadly speaking, the meanings in (14) and (20) to (22) have a goal-oriented flavour: the embedded clause indicates some goal of the subject. One might wonder whether the basic meaning of *tsut* is just 'intend', and is only translated as 'want'in contexts where someone's desires are consistent with their intentions (or vice versa). The following data show that *tsut e=* is compatible with intending to do something without wanting to, as well as wanting to do something without intending to.

(23) *Context: Someone asks me about all the manure scattered about my property.*
      tsútst-ken ens sísxem, k̓émell ta7 ken sqwnén.

tsú<ts>t=ken   e=n-[s-]sí<s>x-em   k̓émell ta7
tsut<DIM>=1SG.SBJ COMP=1SG.POSS-[NMLZ-]move<DIM>-MID but NEG

      k=n-s-qwnén
      DC.IRR=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-want
'I intend to move it, but I don't want to.'   (vf | RI | 4.4.2024)

---

[4] When the clause that follows it has second-person possessive marking (*7-*), goal-directed *e=* becomes *te=*.

451

(24) **tsutst**-ken ens qwetséts ḱémell ta7 ken sxenwéw'lln es qwetséts.

    tsu\<ts>t=ken   e=n-s-qwetséts   ḱémell ta7
    tsut\<DIM>=1SG.SBJ COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-set.out but   NEG

      k=n-s-xenwé\<w>'lln   e=s-qwetséts[-s]
      DC.IRR=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-able\<DIM>.LC.MID COMP=NMLZ-set.out[-3.POSS]

    'I would like to go now, but I'm not capable of leaving.'   (sf, vt | RI | 11.21.2023)

As these data show, *tsut e=* is ambiguous (or underspecified) between indicating intention and desire.

Finally, it should come as no surprise that, as *tsut e=* seems to indicate the intention or desire of its subject, it is infelicitous when its embedded clause describes an action the subject neither intends nor wants to happen. This is illustrated in the example below.

(25) *Context: Gloria is swimming in an ice-cold lake in December.*
    #**tsut** es k7eps.

    tsut e=s-k\<7>ep-s
    tsut   COMP=NMLZ-sick\<INCH>-3.POSS

    Intended: 'She's going to get sick.'
    Consultant's comment: "No, unless you were intentionally swimming to get sick."

                                           (sf | RI | 11.21.2023)

To express these sorts of general future statements, speakers use *me7*, a general-purpose circumstantial necessity modal used for future statements, obligation, and other future-oriented circumstantial modal claims (Oliver 2023).

(26) *Context: Gloria is swimming in an ice-cold lake in December.*
    me7 k7ep re Gloria.

    me7   k7ep   re=Gloria
    CIRC.NEC sick\<INCH> DET=Gloria

    'Gloria will get sick.'   (sf | JA | 10.4.2023)

3.3 Transitive *tsun*

There is also a transitive form of *tsut*, *tsun*.[5] So far, *tsun* seems to cover the same uses as *tsut*, with the addition of a direct object. In all cases I have seen, when an *e=s* clause follows *tsun*, the subject of the embedded clause is the direct object of the matrix clause.

---

[5] These roots are clearly related, but the normal Salishan decomposition into root + (in)transitivizer is difficult to justify: decomposing *tsun* into √*tsu* + the *-n[-t]* control+transitivizer implies the same can be done with *tsut* → √*tsu* + *-t*, which is problematic. Where the *-t* suffix appears on roots, it does so on statives (e.g. *xew-t* 'dry' vs. *xuw-úm* 'to dry s.t.') and rarely unaccusatives (e.g. ḱ*ul-t* 'get made' vs. ḱ*ul-em* 'to make s.t.'), neither of which characterize *tsut*. Given this problem and the rarity of CV roots in Secwepemctsín, the simplest analysis (and the one that I adopt in this paper) is that the control+transitivizer cluster *-n[-t]* has fused with the root in *tsun*.

Like *tsut*, *tsun* can be used to mean 'say' when followed by a quote; as it is transitive, *tsun* is more similar to 'tell'. The object is whoever is being told.

(27) **tsuns** re skú7pecen **re úqwi7s**: "t̓ucw e wíktc yi7éne tke7 st̓7ek re xwgwélemc me7 tq̓wmútecw n7éne ne tskuy."

    tsun-s   re=skú7pecen   **re=úqwi7-s**   t̓ucw e wík[-n]-t-c
    tsut.TR-3.ERG DET=porcupine DET=same.sex.sibling-3.POSS just if see[-CTR]-TR-2SG.ERG

       y7éne   tke7=s-t̓7ek   re=xwgwélemc me7   tq̓wmút=ecw
       this.DEM DET.OBL.IRR=Nmlz-go.along DET=fox   CIRC.NEC climb=2SG.SBJV

         n7éne   n=ts-k̓uy
         there.LOC LOC=STAT-lie(long.object)

    'Porcupine had **told his brother**: "As soon as you see Fox coming, you'll climb on that log."'
                                                         Kuipers (1974:104)

(28) m-**tsúntsems**: "cuy̓, tsq̓élente re7 enwí7!"

    m-**tsún-tsem-s**   cuy̓ tsq̓él-n-t-e   re=7-enwí7
    PST-tsut.TR-1SG.OBJ-3.ERG ADH shoot-CTR-TR-IMP DET=2SG.POSS-EMPH.PRN

    '**He told me**: "Come on, you shoot it!"'   Kuipers (1974:109)

Transitive *tsun* can also reflect the thoughts of the subject, with the object in this case being the thing that the subject is thinking about. In (29), Coyote was tricked by Fox into jumping into a well for some skimmings, which were actually just the reflection of the moon; the object of *tsun*, therefore, is the reflection of the moon.

