

1 **1. Introduction**

2
3 The Salish language family comprises 23 languages which are or were spoken in the Pacific
4 Northwest of North America; see Thompson and Kinkade (1990), Czaykowska-Higgins and
5 Kinkade (1998) for overviews, and van Eijk (2008) for a comprehensive bibliography. All the
6 languages are in advanced stages of endangerment, with the most ‘healthy’ possessing
7 approximately 100 remaining fluent speakers. While the family is understudied compared to
8 more familiar languages of the Indo-European family, in recent years there has been intensive
9 work on the syntax and semantics of Salish, building on a rich descriptive tradition and
10 incorporating insights from contemporary theoretical frameworks. Salish also enjoys a certain
11 fame due to some high-profile proposals that it differs radically in various aspects of its grammar
12 from better-known (mostly European) languages – see for example Kinkade (1983), Jelinek and
13 Demers (1994), Jelinek (1995), Ritter and Wiltschko (2005, to appear), Davis (2006, 2009),
14 Matthewson (2006, to appear). Our goal in this review article is to report some recent findings
15 from the literature on the syntax and semantics of Salish languages, with particular reference to
16 potential loci of variation between Salish and more familiar languages.

17 For reasons of space, we restrict ourselves here to a relatively detailed discussion of four
18 representative topics, one from each of the areas of lexical semantics, super-lexical syntax,
19 semantics and pragmatics. We have chosen these topics partly because of their wider
20 implications for linguistic theory, partly because we ourselves have worked on them, and partly
21 because each has engendered a lively controversy in the Salishan literature. In selecting these
22 topics, we have had to omit discussion of many other interesting questions, including the debate
23 over lexical category distinctions, most issues of sub-lexical syntax and semantics, as well as
24 issues in the syntax and semantics of determiners, quantifiers, aspect, anaphora, and information
25 structure. In order to compensate for the relatively narrow focus of the paper, we provide a fairly
26 complete bibliography of work on Salish syntax and semantics, thematically structured to allow
27 readers to explore the literature for themselves.

28 The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we present the debate about root
29 semantics in Salish languages, and argue for the hypothesis that all Salish verb roots are (i)
30 intransitive, and (ii) unaccusative. In section 3, we discuss configurationality. We outline the
31 Pronominal Argument Hypothesis as applied to Salish, and present counter-arguments which
32 show that at least some Salish languages have a fully configurational syntax with a VP
33 constituent. Section 4 is devoted to tense and tenselessness; we argue that Salish languages are
34 tensed, in spite of superficial evidence to the contrary. In section 5 we present arguments that at
35 least one Salish language differs quite radically from English in its pragmatics, lacking any
36 familiarity presuppositions.

37 In what follows, it is important to bear in mind that though by now descriptive grammars
38 are available for most Salish languages, there is still a paucity of work on formal syntax and
39 semantics, and virtually nothing written on formal pragmatics.¹ Thus, while we endeavor to be as
40 comprehensive as possible when reviewing literature from the entire family, most of the detailed

¹ Some Salish languages that became extinct before or just at the beginning of the era of modern linguistic research on Salish (c. 1965) are less well documented; these include Pentlatch, Nooksack and Twana from Central Salish, the southern outlier Tillamook, and most of the Tsamosan branch, with the exception of Upper Chehalis (and to, a lesser extent, Cowlitz). There is virtually no syntactic or semantic documentation of any of these languages.

41 arguments given here come from the better studied Central and Northern Interior branches, and
42 we rely particularly heavily on the Northern Interior language St'át'imcets (Lillooet). This
43 reflects our own research interests and experience, as well as, in some cases, the extent of the
44 available literature. Where evidence is only available for one or two Salish languages, we adopt
45 the default assumption that what holds for one Salish language can be extended to a
46 generalization about the entire family. We do this in the knowledge that syntactic and semantic
47 variation certainly exists across Salish, and any putative generalization about the entire family
48 should be regarded as a working hypothesis, falsifiable on the basis of detailed empirical
49 investigation of individual languages.

50

51 **2. Lexical decomposition and the nature of the root**

52

53 Salish languages are of interest for the investigation of decompositional theories of verb
54 meaning, since to a much greater extent than in European languages, Salish verbs wear their
55 derivational structure on their sleeves.² A Salish verb typically consists of the following elements
56 (excluding inflectional morphemes such as person marking, and passive, reciprocal and reflexive
57 suffixes):

58

59 (i) a *root* (distinguishable as the domain of various morphophonological processes,
60 including infixation and several types of reduplication).

61

62 (ii) some form of *aspectual* marking, which may be either prefixal (e.g., reflexes of the pan-
63 Salish stative prefix *ʔac-), infixal (e.g., the Interior Salish inchoative infix *-ʔ-), suffixal
64 (e.g., the Interior Salish inchoative suffix *-p), reduplicative (e.g., Central Salish
65 'inceptive' CV- reduplication) or a mixture of these (e.g., Central Salish 'actual'
66 (imperfective) morphology).

67

68 (iii) zero or more *lexical suffixes*, substantive elements with root-like meanings which modify
69 the root in various ways, but do not generally affect valence, aspect, or argument
70 structure.

71

72 (iv) a *transitivizing* or *intransitive suffix*; almost without exception throughout Salish,
73 transitive verbs (those which take object suffixes) must be suffixed with a transitivizer;
74 intransitive verbs fall into both suffixed and unsuffixed types. Transitivity is linked to
75 both aspect and *agent control*: the latter notion refers to the ability of an agent to
76 influence the outcome of an event (Thompson 1979, 1985).

77

78 Of these four basic ingredients, only the root is essential: every Salish language has at least some
79 'bare root' verbs. However, bare root verbs are always in the minority; the majority of verb roots
80 for any given Salish language are obligatorily affixed with one or more of the elements in (ii-iv)

² We assume a three way lexical category distinction between nouns, adjectives, and verbs, and focus here exclusively on the last. The issue of category neutrality in Salish has been the subject of intense debate, but the debate has largely now been settled in favor of recognizing at least a noun-verb distinction and probably an adjective-verb distinction as well. The reader is referred to the bibliography for relevant works.

81 above to form a complex verb stem. A few examples from St'át'imcets should give an idea of the
 82 range of possible derivations:

- 83
- | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 84 | (1) | a. | √puʔ | 'boil' | |
| 85 | | b. | (ʔə)š-puʔ | 'boiled' | (stative prefix) |
| 86 | | c. | puʔ.əʔ-átq ^w aʔ | 'boiling (of water)' | (C ₂ reduplication and lexical suffix) |
| 87 | | d. | púʔ-xal | 'boil things, do boiling' | (active intransitive suffix) |
| 88 | | e. | púʔ-uñ | 'boil s.t. (tr.)' | (directive transitivizer) |
| 89 | | | | | |
| 90 | (2) | a. | √zaχ ^w | 'melt' | |
| 91 | | b. | za-ʔ-χ ^w | 'melt (intr.)' | (inchoative infix) |
| 92 | | c. | zəχ ^w .záχ ^w | 'soft, melted consistency' | (CVC reduplication) |
| 93 | | d. | záχ ^w -xal | 'melt things, do melting' | (active intransitive suffix) |
| 94 | | e. | záχ ^w -añ | 'melt s.t. (tr.)' | (directive transitivizer) |
| 95 | | | | | |
| 96 | (3) | a. | √ʕal | 'stop' | |
| 97 | | b. | ʕál.əl | 'stop (intr.)' | (C ₂ reduplication) |
| 98 | | c. | (ʔə)š-ʕál | 'stopped, staying' | (stative prefix) |
| 99 | | d. | ʕál-xal | 'stop things, do stopping' | (active intransitive suffix) |
| 100 | | e. | ʕál-añ | 'stop s.t., s.o. (tr.)' | (directive transitivizer) |
| 101 | | f. | ʕál-ləx | 'stop (oneself)' | (autonomous intransitive suffix) |

102

103 The rich and (comparatively) transparent nature of verbal derivation in Salish has been a
 104 happy hunting ground for lexical semanticists, and there is a large and growing literature in
 105 several sub-areas of the field, including lexical/situation aspect, agent control, argument structure
 106 and (in)transitivity. It is beyond the scope of this survey to deal with any of these topics in detail:
 107 see the bibliography for relevant references. Instead, we will focus on one issue that continues to
 108 be debated amongst Salishanists, with potentially important cross-linguistic implications. This
 109 issue concerns the representation of verb roots, and especially the following two hypotheses
 110 (Davis 1997, 2000b, Davis and Demirdache 2000).

- 111
- 112 (4) *Intransitivity Hypothesis (IH)*
 113 All verb roots are intransitive in Salish
- 114
- 115 (5) *Unaccusativity Hypothesis (UH)*
 116 All verb roots are unaccusative in Salish
- 117

118 The IH and the UH, if true, have important implications for lexical semantics, particularly
 119 in view of increasingly popular decompositional approaches to verb meaning, in which
 120 transitives (and in many theories, unergatives, *qua* concealed transitives) are built up
 121 syntactically from monadic roots (see Hale and Keyser 2002, Ramchand 2008, etc.) However,
 122 neither has gone unchallenged: the UH, in particular, goes against most traditional analyses of
 123 Salish, which recognize unergative ('control') as well as unaccusative 'non-control' roots (the
 124 terms are from L.C. Thompson 1979, 1985); and several authors have recently claimed that it is
 125 necessary to recognize transitive roots as well, yielding a standard three-way contrast. In what
 126 follows, we will outline evidence for both the IH and the UH (principally from St'át'imcets) and

127 discuss some of the objections that have been raised in the literature.

128 First, however, it will be necessary to add a third hypothesis, since the issue of verb root
129 semantics is dependent on the premise that roots *have* independent lexical semantic content.

130

131 (6) *Primacy of the root*

132 The root is an active semantic unit in the Salish verbal complex

133

134 The primacy of the root is assumed in virtually all early work on Salish, on the basis of its role as
135 a domain for phonological and morphological processes (see Czaykowska-Higgins 1993 for a
136 particularly clear exposition). However, more recently, its utility as a lexical semantic unit has
137 been questioned: see Hess (1993), N. Mattina (1996), Willet (2003). These authors have claimed
138 that the root is a morphophonological but not a morphosyntactic or semantic unit; as N. Mattina
139 (1996: 24) puts it: ‘Salishan roots, as traditionally defined, are not relevant to semantico-
140 syntactic relationships between underived lexemes and their derivatives.’ Instead, the *verb base*
141 (more or less equivalent to the traditional Salishan verb stem – that is, the verb root plus all
142 derivational but not inflectional morphology) is taken as a primitive unit of lexical organization
143 (the *lexeme*: see Beard 1995).

144 The principal arguments for a lexeme-based and against a root-and-affix-based approach
145 to Salish verbs rely on familiar criteria of compositionality and productivity. First, the semantic
146 relationship between roots and derivational morphemes is sometimes non-compositional; second,
147 there are many more or less accidental gaps in the expected output of derivational operations,
148 including many bound roots that fail to surface unless affixed.³ We do not find these arguments
149 convincing, because they are based on the assumption that any irregularity in distribution or
150 meaning precludes the existence of a derivational relationship. But there is nothing to stop both
151 the input and the output of morphological operations being listed in the lexicon, just in case they
152 need to be – i.e., if they show idiosyncratic properties. And, of course, the existence of
153 idiosyncratic forms is not limited to the derivational morphology, nor even to the morphological
154 component; phrasal idioms are paradigm cases of ‘listemes’, though their components are clearly
155 syntactic. Likewise, exceptional non-application of a morphological process does not invalidate
156 the process itself: it simply calls for a theory that allows particular lexical entries to block the
157 application of otherwise general rules. We will therefore continue to uphold the traditional view
158 that Salish roots are associated with lexical semantic content, and return to the issue of how
159 many verb root classes we need to distinguish.

160 We begin with the IH, which claims that all Salish roots are intransitive. From a
161 morphological perspective, this is motivated by a Salish near-universal: all formally transitive
162 predicates (that is, those which may occur with object suffixes) require an overt transitive
163 suffix.⁴ This is illustrated in (7) with a selection of bare root intransitive verbs in St’át’imcets

³ A third typical argument is an appeal to speaker intuitions of what counts as a ‘word’. We are suspicious of such intuitions, given that the notion of ‘word’ involves a meta-linguistic judgement based on English grammar, with no clear-cut Salish counterpart at all.

⁴ Exceptions are the following: (i) Bella Coola, which has fused its object suffixes with its transitive suffixes; (ii) Southern Interior languages, which have developed transitive paradigms (or parts of paradigms) from nominalized intransitive predicates; (iii) two roots **√twal* ‘to leave’ and **√ʔupal* ‘to eat’ which behave exceptionally in a number of languages in being able to take object suffixes without transitive suffixes.