(29) m-**tsúnses** ri7 t̓ek styéwllkwle.

    m-**tsún-s=es**   ri7   t̓ek=styéwllkwle
    PST-tsut.TR-3.ERG=3.SBJV 3.SBJV EMPH DET.OBL.IRR=skimmings.dish

    'He **thought it** [the reflection of the moon] was skimmings.'   Kuipers (1974:92)

Finally, like *tsut*, *tsun* can be followed by the *e=* complementizer. We once again see the meaning of intention or desire emerge.

(30) **tsútsen** tsem **es** cp7ers.

    tsú<ts>en[-n]   tsem **e=s**-cp<7>er-s
    tsut.TR<DIM>[-1SG.ERG] first COMP=NMLZ-cool.off<INCH>-3.POSS

    'I **want** it to cool off first.'   Kuipers (1974:169)

(31) m-**tsúntsen te7** sqwetséts.

    m-**tsún-ts-n**   **te=7-s**-qwetséts
    PST-tsut.TR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG COMP=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-set.out

    '**I told you** to go.'   Kuipers (1974:169)

(32) **tsútsentsems ens** tsnens.

    tsú\<ts\>n-tsem-s   **e=n-s**-ts-ne\<n\>s

    tsut.TR\<DIM\>-1SG.OBJ-3.ERG COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-CSL-go\<DIM\>

    'He **asked** me to come.'   Kuipers (1974:169)

The uses of *tsun e=*, unlike *tsut e=*, also include meanings of saying, as in (31) and (32). These 'say' uses of *tsun e=* still indicate a desire or intent on the subject's part for the *object* to take the action in the embedded clause. Accordingly, the person marking on the embedded clause agrees with the object agreement on *tsun*.

(33) tsútsentsems ens tsnens.

    tsú\<ts\>n-tsem-s   e=n-s-ts-ne\<n\>s

    tsut.TR\<DIM\>-1SG.OBJ-3.ERG COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-CSL-go\<DIM\>

    'He asked me to come.'   Kuipers (1974:169)

(34) m-tsúntsen te7 sqwetséts.

    m-tsún-ts-n   te=7-s-qwetséts

    PST-tsut.TR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG COMP=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-set.out

    'I told you to go.'   Kuipers (1974:169)

I have not yet had a chance to elicit a sentence like *tsú\<ts\>-n-tsem-s e=s-wéwl-em-s* (tsut\<DIM\>-TR-1SG.OBJ-3.ERG COMP=NMLZ-fish-MID-3.POSS), where the subject of the embedded clause is the *subject* of the matrix clause, so I do not yet know whether such a configuration is possible and, if possible, what it would mean.

    I will not directly account for transitive *tsun* in my analysis, but I predict that its semantics will fall out fairly straightforwardly from adding a direct object to the semantics of *tsut*.

4 *tsut* in conditionals

tsut appears frequently in the antecedent of a conditional, often with similar meanings to its unembedded uses.

(35) e **tsút**es es píxems pexyéwt, yewske es nes es etícs pyin.

    e **tsut**-es   e=s-píx-em-s   pexyéwt   ye-ws=ske

    if tsut-3.SBJV COMP=NMLZ-hunt-MID-3.POSS day.removed COP-3.SBJV=should

      e=s-nes[-s]   e=s-7etíc-s   pyin

      COMP=NMLZ-go[-3.POSS] COMP=NMLZ-sleep-3.POSS now

    'If he is going hunting tomorrow, he should go to sleep now.'   (vf | GD | 2.10.2023)

However, in some conditional contexts, *tsut* seems not to mark intention or desire at all.

(36) e **tsút**ecw e7 s7ápse, me7 ápse-k ne c7ép'qsten'.

    e **tsút**=ecw   e=7-s-7ápse   me7   ápse=k
    if **tsut**=2SG.SBJV COMP=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-sneeze CIRC.NEC sneeze=2SG.SBJ

        n=c7ép'qsten'
        LOC=handkerchief

    'If you have to sneeze, sneeze in a handkerchief.'   (vf | GD | 2.10.2023)

(37) e **tsút**es k spleǩs re xyum te scenc ne tqeltqs re sqeltús, ta7 ri7 k tqelcítṡe ri7 me7 estcistés.

    e **tsút**=es   k=s-pleǩ-s   re=xyum te=scenc   ne=tqeltq-s
    if **tsut**=3.SBJV DC.IRR=NMLZ-fall-3.POSS DET=big DET.OBL=rock LOC=high-3.POSS

        re=sqeltús   ta7 ri7   k=tqelcítṡe ri7   me7   estcey-s-t-és
        DET=mountain NEG EMPH DC.IRR=fence EMPH CIRC.NEC stop-CAUS-TR-3.ERG

    'If the big rock on the mountain is going to fall, there's no fence that will stop it.'