164 together with their transitivized alternants, derived by suffixation of the directive transitivizer
 165 -*Vn*/*Vn'* or the causative transitivizer -*š*/*-č*:

166					
167	(7)	<i>Intransitive</i>		<i>Transitive</i>	
168		qam̄t	‘to get hit (by flying object)’	qam̄t-š	‘to hit s.o./s.t.’
169		ʔuš	‘to get thrown out’	ʔuš-č	‘to throw out s.t.’
170		mayš	‘to get fixed’	máyš-ən	‘to fix s.t.’
171		ʕiq	‘to get here, arrive’	ʕiq-š	‘to bring s.o./s.t.’
172		kič	‘to get laid down’	kíč- <i>in'</i>	‘to lay s.t. down’
173		q̄wəl	‘to get cooked, ripe’	q̄wəl-ən	‘to cook, roast s.t.’
174		zuq ^w	‘to die’	zuq ^w -š	‘to kill s.o./s.t.’
175		x ^w ak	‘to wake up, be awoken’	x ^w ák- <i>an'</i>	‘to wake s.o.’
176		ʔáčχ	‘to get seen’	ʔáčχ-ən	‘to see s.o./s.t.’
177		ʔwal	‘to get left behind’	ʔwál-ən	‘to leave s.o./s.t. behind’
178					

179 The verbs on the left are associated with a single argument, obligatorily registered on the
 180 predicate in the form of a subject clitic (null in the non-plural third person indicative); those on
 181 the right have two arguments, registered on the predicate in the form of an object suffix (null in
 182 the third person non-plural) and a subject clitic or suffix:

- 183
- 184 (8) a. qam̄t=kan
 185 get.hit=1.SG.SU
 186 ‘I got hit.’
- 187
- 188 b. qam̄t-š-túm^x-aš ta=k̄əʕh=a
 189 get.hit-CAUS-1SG.OBJ-3ERG DET=rock=EXIS
 190 ‘The/a rock hit me.’
- 191
- 192 (9) a. ʔáčχ(=Ø) ta=míχaʔ=a
 193 get.seen(=3SU) DET=bear=EXIS
 194 ‘The/a bear was sighted.’
- 195
- 196 b. ʔáčχ-ən(-Ø)=ʔkan ta=míχaʔ=a
 197 get.seen-DIR(-3OBJ)=1SG.SU DET=bear=EXIS
 198 ‘I saw a/the bear.’
- 199

200 The pattern shown in (7-9) constitutes *prima facie* evidence that the intransitive alternant is basic
 201 and the transitive alternant is derived by a process of causativization, mediated by the
 202 transitivizer. (We leave aside the important issue of whether this process is syntactic, lexical, or
 203 ‘1-syntactic’: see Jelinek 1994 for a syntactic approach, Davis and Demirdache 2000 for a lexical
 204 (event-structure) approach, and Wiltschko 2001 for a mixed account.)

205 However, a number of researchers (Gerds 1988, S. Thomason and Everett 1993, S.
 206 Thomason et al. 1994, L. Thomason 1994, N. Mattina 1996, and most recently Gerds 2006,
 207 Gerds and Hukari 1998, 2006a, b, to appear) have argued that in spite of surface morphology, it

208 is necessary to recognize transitive as well as intransitive verb roots. Gerdts and Hukari, who
209 have undertaken the most systematic investigation of the combinatorial properties of roots for
210 any Salish language, base their findings on a sample of 489 verb roots from Island Halkomelem.
211 Their principal arguments are based on the following considerations. First, though 93% of the
212 roots in their sample appear with the unmarked *-t* transitivizer (the equivalent of St'át'imcets
213 *-Vn*), 19% of these do not have a bare root alternant. Second, in another 8%, the bare root
214 alternant only appears in a very restricted context (referred to by Gerdts and Hukari as 'pseudo-
215 transitive imperatives'). They conclude that only transitives which freely alternate with bare
216 intransitives should be treated as derived from intransitive roots; otherwise, the root should be
217 treated as transitive.⁵

218 These arguments seem to us to be problematic for two reasons. First, the division
219 between alternating (intransitive) and non-alternating (transitive) roots means that the *-t*
220 transitivizer must be given a non-unitary representation – with intransitive roots, it adds an
221 argument, while with transitive roots, it redundantly signals an already existing transitive
222 relation.⁶

223 Second, the idea that the productivity of an alternation should be judged by a count of the
224 number of forms that undergo it reflects a static notion of the mental lexicon, which we suspect
225 underdetermines the morphological resources of fluent speakers. Under this view, the lexicon is
226 much like a dictionary, consisting of a set of *actual* words: the non-existence of a particular
227 lexical entry is taken at face value, and therefore if a transitive form has no intransitive alternant,
228 its root must be transitive.⁷ However, we prefer to emphasize the dynamic nature of
229 morphological alternations, as represented in the minds of fluent speakers, and reflected in the
230 set of *possible* words. This involves asking the following question: *if* a non-alternating transitive
231 had a bare root alternant, what *would* it mean? The fact that our consultants can answer these
232 questions coherently (and consistently) testifies to their intuitions about possible words and their
233 meanings; and the investigation of such intuitions is parallel to the investigation of 'possible
234 sentences' and their meanings – i.e., the enterprise of generative syntax.

235 That the domain of possible words (or in this case, possible roots) is of more than
236 hypothetical interest is shown by the fact that the class of non-alternating transitives is not
237 necessarily fixed, either for a language or even for an individual speaker. For example, if we
238 consult van Eijk's comprehensive (1987) dictionary of St'át'imcets, we find, as in Halkomelem,
239 a set of transitive verbs with no bare root alternant: these include *máyšən*, *kíčiń*, and *ʔwáɫən*, all
240 of which appear in the list in (7) above *with* a bare root alternant. At the point at which van Eijk
241 compiled the dictionary, the bare root alternants of these verbs had never been recorded – but

⁵ Note that the notion of underlying transitivity can be construed in various ways. These include: a quasi-semantic approach based on thematic or aspectual roles; a classical argument structure approach (realized either configurationally or non-configurationally); and a purely morphosyntactic ('inflectional') approach employing e.g., case-licensing. Gerdts and Hukari do not take a stand on this question.

⁶ This point holds irrespective of which notion of transitivity is chosen.

⁷ Of course, this approach *is* appropriate in the domain of lexicography, as opposed to that of grammatical theory; in compiling dictionaries, decisions have to be made about actual rather than possible words. It should be remembered, however, that any dictionary contains a subset of the set of possible words, and therefore is bound to under-represent the lexical resources of fluent speakers.

242 they are all perfectly comprehensible to any fluent speaker, including those who have neither
 243 used nor heard them before. And such forms continue to emerge; quite recently, while editing a
 244 text collection from a speaker with whom we have worked for many years, we came across the
 245 following phrase (produced by the speaker as the title for one of her stories):

246
 247 (10) ti=ʔáp=a ćúq^waž láti? qílq=a
 248 DET=forgot=EXIS fish there seat=EXIS
 249 ‘the fish that got forgotten on the sofa’

250
 251 Neither Jan van Eijk (p.c. 2008) nor we had ever previously recorded the bare root *ʔap*, though
 252 its transitive alternant *ʔápən* ‘to forget s.o, s.t.’ is very common. Subsequent elicitation
 253 confirmed the acceptability of the bare root and revealed its characteristic (telic, patient-oriented)
 254 profile.

255 What, then, of the 19% of transitives that fail to alternate in Gerdts and Hukari’s sample
 256 of Halkomelem? We suspect that this group exists because it is often difficult to find an
 257 appropriate real-world context of use for the bare root alternant. Bare roots in Salish (with the
 258 exception of the ‘control roots’ discussed below) have a very particular cluster of thematic and
 259 aspectual properties. In particular, they are non-agentive, in the sense that their single argument
 260 is a theme/patient, even when the lexical content of the root itself often strongly implies real-
 261 world agency (as with ‘forget’, ‘fix’, ‘abandon’, ‘throw away’, and others).⁸ Speakers often
 262 prefer to employ passivized transitives for patient-oriented readings of these predicates, since
 263 passives linguistically entail an agent, which may be expressed as an oblique argument; in
 264 contrast, with bare roots, obliques may only be interpreted as instruments. This can be seen in the
 265 contrast in (11):

266
 267 (11) a. qám̄t ta=twów̄w̄ət=a ʔə=ta=šqúm̄č=a
 268 get.hit DET=boy=EXIS OBL=DET=ball=EXIS
 269 ‘The boy was hit by/with a ball.’
 270
 271 b. qám̄t ta=twów̄w̄ət=a ʔə=ta=šmóm̄ʔač=a
 272 get.hit DET=boy=EXIS OBL=DET=girl=EXIS
 273 !!’The boy was hit by/with a girl (flying through the air).’
 274
 275 c. qám̄t-š-tum ta=twów̄w̄ət=a ʔə=ta=šqúm̄č=a
 276 get.hit-CAUS-3SG.PASS DET=boy=EXIS OBL=DET=ball=EXIS
 277 ‘The boy was hit by/with a ball.’
 278

⁸ In this regard, Tom Hukari (p.c., 2009) remarks of his Halkomelem consultants that ‘the issue [...] is whether the world as they perceive it will sustain the meaning of the predicate as they understand it without outside agency. If their understanding of the meaning of the predicate is such that the described event cannot come about without an agent, then the root fails as a word.’ This points to an interesting possible cross-linguistic difference between Halkomelem and St’át’imcets, since, as noted above, our St’át’imcets consultants have no difficulty in accepting (and producing) bare root versions of predicates which strongly entail real-world agency, as long as the agent is not salient in the discourse context.

279 d. qám̓t-š-tum ta=twówwət=a ?ə=ta=šmóm̓táč=a
 280 get.hit- CAUS-3SG.PASS DET=boy=EXIS OBL=DET=ball=EXIS
 281 ‘The boy was hit by a girl (throwing something).’
 282

283 Notice that the passive covers all the meanings of the bare root, but not vice-versa. In fact, the
 284 only circumstance where a bare root would be appropriate, but a passivized transitive would not,
 285 is where there is no possibility of real-world agency. In cases of bare roots whose lexical content
 286 strongly implies agency, this contingency is unlikely ever to occur. However, a bare root of this
 287 type might still be used where the speaker wished for some reason not to mention an agent that
 288 was nevertheless present in the speech situation. Strikingly, this corresponds precisely to Gerdts
 289 and Hukari’s ‘pseudo-transitive imperative’ construction in Halkomelem. Here, bare roots show
 290 up when the speaker wishes to frame a polite request without making any direct reference to the
 291 agent, as in (12):
 292

293 (12) ?i=ce? ?ə=tə?i k^w=s=taχ^w=s k^wθə=sənix^wə† ?ə^w-k^weyələs
 294 AUX=FUT OBL=here DET=NOM=beach=3POSS DET=canoes LINK-tomorrow
 295 ‘You will beach the canoes over here tomorrow.’
 296 [Literally: ‘The canoes will beach here tomorrow.’] (Gerdts and Hukari to appear a)
 297

298 Thus, rather than undermining the generality of the bare root-transitive alternation, the 8% of
 299 bare roots in Gerdts and Hukari’s sample which only surface in the pseudo-transitive imperative
 300 construction might actually provide evidence *for* its generality, and therefore for the IH.⁹

301 We conclude that Gerdts and Hukari’s arguments do not invalidate the IH for Salish, and
 302 turn to the UH, which claims that an unaccusative root of the type seen in (7) underlies *all* verbal
 303 predicates in Salish.

304 Unlike with the IH, surface morphological evidence seems to argue against the UH, due
 305 to the existence (in every Salish language where the topic has been investigated in detail) of a set
 306 ‘control roots’ alongside the unaccusative ‘non-control’ roots we have been investigating so far.
 307 Typically, control roots comprise a sizeable minority of all unsuffixed intransitives (there are
 308 more than a hundred in St’át’imcets: see Davis 2006b for a more or less complete list), and
 309 though they fall into several subtypes (some object-directed, some lexically reflexive), they are
 310 all clearly distinguished from unaccusative bare roots in being agentive.¹⁰ A typical selection
 311 from St’át’imcets is given below:
 312

313 (13) *Some ‘control roots’ in St’át’imcets*
 314

⁹ Tom Hukari (p.c. 2009) comments that ‘I would be inclined to say that those [unaccusative roots] that appear in pseudo transitives, when they appear in that context, have intransitive unaccusative argument structure but possibly are assigned some sort of semantic agent.’ This is in line with our own interpretation, and seems to indicate that Halkomelem speakers *do* tolerate at least some bare roots with strongly agentive meanings (pace footnote 8), albeit in more restricted contexts than St’át’imcets speakers are willing to allow.

¹⁰ Note that agency does not necessarily imply a human or even an animate agent, but simply an ‘actor’; for example, substances such as medicine, poison, and disease, which act on patients, may be the subjects of control intransitives. The traditional term ‘active’ is perhaps more appropriate than ‘agentive’ for this reason.