                                          (vf | RI | 6.30.2023)

In the preceding two examples, no intention is referred to by *tsut*: they refer to an involuntary future occurrence. In the first case, sneezing is not an intentional act, and in the second case, the rock does not have any intentions.[6]

Recall that, in unembedded contexts, *tsut* was judged to be bad if the embedded clause was neither an intention nor a desire of the subject, and that *me7* was used instead in this case.

(38) a. *Context: Gloria is swimming in an ice-cold lake in December.*
      #**tsut** es k7eps.

      tsut e=s-k<7>ep-s
      tsut COMP=NMLZ-sick<INCH>-3.POSS

      Intended: 'She's going to get sick.'
      Consultant's comment: "No, unless you were intentionally swimming to get sick."
                                    (sf | RI | 11.21.2023)

    b. *Context: Gloria is swimming in an ice-cold lake in December.*
      me7 k7ep re Gloria.

      me7   k<7>ep   re=Gloria.
      CIRC.NEC sick<INCH> DET=Gloria

      'Gloria will get sick.'   (sf | JA | 10.4.2023)

It is, in fact, impossible to use *me7* in the antecedent of a conditional in Secwepemctsín: *tsut* must be used instead.

---

[6] Readers may be curious as to whether the rock is being ascribed intentions or animacy in this case. I followed up by asking my consultant whether I could say *e xenwellṅes es pleǩs re xyum te scenc...* 'if the rock is able to fall...' instead, and he replied that this would be strange as it would 'give the rock the will to roll or not to roll.' I take this comment to mean that the rock cannot be interpreted as having intentions in this context.

(39) a. *e **me7** píxems pexyéwt, yewske es nes es etí7cs pyin.

    e **me7** píx-em-s pexyéwt yé=ws=ske e=s-nes[-s]
    if CIRC.NEC hunt-MID-3.POSS tomorrow COP=3.SBJV=COND COMP=NMLZ-go[-3.POSS]

      e=s-7etíc-s pyin
      COMP=NMLZ-sleep-3.POSS now

    Intended: 'If he is going hunting tomorrow, he should go to sleep now.'
    Consultant's comment: "I never heard anyone say it that way."   (sf | GD | 2.10.2023)

  b. e **tsút**es es píxems pexyéwt, yéwske es nes es etícs pyin.

    e **tsút**=es e=s-píx-em-s pexyéwt yé=ws=ske
    if tsut=3.SBJV COMP=NMLZ-hunt-MID-3.POSS tomorrow COP=3.SBJV=COND

      e=s-nes[-s] e=s-7etíc-s pyin
      COMP=NMLZ-go[-3.POSS] COMP=NMLZ-sleep-3.POSS now

    'If he is going hunting tomorrow, he should go to sleep now.'   (vf | GD | 2.10.2023)

The lack of intention or desire in these environments extends to weather, as well, although this is not uncommon cross-linguistically:[7]

(40) *Context: Sander is talking about going to the store, and he mentions to me that snow is on the forecast.*
    e **tsút**es es wucwt.s, yewske ri7 ke7 stéwem tek lepél.

    e **tsút**=es e=s-wucwt-s ye=w=ske ri7
    if tsut=3.SBJV COMP=NMLZ-snow-3.POSS COP=3.SBJV=should EMPH

      k=e7-s-téw-em tek=lepél
      DC.IRR=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-buy-MID DET.OBL.IRR=shovel

    'If it's going to snow, you should buy a shovel.'   (vf | RI | 4.4.2024)

These uses of *tsut* in conditionals, which seem not to reflect their subject's intention or desire, are an indication that the range of meanings of *tsut* is broader than it may have seemed from the unembedded uses of *tsut*.

5 Analysis

I will make two primary arguments in this section. First: the *e=* complementizer contributes prospective aspect, and is responsible for the difference in meanings of *tsut* with and without *e=*. Second: the basic semantics of *tsut* is of a variable base modal: it can take either a *doxastic* modal base, which reflects the beliefs of the subject; or a *circumstantial* modal base, which reflects the different ways the world could take shape. These two parts together account for the semantics of *tsut* as a whole and all of its uses described so far.

5.1 The contribution of the *e=* complementizer

What do the uses of *tsut* with the *e=* complementizer have in common? The meanings we have seen are:

---

[7] Cf. English 'it wants to rain'.

- 'going to'

- 'want'

- 'intend'

- 'thinking of'

- 'would like to'

- 'have to'

One important commonality of all these meanings it that the time of the embedded proposition is placed after the reference time of the sentence. This is very clear in examples like (14) (repeated below as (41)), where the making of the fishing platform follows the reference time (in (41), the reference time is the time of utterance).