315	záqil	‘to peek’	qańim	‘to hear’
316	naq ^w	‘to steal’	ʔaž	‘to pay for’
317	k ^w uk ^w	‘to cook’	šáʔšəž	‘to play’
318	ʔíʔən	‘to eat’ (Upper dialect)	šaq ^w	‘to fly’
319	qaʔ	‘to eat’ (Lower dialect)	q ^w aʔút	‘to speak’

320

321 As has been noted by several researchers, control roots semantically parallel unergatives in more
 322 familiar languages (see in particular Gerdts 1998, 2006). It might appear, then, that we need to
 323 distinguish at least two ‘macro-classes’ of intransitive root: unaccusatives (the non-control roots
 324 participating in the intransitive-transitive alternation exemplified in (7)) and unergatives (the
 325 control roots exemplified in (13)). This is the conclusion reached by Gerdts and Hukari (2006a,
 326 forthcoming) on the basis of their 489-root survey: they point out that 7% of their roots show an
 327 alternation between a *-t* transitive and an agentive intransitive, rather than the patient-oriented
 328 intransitive predicted by the UH.¹¹

329 In spite of the *prima facie* evidence, however, Davis (1997, 2000b) argues that all control
 330 roots in St’át’imcets are *derived*, by zero affixation from an underlying unaccusative root
 331 (specifically, via a zero-allomorph of the pan-Salish middle marker *-Vm*). The basic thrust of the
 332 argumentation is as follows.

333 First, every Salish language possesses an inventory of intransitive suffixes that alternate
 334 quite productively with transitivizers. In St’át’imcets (which is fairly typical in this regard), there
 335 are three main intransitive suffixes: the active intransitive *-xal*, which derives ‘object-directed’
 336 intransitives, the autonomous intransitive *-ləx/-ílx*, which derives lexical reflexives, and the
 337 middle marker *-Vm*, which is ambiguous between the two.

338 Next, Davis shows that syntactically and semantically, control roots pattern identically to
 339 either object-directed or lexically reflexive middles. On the semantic side, there are many
 340 synonymous or near-synonymous pairs of predicates, one suffixed with a middle marker, the
 341 other zero-marked. Some of these are differentiated dialectally: for example, the Lower
 342 St’át’imcets word for ‘work’ is the middle-marked form *k^wzúšəm*, while its Upper St’át’imcets
 343 counterpart is the zero-derived form *ʔalkšt*. On the syntactic side, zero-marked intransitives show
 344 identical behavior to their middle-marked counterparts. For example, active intransitives, object-
 345 directed middles and object-directed ‘control roots’ may all occur with overt theme DPs (though
 346 not with object suffixes: see Davis and Matthewson 2003b); they are the only intransitive
 347 predicates to do so. Furthermore, the same three classes of intransitive verb all undergo an
 348 operation of predicate nominalization, yielding a derived nominal predicate whose agent is
 349 marked by possessive morphology, as shown in (14):

350

351 (14) a. *active-marked*

352	ʔáma=ʔuʔ	lák ^w ʔa	ti=š-x ^w ʔúx ^w -š=a
353	good=PART	NONVIS.DEIC	DET=NOM-smell-3POSS=EXIS

¹¹ Gerdts and Hukari also make the important observation that many of the roots in their survey (a full 48%, in fact) are what they term ‘swingers’ – that is, they can either show unaccusative or unergative characteristics, depending on the context of use. For us, this simply reflects the free availability of the zero-middle marker introduced below, whose distribution is constrained only by ‘encyclopedic’ considerations – that is, whether a pragmatically appropriate set of contexts exists for the expression of a zero middle or a bare root unaccusative.

- 354 ʔi waʔ š-ǰ^wəl-xál-šu
 355 PL.DET IMPF NOM-cook/roast-ACT-2SG.POSS
 356 ‘What you’re cooking smells good!’
 357
 358 b. *middle-marked*
 359 ʔáma=ǰuʔ lák^wʔa ti=š-x^wʔúx^w-š=a
 360 good=PART NONVIS.DEIC DET=NOM-smell-3POSS=EXIS
 361 ʔi waʔ š-ǰ^wəl-əm-šu
 362 PL.DET IMPF NOM-cook/roast-MID-2SG.POSS
 363 ‘What you’re cooking smells good!’
 364
 365 c. *zero-marked* (‘control root’)
 366 ʔáma=ǰuʔ lák^wʔa ti=š-x^wʔúx^w-š=a
 367 good=PART NONVIS.DEIC DET=NOM-smell-3POSS=EXIS
 368 ʔi waʔ š-k^wúk^w-šu
 369 PL.DET IMPF NOM-cook(-Ø)-2SG.POSS
 370 ‘What you’re cooking smells good!’
 371

372 Not only do we find semantic and syntactic parallels between control roots and middles, we also
 373 find alternations between the two. This can be seen clearly with agentive intransitives containing
 374 lexical suffixes, which normally take a middle marker; in many cases, the middle is in free
 375 variation with a zero-affixed form, as shown in (15).
 376

- 377 (15) a. wáʔ ʔúǰ^w-alq^w(-əm) ʔi=wáʔ zík-alč
 378 IMPV peel-log(-MID) PL.DET=IMPV fell.log-house
 379 ‘The ones building the log house are peeling logs.’
 380
 381 b. x^wuǰ ʔayʔ pum-ákaʔ/pum-ákʔ-am) ʔi= ʔux^walmíx^w=a
 382 IMPV now pound-hand/pound-hand-MID PL.DET=people=EXIS
 383 ‘Then the people began to drum.’
 384
 385 c. x^wʔǰz=ǰuʔ k^w=a=š ʔáy-č(-am)
 386 NEG=PART DET(NOM)=IMPV=3POSS answer-mouth(-MID)
 387 ‘S/he’s still not answering.’
 388

389 These systematic parallels between middles and control intransitives stand in stark contrast to the
 390 situation with unaccusative intransitives: there are *no* overt intransitive suffixes which yield
 391 derived unaccusatives.¹² This striking asymmetry can easily be understood if the direction of

¹² As documented in Davis (2000b), there are some inchoative verbs in St’át’imcets marked with autonomous (lexical reflexive) morphology (e.g., *nák-ləx* ‘to change’, *ǰw-ilx* ‘to get close (of weather)’, *ǰúp-ləx* ‘to twist’). However, these verbs differ in thematic and aspectual properties from bare unaccusatives: they describe spontaneous events (i.e., they are necessarily non-agentive), and they do not necessarily culminate, unlike bare root unaccusatives. In these respects, they parallel verbs marked either with inchoative morphology or by C₂ reduplication, and, in fact, they often freely alternate with forms which undergo one or the other of these

392 derivation goes from unaccusative root to derived intransitive (including zero-derived ‘control
393 roots’) and transitives, but is a mystery otherwise.¹³ Davis concludes in favor of the UH, and we
394 see no reason to alter that conclusion.

395 Where does this leave Salish in terms of the typology of possible roots? On the one hand,
396 there is no doubt that the existence of bare unaccusatives with strongly agentive lexical content,
397 including many of the forms in (7), gives Salish a thoroughly exotic feel (for example, such
398 forms fall outside the typological parameters countenanced by Haspelmath 1993 in his cross-
399 linguistic study of the causative-inchoative alternation). On the other hand, strongly
400 decompositional theories of verb meaning such as that of e.g., Ramchand (2008) posit abstract
401 atoms which correspond rather closely to the morphologically distinguished atomic elements of
402 the Salishan verb.¹⁴ It may be, then, that the only unusual thing about the lexical semantics of the
403 verb in Salish is the extreme transparency of its morphology, which provides a window into
404 derivational operations which are largely obscured in more familiar languages.