(41) **tsut** kucw **es** k̓úlems tek st̓ek.

    tsut kucw   **e=s**-k̓úl-em-s   tek=st̓ek
    tsut 1PL.EXCL COMP=NMLZ-make-MID-3.POSS DET.OBL.IRR=fishing.platform
    'We're going to make a fishing platform.'   (Kuipers 1974:168)

Similarly, in cases like (22), repeated below as (42), the time of the embedded proposition (eating) is after the reference time (when the desire is expressed).

(42) **tsútst**-ken **ens** íllen.
    tsu<ts>t=ken   e=n-s-7íllen
    tsut<DIM>=1SG.SBJ COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-eat
    'I want to eat.'   (Kuipers 1974:79)

Note that this future *orientation* is not the same thing as future *tense*. Future tense would require the event to be in the future of the *utterance* time, but the embedded clause of *tsut e=* can be in the future of some past time. In (43), the embedded proposition, killing a child, was a possible future at the past time when the cougar's intent was expressed.

(43) *Context: One of your neighbors has just shot a cougar. You ask why: he answers that the cougar was on a rampage, killing cats and raccoons, and it has just cornered a child and was growling at it before it was shot.* (Adapted from Rullmann et al. 2008)

    re=smuwe7 **tsut** e=s-pul-s-t-s   re=sqwimé7melt e ta7=wes
    DET=cougar tsut COMP=NMLZ-lie.down-CAUS-TR-3.ERG DET=child   if NEG=3.SBJV
        e=s-qe<q̓>l-n[-t-n]
        COMP=NMLZ-shoot<DIM>-CTR[-TR-1SG.ERG]
    'The cougar **would have** killed a child if I hadn't shot it.'   (vf | RI | 3.29.2021)

As mentioned earlier, clauses introduced by *e=s* appear in numerous places in Secwepemctsín: as purposive clauses, and as the complement of other future-oriented claims such as ability (after *xil/xelnwén̓/xelnwélln̓*), and other infinitival uses. These uses all have future orientation in common.

457

(44) nens-ken te skul **es** xepqenwéẉen **ens** tswewllcw tek tsitcw.

    ne\<n\>s=ken   te=skul   **e=s**-xepqe-nwé\<ẇ\>en[-n]
    go\<DIM\>=1SG.SBJV DET.OBL=school COMP=NMLZ-learn-LC.TR\<DIM\>[-1SG.ERG]

      e=n-s-tswe\<w\>-llcw   tek=tsitcw
      COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-build\<DIM\>-house DET.OBL.IRR=house

    'I'm going to school **to** learn how to build a house.'   (Lyon and Ignace 2021:217)

(45) ta7 k sxenwéṅs **es** cwentés.

    ta7   k=s-xe[l]-nwéṅ-s   **e=s**-cwe-n-t-és
    NEG DC.IRR=NMLZ-able-LC.TR-3.ERG COMP=NMLZ-lift-CTR-TR-3.ERG

    'He is unable **to** lift it.'   (sf | MJ | 2.16.2022)

(46) cw7ús-k **te7** sqwetséts.

    cw7ús=k   **te=7-s-**qwetséts
    eager=2SG.SBJV COMP=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-set.out

    'You're eager **to** go.'   (Kuipers 1974:86)

We can see this especially clearly in the following two examples, where the same predicate has a future-oriented complement with an *e=s* clause and a past-oriented complement with a *te=* relative clause.

(47) a. tslexemstés **es** ṗíxems tek ú7se.

        ts-lexem-s-t-és   **e=s**-ṗíx-em-s   tek=7ú7se
        CUST-know-CAUS-TR-3.ERG COMP=NMLZ-fry-MID-3.POSS DET.OBL.IRR=egg

        'She knows how **to** fry eggs.'   (Lyon and Ignace unpublished)

    b. tslexemstés **te** m-tskíktsc-ken.

        ts-lexem-s-t-és   **te**=m-ts-kí\<k\>tsc=ken
        CUST-know-CAUS-TR-3.ERG DC.OBL=PST-CSL-arrive\<DIM\>=1SG.SBJV

        'He knows **that** I've arrived.'   (Lyon and Ignace unpublished)

In light of the behaviour of *e=s* clauses, I propose that the *e=* complementizer introduces prospective aspect, which places the time of the embedded proposition in the future of a contextually specified reference time.

(48) $\llbracket$ PROSP $\rrbracket = \lambda p \lambda w \lambda t \exists t[t \in [t, \infty) \land p(w)(t)]$ (Mari 2016)

I set aside the other necessary semantic elements of *e=* for now — particularly, its semantics as a complementizer that takes a nominalized clause — as the prospective aspect is the only crucial element for my analysis.

5.2 The semantics of *tsut*

Now that we have established that the *e=* complementizer contributes prospective aspect, what is the semantic contribution of *tsut*? I will argue that it is a necessity modal — something that says 'in all possible worlds of a particular sort, my embedded proposition is true'. The 'particular sort' of possible worlds is specified by the modal base, and different modal bases will yield the different meanings of *tsut*.