405

406 **3. Configurationality**

407

408 Any linguist with a passing acquaintance with the syntactic literature on Salish is probably aware
409 of the radical claim, embodied in a series of papers by Eloise Jelinek and Richard Demers, that
410 some Salish languages are of the *pronominal argument* type (see in particular Jelinek and
411 Demers 1994, Jelinek 1995, 1996, 1998a).

412 In this section, we briefly review Jelinek and Demers’ arguments for the Pronominal
413 Argument Hypothesis (henceforth PAH) as applied to Salish, and the debate which ensued
414 amongst Salishanists over the structure of the clause. We conclude that in spite of superficial
415 morphological and syntactic evidence for the PAH, there is overwhelming evidence from a
416 variety of syntactic diagnostics that certainly some and probably all Salish languages are

processes: thus *náǰək*’ also means ‘to change’, *ǰəw-p* means ‘to get close (of weather)’, and
ǰúp.əp means ‘to twist’). Note also that Gerds (2006) describes a parallel set of ‘inchoative
reflexives’ marked with the limited control reflexivizer *-namət*, however, these have a telic
interpretation and are translated as ‘finally’ or ‘just now’.

¹³ This derivational asymmetry is also the reason why the zero-middle approach constitutes a
genuinely empirical (i.e., falsifiable) alternative to the conventional division of intransitive roots
into control and non-control classes. The latter makes no predictions about the direction of
derivation – it is just as likely under this view for there to be overt morphology deriving
unaccusatives as unergatives, contrary to fact. More generally, the zero-middle analysis is
compatible with a fully monotonic view of morphological composition, whereby once
introduced, argument structure may not be subsequently deleted.

¹⁴ But not entirely so. One of the most intriguing properties of unaccusatives in Salish is that they
have a uniformly telic event structure – unlike other Salish Aktionsarten, they entail culmination
(Bar-el 2005, Bar-el et al. 2005, Kiyota 2008). This is at odds with most aspectually-driven
decompositional theories, which assume that states (as the most primitive type of eventuality) are
basic, with transitions added compositionally by predicates such as CAUSE. We do not currently
know whether the ‘atomic state’ theory can be reduced to the ‘atomic transition’ theory, or vice-
versa, or whether this represents a genuine parametric difference between roots in Salish and in
other languages.

417 conventionally configurational in their underlying structure.

418 Though there are multiple versions of the PAH, the intuition behind them is quite simple:
 419 in languages where core arguments are obligatorily marked on the predicate complex by
 420 pronouns, and lexical arguments are optional, it is the pronouns which are responsible for
 421 saturating argument positions; associated ‘argument’ phrases are actually adjuncts. There are two
 422 core predictions of the PAH:

423

424 (i) Every argument position must be occupied by a pronoun.

425 (ii) No non-pronominal constituent can be in an argument position.

426

427 In ‘radical head-marking’ systems such as Salish, where pronominal morphology takes the form
 428 of affixes and clitics, (i) translates into the claim that pronominal argument languages will have
 429 full and obligatory agreement paradigms. This is indeed a characteristic property of all Salish
 430 languages, which have up to four subject and two object paradigms. Two representative partial
 431 paradigms are given below, showing transitive indicative pronouns in St’át’imcets (Northern
 432 Interior), and the Lummi dialect of Northern Straits (Central Salish), the language on which
 433 Jelinek and Demers based their pronominal argument analysis. Both languages also have
 434 nominalized (possessive) and subjunctive (a.k.a. ‘conjunctive’) subject paradigms, and partially
 435 distinguish intransitive from transitive subject pronouns

436

437 (16)

ST’ÁT’IMCETS TRANSITIVE INDICATIVE PRONOUNS

		<i>OBJECT</i>					
		1SG	2SG	1PL	2PL	3	3PL
<i>SUBJECT</i>	1SG		-či(n)=ʔkan tumi(n)=ʔkan		-tumuʔ=kan	=ʔkan	-taniʔkan, -wit=kan
	2SG	-č=kax ^w , -tumx=kax ^w		tumuʔ=kax ^w		=ʔkax ^w	-wit=kax ^w
	1PL		* (passive)		* (passive)	* (passive)	* (passive)
	2PL	-č=kaʔap, -tumx=kaʔap		tumuʔ=kaʔap		=ʔkaʔap	-wit=kaʔap
	3SG	-č-aš, -tumx-aš	-či-haš, -tumi-haš	tumuʔ-aš	-tam-aʔapaš	-aš	-aš
	3PL	čal-itaš, -tumxal-itaš	-či-haš-wit, -tumi-haš-wit	-tumul-itaš	-tam-aʔapaš- wit	-itaš, -twitaš	-itaš, -twitaš
	PAS	-čal-əm, -tumxal-əm	-či-m, -tum-im	-tumul-əm	-tam-ʔkaʔap	-əm, -tum	-tanəmwit

438

439 (17)

NORTHERN STRAITS (LUMMI) TRANSITIVE INDICATIVE PRONOUNS

		<i>OBJECT</i>			
		1SG	2	1PL	3
<i>SUBJECT</i>	1SG		-ɔŋəs=sn		=sn
	2SG	-ɔŋəs=sx ^w		-ɔŋəʔ=sx ^w	=sx ^w
	1PL		-ɔŋəs=ʔ		=ʔ
	3	* (passive)	* (passive)	* (passive)	-əs
	PAS	-ŋ=sn	-ŋ=sx ^w	-ŋ=ʔ	-ŋ

440

441 Turning to (ii), the second obvious consequence of the PAH is that lexical (DP)
 442 arguments will be freely omissible in a pronominal argument language, since they have the status
 443 of adjuncts. This is also true of all Salish languages: once introduced, discourse referents are

444 generally referred to by null pronouns rather than by overt DPs. In fact, transitive clauses with
 445 two overt DPs are dispreferred throughout the family, and barred altogether in some Central
 446 Salish languages (notably, Lushootseed and Twana).