Without an embedded *e=s* clause, *tsut* means 'say' or 'believe'. I propose to capture this with a *doxastic* modal base, which yields the set of all worlds consistent with the beliefs of the subject.[8] I use a standard modal analysis of attitude verbs to capture this (cf. Heim 1992; Kratzer 1991).

(49) $[\![\,tsut\,]\!]^{c,g}$ is only defined if c provides a doxastic modal base.
      $[\![\,tsut\,]\!]^{c,g} = \lambda p_{\langle i,st\rangle}\lambda x\lambda t\lambda w.\forall w'[w' \in (MB(w)(x)(t)) \to p(w')]$

As these uses lack the *e=s* clause and its prospective aspect, the embedded proposition of doxastic *tsut* can be in the past of the event time, as it is simply a reported belief or statement. This is shown in (50) below.

(50) "mé7e!" **tsut**, "m-títqwen lu7, m-títqwen lu7."

mé7e	**tsut**	m-tí<t̓>qw-n[-t-n]		lu7	m-tí<t̓>qw-n[-t-n]		lu7
yes	tsut	PST-kill<DIM>-CTR-TR-1SG.ERG		REM	PST-kill<DIM>-CTR-TR-1SG.ERG		REM

"Yes!" he said, "I killed them, I killed them."   (Kuipers 1974:103)

When *tsut* takes an embedded clause with the *e=* complementizer, it frequently indicates an intent or a desire, as in (21) and (22) (repeated as (51) and (52) below).

(51) **tsut es** qwetséts re Sander.

tsut	e=s-qwetséts[-s]	re=Sander
tsut	COMP=NMLZ-set.out[-3.POSS]	DET=Sander

'Sander intends to go.'   (sf | RI | 11.21.2023)

(52) **tsútst**-ken **ens** íllen.

tsu<ts>t=ken	e=n-s-7íllen
tsut<DIM>=1SG.SBJ	COMP=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-eat

'I want to eat.'   (Kuipers 1974:79)

I propose to capture these uses with a simple compositional approach: *tsut* remains a doxastic necessity modal, and the *e=* clause introduces prospective aspect. This places the time of the embedded proposition in the future of the time of the modal claim, meaning we now get a meaning like 'in all of *x*'s belief worlds at *t*, *p* occurs some time after *t*.'

---

[8] Technically, a doxastic modal base only covers beliefs, not statements or said things. This is because speakers can say things which they do not themselves believe. I do not address this issue in this paper, using a doxastic base to cover both believing and saying, but a more accurate account of this modal base deserves further research.

(53) $[\![\,tsut\ \text{PROSP}\,]\!]^{c,g} = \lambda p_{\langle i,st\rangle}\lambda x\lambda t\lambda w.\forall w'[w' \in MB(w)(x)(t) \rightarrow \exists t[t \in [t,\infty) \wedge p(w')(t)]]$

This denotation doesn't quite capture the elements of intention or desire, though; it merely expresses a belief that some event will occur in the future. To capture this, we need to introduce an **ordering source**, which orders the worlds in the modal base according to some metric. In our case, these will be a *bouletic* ordering source, which orders worlds based on how well they fulfill the subject's *desires*, and a similar *teleological* ordering source, which order worlds based on how well they fulfill the subject's *goals*. I will not go into the details of their implementation, but see Portner (1997) for the implementation of bouletic modality and Kratzer (1991) for the implementaiton of ordering sources.

Following Portner (2009), I also define a 'best' function that uses an ordering source to yield only the highest-ranked worlds from the modal base.

(54) $\text{BEST}_{OS}(\text{MB}) = \{w : w \in MB \wedge \neg\exists w' \in MB \text{ s.t. } w' \leq_{OS} w\}$ (Adapted from Portner 2009)

In other words, the best worlds in the modal base according to the ordering source are all worlds from the modal base that don't have any worlds better-ranked than them.[9]

Putting it all together, we have:

(55) $[\![\,tsut\ \text{PROSP}\,]\!]^{c,g} = \lambda p_{\langle i,st\rangle}\lambda x\lambda t\lambda w.\forall w'[w' \in \text{BEST}_{OS(w)(x)(t)}(MB(w)(x)(t)) \rightarrow \exists t[t \in [t,\infty) \wedge p(w')(t)]]$

The fact that *tsut e=s...* yields readings of intention or desire, rather than simply a belief about a future event, likely derives from the fact that the subject of the embedded clause is, in all cases I have seen, the same as the subject of *tsut*. If John has a belief about what *he himself* will do in the future, this is most logically interpreted as a plan or a desire, as John would generally be assumed to have control over his future actions. I have not had a chance to elicit whether this match in subjecthood is a requirement of *tsut e=s...* constructions, or simply the most common occurrence of them. If different subjecthood is possible, I anticipate *tsut e=s...* could refer to a belief about a future event.

Finally, we must account for the use in (36), (37), and (40) (repeated below as (56)), which do not involve the volition of a subject, but rather a natural progression of events.

(56) *Context: Sander is talking about going to the store, and he mentions to me that snow is on the forecast.*

e **tsút**es es wucwt.s, yewske ri7 ke7 stéwem tek lepél.

e	**tsút**=es	e=s-wucwt-s	ye=w=ske	ri7
if	tsut=3.SBJV	COMP=NMLZ-snow-3.POSS	COP=3.SBJV=should	EMPH

k=e7-s-téw-em	tek=lepél
DC.IRR=2SG.POSS-NMLZ-buy-MID	DET.OBL.IRR=shovel

'If it's going to snow, you should buy a shovel.'   (vf | RI | 4.4.2024)

From a purely semantic point of view, this use of *tsut e=s...* is incompatible with the doxastic modal base, which sources possible worlds from a subject's beliefs. Instead, I propose that these uses come from an alternative modal base: the **circumstantial** (or metaphysical) modal base. Broadly

---

[9] $w_1 \leq_{OS} w_2$ iff for all propositions p in OS, if $w_2 \in p$, then $w_1 \in p$; so w_1 is better than w_2 if $w_1 \leq_{OS} w_2$.

speaking, a circumstantial modal base contains possible worlds which reflect the ways the world might develop given its state at some time. Paired with this circumstantial modal base, the ordering source would be *stereotypical*, which ranks worlds higher the more closely they follow the normal proceeding of events. The denotation will look exactly the same as before, but with a circumstantial modal base and stereotypical ordering source provided by the context.[10]

5.3 Putting it all together

Our final denotations are as follows. Without the *e=* complementizer, we have the denotation in (57); with the *e=* complementizer, we have the denotation in (58).

(57) $[\![\, tsut \,]\!]^{c,g}$ is only defined when the context provides a circumstantial or doxastic modal base, and a bouletic, teleological, or stereotypical ordering source.
$[\![\, tsut \,]\!]^{c,g} = \lambda p_{\langle i,st \rangle} \lambda x \lambda t \lambda w. \forall w'[w' \in \text{BEST}_{OS(w)(x)(t)}(MB(w)(x)(t)) \rightarrow p(w')]$

(58) $[\![\, tsut \,]\!]^{c,g}$ is only defined when the context provides a circumstantial or doxastic modal base, and a bouletic, teleological, or stereotypical ordering source.
$[\![\, tsut \; e= \,]\!]^{c,g} = [\![\, tsut \; \text{PROSP} \,]\!]^{c,g} = \lambda p_{\langle i,st \rangle} \lambda x \lambda t \lambda w. \forall w'[w' \in \text{BEST}_{OS(w)(x)(t)}(MB(w)(x)(t)) \rightarrow \exists t[t \in [t,\infty) \wedge p(w')(t)]]$

These denotations account for the attested meanings of *tsut* in the following ways.

1. Saying/thinking a statement/belief: *tsut* has a doxastic modal base and a stereotypical ordering source, so the embedded proposition is true in the most stereotypical of the subject's belief worlds.

2. Intending to do something: *tsut* has a doxastic modal base, a teleological ordering source, and prospective aspect, meaning the embedded proposition is true in the future of all of subject's belief worlds which most closely correspond to achieving the subject's goals.

3. Wanting to do something: *tsut* has a doxastic modal base, a bouletic ordering source, and prospective aspect, meaning the embedded proposition is true in the future of all of subject's belief worlds which most closely correspond to achieving the subject's desires.

4. Something will happen (in the antecedent of a conditional): *tsut* has a circumstantial modal base, a stereotypical ordering source, and prospective aspect, meaning the embedded proposition is true in all possible developments of the world which are most stereotypically likely.

This analysis is inspired by Matthewson (2012) and Rullmann and Matthewson (2018), who incorporate prospective aspect as the source of future orientation for modals in general; the *e=* complementizer in Secwepemctsín is particularly reminiscent of Gitksan *dim* as an overt marker of prospective aspect (Matthewson 2012).

---

[10] A small semantic issue is that a doxastic modal base takes an individual argument (the entity whose belief worlds we are interested in), whereas a circumstantial modal base does not. Adjusting the semantics to get this to work is a topic of future research.

Without an *e=s* clause, no prospective aspect is present, and the subordinate clause of *tsut* is evaluated at the same time as *tsut* (or before, if a past tense is present in the subordinate clause). Following Matthewson (2006), I assume a null nonfuture tense on non-future-marked clauses, so the time of evaluation of *tsut* and its embedded clause would be a present or past time (depending on context). Following Condoravdi (2002), I propose that a circumstantial modal base must satisfy the Diversity Condition, which essentially states that the modal base must include *p*-worlds and not-*p*-worlds.

(59) Diversity Condition:
There is w in the common ground and w', $w'' \in MB(w)(t)$ such that $p(w')(t)$ and $\neg p(w'')(t)$.
(Adapted from Condoravdi 2002)

At a present or past time, the truth of *p* (the embedded proposition) is settled, so the Diversity Condition cannot be fulfilled. The Diversity Condition also applies to teleological and bouletic ordering sources: to claim one desires or intends to *p*, *p* cannot already be settled. Therefore, the modal base of *tsut* cannot be circumstantial, and its ordering source cannot be teleological or bouletic: its only remaining option is a doxastic modal base with a stereotypical ordering source. In this way, I derive that the only reading of *tsut* when it does not embed an *e=s* clause is the doxastic (say/think) reading.