447 Third, in a pronominal argument language, lexical DPs will show the same word order
 448 freedom (or lack of it) as adjuncts. To the extent that this has been systematically investigated,
 449 this is also true of Salish. All Salish languages are basically predicate initial, though many allow
 450 subjects, and some also objects and adjuncts, to precede the predicate. Post-predicatively,
 451 adjuncts (both clausal and phrasal) may generally be freely interspersed with arguments; in the
 452 following St'át'imcets sentence, for example, every permutation of post-predicative word order
 453 is possible (Gardiner, Matthewson and Davis 1993):

454
 455 (18) čaq^w-ań(-Ø)-ítaš ?i=šq^wəl=a ?i=šk^wəm^wúk^wmi?t=a
 456 eat-DIR(-3OBJ)-3PL.ERG PL.DET=berry=EXIS PL.DET=children=EXIS
 457 l=ta=ləp^xáltən=a ?i=nátx^w=aš
 458 in=PL.DET=garden=EXIS when(PAST)=day=3CONJ
 459 'The children ate the berries in the garden yesterday.'

460
 461 Pre-predicatively, both adjuncts and arguments are more or less restricted, depending on the
 462 language. In some Central Salish languages, they may not be fronted unless clefted or dislocated;
 463 in others, particularly in the Southern Interior, both may be freely topicalized. The point is, there
 464 is no sharp argument-adjunct distinction in word order possibilities.

465 So far, then, the surface morphological and syntactic properties of Salish languages make
 466 them strong candidates for pronominal argument status. At the same time, however, it is
 467 important to point out that none of these properties provide knock-down arguments for the PAH
 468 – there are perfectly well-behaved configurational systems with rich agreement morphology,
 469 extensive use of null arguments, and relatively free word order. Examples of head-initial
 470 languages of this type include Malayo-Polynesian languages such as Chamorro (Chung 1998)
 471 and various Mayan languages with variable post-predicative word order (including Tzotzil,
 472 Tz'utujil, Yukateko, and Lakandon: see England 1991); in fact, it is even possible to view certain
 473 Romance languages with post-verbal subjects, null arguments, and extensive clitic-doubling as
 474 falling into this class.

475 Accordingly, we will now turn to a second series of predictions of the PAH, based on more
 476 subtle syntactic diagnostics. Strikingly, we shall see that all of them yield the wrong results for
 477 Salish.

478 We begin with the existence of *unregistered arguments*: that is, argument DPs which have
 479 no corresponding pronominal affix or clitic.¹⁵ In most Salish languages, arguments which are not
 480 registered by pronominal morphology are marked oblique. However, in several languages, the
 481 oblique marker is optionally omitted, and in St'át'imcets it is *obligatorily* absent on unregistered
 482 DP objects, including the themes of both active ('anti-passive') intransitive and ditransitive
 483 predicates, as discussed in Davis and Matthewson (2003b). Ditransitive themes in St'át'imcets
 484 constitute particularly strong counter-evidence to the PAH prediction that all argument DPs
 485 should be registered on the predicate by pronominal morphology, since though unregistered, they

¹⁵ See Austin and Bresnan (1996) for parallel arguments against the PAH for Australian languages, in response to Jelinek's (1984) pronominal argument analysis of Warlpiri.

486 are obligatorily present, either in the form of an overt DP (19a) or a null pronoun (*pro*) (19b).¹⁶

- 487 čúʔ-xi(t)-č-aš ta=kúkwpí7=a ta=n-šəmʔám=a
488 (19) a.
489 point-IND-1SG.OBJ-3ERG DET=chief=EXIS DET=1SG.POSS-wife=EXIS
490 ‘My wife pointed out the chief to me.’
491
492 b. čúʔ-xi(t)-č-aš *pro* ta=n-šəmʔám=a
493 point-IND-1SG.OBJ-3ERG DET=1SG.POSS-wife=EXIS
494 ‘My wife pointed *(him/her/it/them) out to me.’
495

496 Furthermore, the interpretation of overt theme DPs in ditransitives is unrestricted: they may be
497 quantified, as in (20), or even represented by demonstratives, as in (21). This is important
498 because it preclude a potential alternative analysis of unregistered nominals as predicate
499 modifiers, which would not saturate an argument position, and would therefore not need to be
500 registered by pronominal morphology.

- 501
502 (20) náš-xit(-Ø)=kan ʔi=škʷəm kʷúkʷmiʔt=a [tákəm ʔi=šáyʃiʔtən=a]
503 go-IND(-3OBJ)=1SG.SU PL.DET=children=EXIS [all PL.DET=toy=EXIS]
504 ‘I brought the children all their toys.’
505

- 506 (21) čuʔ-xi(t)-tani=ʔkán=tiʔ
507 point-IND-3PL.OBJ=1SG.SU=DEM
508 ‘I pointed that out to them.’
509

510 We conclude, following Davis and Matthewson (2003b), that the unregistered theme arguments
511 of ditransitives constitute strong evidence against the PAH for St’át’imcets.

512 A related problem concerns differences in interpretation between DPs and pronouns. The
513 PAH predicts that their interpretation should be identical, since overt DPs are simply optional
514 adjuncts to pronominal arguments. But as Jelinek and Demers (1994: 732) concede, this is not
515 the case in Northern Straits Salish: object pronouns are definite, while overt object DPs can be
516 either definite or indefinite:

- 517
518 (22) a. leŋ-t=sən
519 see-TR=1SG.SU
520 ‘I saw her/him/it/them.’ (*not* ‘someone/something’)
521
522 b. leŋ-t=sən cə=sməyəs
523 see-TR=1SG.SU DET=deer
524 ‘I saw the/a deer.’
525

¹⁶ This leaves open the (remote) possibility that the ditransitive theme might be registered on the predicate by non-overt pronominal agreement. However, if we were to assume the existence of this type of agreement, it would have to be uniquely restricted in both its form (obligatorily Ø-marked) and distribution (confined to third person). We do not find an agreement ‘paradigm’ consisting of a single phonologically empty cell very plausible.

526 It might be possible to appeal to a predicate modifier analysis to handle the indefinite
 527 interpretation of DPs, but this would be problematic for the treatment of determiners, which
 528 would have to be vacuous on the indefinite reading, and semantically active on the definite
 529 reading.

530 A further set of counter-arguments to the PAH analysis of Salish is provided by syntactic
 531 diagnostics that show two kinds of asymmetry: those between adjuncts and arguments, and those
 532 between subjects and objects. Adjunct-argument asymmetries are problematic because they
 533 should not exist: if all non-pronominal arguments *are* adjuncts, then the two should behave
 534 identically. Subject-object asymmetries are problematic because lexical DPs are not in
 535 conventional, hierarchically distinguished positions in pronominal argument languages: instead,
 536 they are clausal adjuncts which should show no structural asymmetries.