Finally, why does *tsut* not appear with a circumstantial modal base outside of the limited context of the antecedent of a conditional? I posit that this may be due to competition effects with *me7*. Oliver (2023) analyzes *me7* as a circumstantial modal, whereas *tsut* is a doxastic *or* circumstantial modal. In a context where a circumstantial modal is warranted, *me7* is the more specific option, as it is compatible with a proper subset of the modal bases that *tsut* is compatible with. Gricean pragmatic reasoning leads conversational participants to choose (and assume) the most informative option (Grice 1975). Using this reasoning, a listener hearing *tsut* would assume that the speaker could not be making a circumstantial modal claim, as they would have chosen the more specific option, *me7*. Therefore, *tsut* is pragmatically favored to have a doxastic interpretation where *me7* is available as an alternative. In the antecedent of a conditional, however, *me7* is unavailable, so *tsut* is the only option for circumstantial modal claims and there is no pragmatic dispreference for circumstantial *tsut*.

6 Further questions

Beyond the previous things I mentioned needing further elicitation and investigation, there are several unanswered questions pertaining to the semantics of *tsut*.

First, it appears that *tsut* is preferred (or necessary) for future-in-the-past or counterfactual readings, and *me7* is likewise dispreferred (or impossible).

(60) a. re sqéxe **tsut es** ste7 tek séwllkwe k̓émell m-nexéll te m-ṫek7ílc.

re=sqéxe **tsut e=s**-ste7-s   k̓émell m-nexéll   te=m-ṫek7ílc
DET=dog tsut COMP=[NMLZ-]drink-3.POSS but   PST-afraid DC.OBL=PST-run.away
'The dog was going to drink, but then it got scared and ran away.'
(Lyon and Ignace 2021:222)

b. #re sqéxe **me7** ste7 tek séwllkwe ḱémell m-nexéll te m-ṫek7ílc.

> re=sqéxe **me7** ste7 tek=séwllkwe ḱémell m-nexéll te=m-ṫek7ílc
> DET=dog CIRC.NEC drink DET.OBL.IRR=water but PST-afraid DC.OBL=PST-run.away
> *Intended:* 'The dog was going to drink, but then it got scared and ran away.'
> (The speaker indicated that *re sqéxe me7 ste7 tek séwllkwe* can only mean 'the dog **is going** to drink water, not 'the dog **was going** to drink water'.)

> (Lyon and Ignace 2021:222)

This pattern is similar to that found in the antecedent of a conditional, where *me7* is ruled out and *tsut* is the only option. It is not clear whether *tsut* can indicate circumstantial modality in these environments, like it can in the antecedent of a conditional. More study is needed of the future-in-the-past uses of *tsut* and the apparent lack thereof for *me7*. Does this hold throughout all uses of *me7*, or can *me7* be used for future-in-the-past in certain contexts (e.g., a narrative set in the past)? How do the semantics of *tsut* and *me7* reflect this difference?

Second, (37) (repeated below as (61)) follows *tsut* with a *k=* clause (often called 'irrealis', and associated with negation, questions, conditionals, and some future uses (Kuipers 1974:57)) rather than an *e=s* clause.

(61) e **tsút**es **k** spleḱs re xyum te scenc ne tqeltqs re sqeltús, ta7 ri7 k tqelcítṡe ri7 me7 estcistés.

> e tsut=es **k**=s-pleḱ-s re=xyum te=scenc ne=tqeltq-s
> if tsut=3.SBJV DC.IRR=NMLZ-fall-3.POSS DET=big DET.OBL=rock LOC=high-3.POSS

> re=sqeltús ta7 ri7 **k**=tqelcítṡe ri7 me7 estcey-s-t-és
> DET=mountain NEG EMPH DC.IRR=fence EMPH CIRC.NEC stop-CAUS-TR-3.ERG

> 'If the big rock on the mountain is going to fall, there's no fence that will stop it.'

> (vf | RI | 6.30.2023)

This complicates the compositional account of *tsut* with its complement clause, as although *k=* clauses are sometimes associated with a prospective aspect, this is not always the case, as in the case of negation and after question words. In (62), the *k=* complementizer embeds a state which holds at the time of utterance, and in (63), it embeds a past event.

(62) ta7 put **k** sle7s.

> ta7 put **k**=s-le7-s
> NEG EMPH DC.IRR=NMLZ-good-3.POSS

> 'It's not very good.' (Kuipers 1974:81)

(63) stéṁi **k** stsḱulemétentst?

> stéṁi **k**=s-tsḱulemét-n[-t]-ts-t
> what DC.IRR=NMLZ-send.person-CTR[-TR]-2SG.OBJ-PASS

> 'What were you sent for?' (Kuipers 1974:222)

Finally, a more in-depth analysis is needed of the nominalized and possessed form of *tsut*, which is seemingly only used to report someone's opinions.

(64) **ren stsutst** w7ec re séysus re Ruby.

    re=n-s-tsu<ts>t   w7ec   re=séyse=us   re=Ruby

    DET=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-tsut<DIM> IPFV   DC=play=3.SBJV DET=Ruby

    'I think Ruby is playing.'   (vf | RI | 11.21.2023)

It appears as though these constructions do not take *e=s* clauses to indicate future orientation, instead using *me7*. Unfortunately, *me7* cannot appear alongside a determiner or complementizer (even if the determiner/complementizer is syntactically required, *me7* 'replaces' it), so we cannot tell what complementizer is being used, but there is no nominalizer on the following predicate, so the syntactic configuration of the subordinate clause is definitely not the same as an *e=s* clause (which requires a nominalizer).

(65) **te stsut.s** me7 tscpelq̓ílc-ekwe.

    te=s-tsut-s   me7   ts-c-pelq̓ílc=ekwe

    DET.OBL=NMLZ-tsut-3.POSS CIRC.NEC CSL-PREF-return=RPRT

    'He said he was coming back.'   (Kuipers 1974:168)

(66) **ten stsutst** me7 qwetséts-ken.

    te=n-s-tsu<ts>t   me7   qwetséts=ken

    DET.OBL=1SG.POSS-NMLZ-tsut<DIM> CIRC.NEC leave=1SG.SBJV

    'I think I might be going.'   (Kuipers 1974:168)

Much more remains to be investigated about *tsut*, but this paper represents a first hypothesis: I am excited to see whether it is disproven or supported by future discoveries. This paper represents another piece of the analysis of the modal system of Secwepemctsín, and reveals an interesting divergence from its neighboring Norther Interior Salish languages, St'át'imcets and Nłeʔkepmxcín: *tsut*'s cognates in these language do not share the future-oriented modal uses. The contribution of the *e=* complementizer also represents a promising avenue for further investigation. The *e=* complementizer may have wider implications for modal interpretations in Secwepemctsín, and if my hypothesis that it contributes prospective aspect is on the right track, it provides further evidence for a separate prospective aspect being involved in future-oriented modality, advancing a discussion beginning with Condoravdi (2002).

References

Bochnak, M. Ryan, and Lisa Matthewson. 2020. Techniques in complex semantic fieldwork. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 6:261–283.

Condoravdi, Cleo. 2002. Temporal interpretation of modals: Modals for the present and for the past. In *The construction of meaning*, ed. David I. Beaver, Luis D. Casillas Martínez, Brady Z. Clark, and Stefan Kaufmann, volume 5987, 59–88. Standford, CA: CSLI.

First Voices. 2024. First Voices: Secwépemc. Online.

Gessner, Suzanne, Tracey Herbert, and Aliana Parker. 2022. *Report on the status of B.C. First Nations languages*. First Peoples' Cultural Council.

Grice, Herbert P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts*, 41–58. Brill.

Heim, Irene. 1992. Presupposition projection and the semantics of attitude verbs. *Journal of semantics* 9:183–221.

Ignace, Marianne, and Ronald Ignace. 2017. *Secwépemc people, land, and laws: Yerí7 re stsq'ey's-kucw*, volume 90. McGill-Queen's UP.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. Modality. In *Semantics: An international handbook of contemporary research*, ed. Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich, 639–650. de Gruyter, Berlin.

Kuipers, Aert Hendrik. 1974. *The Shuswap language*. Moulton.

Lyon, John, and Marianne Ignace. 2021. Comparing futures: Nsyilxcen *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7*. In *Papers for the International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages 56*, ed. Daniel Reisinger, Hannah Green, Laura Griffin, Marianne Huijsmans, Gloria Mellesmoen, and Bailey Trotter, 167–225. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia: UBCWPL.

Lyon, John, and Marianne Ignace. unpublished. A teaching grammar of Secwepemctsín.

Mari, Alda. 2016. Actuality entailments: when the modality is in the presupposition. In *Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics. Celebrating 20 Years of LACL (1996–2016) 9th International Conference, LACL 2016, Nancy, France, December 5-7, 2016, Proceedings 9*, 191–210. Springer.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2004. On the methodology of semantic fieldwork. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70:369–415.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2006. Temporal semantics in a superficially tenseless language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29:673–714.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2012. On the (non-)future orientation of modals. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, volume 16, 431–446.

Oliver, Bruce. 2023. An analysis of circumstantial *xwent* in Secwepemctsín. In *UBC Qualifying Papers*.

Portner, Paul. 1997. The semantics of mood, complementation, and conversational force. *Natural language semantics* 5:167–212.

Portner, Paul. 2009. *Modality*, volume 1. Oxford University Press.

Rullmann, Hotze, and Lisa Matthewson. 2018. Towards a theory of modal-temporal interaction. *Language* 94:281–331.

Rullmann, Hotze, Lisa Matthewson, and Henry Davis. 2008. Modals as distributive indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 16:317–357.

Thompson, Lawrence C., and M. Terry Thompson. 1996. *Thompson River Salish dictionary: Nłeʔkepmxcín*. UMOPL.

Van Eijk, Jan. 2013. *Lillooet-English dictionary*. University of British Columbia Occasional Papers in Linguistics.