537 The clearest case of an adjunct-argument asymmetry in Salish is provided by WH-
 538 movement. Though, as pointed out by Jelinek (1998b), the Salish WH-phrase itself (a predicate)
 539 does not move, A'-movement of an operator certainly *does* take place in its sister, which has the
 540 form of a headless relative clause. This movement leaves an obligatory gap and can take place
 541 across a complement clause, as shown for St'át'imcets in (23):

- 542
 543 (23) štam̓ [k^wu=š-čút-šu [k^w=š=ʔáčχ-ən-ax^w]]
 544 what [DET=NOM-say- 2SG.POSS [DET=NOM=see-DIR-2SG.ERG]]
 545 'What did you say you saw?'
 546

547 WH-movement is subject to a standard range of island effects in the Salish language where these
 548 have been investigated (Davis, Gardiner and Matthewson 1993, Gardiner 1993, Baptiste 2002,
 549 Davis 2008); most significantly for our purposes, it is sensitive to the Adjunct Island Condition,
 550 which bars movement from inside an adjunct, such as the temporal clause in the St'át'imcets
 551 example in (24):

- 552
 553 (24) * štam̓ [k^wu=š-čúləl-šu [ʔi=ʔáčχ-ən-ax^w]]
 554 what [DET=NOM-run.away- 2SG.POSS [when(PAST)=see-DIR-2SG.ERG]]
 555 'What did you run away when you saw?'
 556

557 The contrast between examples like (23) and (24) is unexpected under the PAH, where there is
 558 no structural distinction between complement and adjunct clauses, since both are adjoined at the
 559 clausal level.¹⁷

560 Turning to subject-object asymmetries, a number of standard c-command-based tests
 561 clearly distinguish the hierarchical position of subjects and objects. They include the following:
 562 *intra-clausal Condition C effects* (Matthewson, Davis and Gardiner 1993 on the Northern
 563 Interior Salish languages St'át'imcets, Secwepemctsin (Shuswap), and Nlhe7kepmxtsin
 564 (Thompson River Salish), Hukari 1996 on Halkomelem, Koch 2006 on Nlhe7kepmxtsin, Davis
 565 2006a, 2009 on St'át'imcets); *strong crossover effects* (Demirdache 1997, Davis 2006a, 2009 on
 566 St'át'imcets), *weak crossover effects* (Gardiner 1991 on Secwepemctsin, Davis, Gardiner and
 567 Matthewson 1993 on the three Northern Interior languages, Davis 2005 on St'át'imcets, Hukari

¹⁷ This does not apply to versions of the PAH such as that of Baker (1996), where only DPs must be adjoined, since they are required to be licensed by Case; clauses need not be Case-marked and therefore show normal adjunct-argument asymmetries.

1996 on Halkomelem); *the interpretation of bound variable pronouns* (Davis 2005 on St’át’imcets); and *superiority effects* (Davis, Gardiner and Matthewson 1993 on the Northern Interior languages, Davis 2008 on St’át’imcets). To take just one example, (25) and (26) illustrate the effects of weak crossover in St’át’imcets. In (25) we see that covaluation is possible between a name and a null pronoun (*pro*) inside a relative clause, whether in object or subject position; in contrast, in (26), we see *pro* inside a relative clause in object position may co-vary with a WH-phrase associated with a trace in subject position, but a *pro* in a relative clause in subject position may *not* covary with a WH-phrase associated with a trace in object position.

- 577 (25) $\dot{c}umq\dot{s}-\dot{a}\dot{n}-a\dot{s}$ $k^w=\dot{s}=Mary$ $[ta=wa?$ $\chi^w\dot{e}y-\dot{s}-\dot{a}\dot{s}$ $\dot{s}qayx^w]$
 578 kiss-DIR-3ERG DET=NOM=Mary [DET=IMPF love-CAUS-3ERG man]
 579 (i) ‘Mary_i kissed the man she_{i/j} loved.’ *or*
 580 (ii) ‘The man she_{i/j} loved kissed Mary_i.’
 581
 582 (26) $\dot{s}wat$ $k^wu=\dot{c}umq\dot{s}-\dot{a}\dot{n}-a\dot{s}$ $ta=wa?$ $\chi^w\dot{e}y-\dot{s}-\dot{a}\dot{s}$ $\dot{s}qayx^w]$
 583 who DET=kiss-DIR-3ERG DET=IMPF love-CAUS-3ERG man]
 584 (i) ‘Who_i kissed the man she_{i/j} loved?’ *or*
 585 (ii) ‘Who_i did the man she_{*i/j} loved kiss?’
 586

587 The relevant case is the missing bound reading in (26ii).¹⁸

588 A related set of tests directly probes for the position of lexical DPs, by picking out a
 589 constituent (VP) that contains the (DP) object and the verb, but systematically excludes the
 590 subject. The existence of a conventionally defined VP is unexpected under the PAH, since all
 591 DPs are adjuncts, and should be outside the VP (if one exists). In St’át’imcets, three grammatical
 592 processes pick out the VP: VP-coordination, VP-pronominalization (Davis 2005), and VP
 593 ellipsis (Davis 2004, 2005, 2009). The last provides perhaps the most compelling evidence for a
 594 VP constituent (though it appears to be confined to St’át’imcets), since it rather strikingly
 595 resembles its English counterpart. It is licensed by an auxiliary, strands the subject (whether
 596 pronominal or lexical), elides all material in VP (including the verb, its object(s) and VP-level
 597 adjuncts), and allows both strict and sloppy readings, as shown in (27).
 598

- 599 (27) $x^w\dot{u}z=ʔkan$ $\chi lit-\dot{e}n$ $t\acute{a}k\dot{e}m$ $?i=n-\dot{s}n\acute{o}k^wn\acute{u}k^w?=a,$
 600 going.to=1SG.SU invite-DIR all PL.DET=1SG.POSS-friends=EXIS
 601 $m\acute{u}ta?$ $x^w\dot{u}z=\dot{\chi}u?$ $\dot{\chi}it$ $k^w=\dot{s}=Lisa$
 602 and going.to=PART also DET=NOM=Lisa
 603 (i) ‘I’m going to invite all my friends and Lisa is going to (invite all my friends), too.’
 604 (*strict interpretation*)
 605 (ii) ‘I’m going to invite all my friends and Lisa is going to (invite all her friends), too.’
 606 (*sloppy interpretation*)
 607

¹⁸ Different versions of the PAH make different predictions about weak crossover, depending on whether A’-movement is allowed. Theories such as that of Jelinek and Demers (1994), which disallow it, predict no effects, while theories which allow it, such as that of Baker (1996), predict effects with both subject *and* object. The point is that no version of the PAH predicts the subject-object asymmetry shown in (26).

608 We conclude that at least for St'át'imcets, the evidence for a conventional hierarchical clausal
 609 structure with a VP-external subject asymmetrically c-commanding a VP-internal object is very
 610 strong indeed; and to the extent that parallel tests have been carried out in other Salish languages,
 611 they support the same conclusion.

612 With respect to the last point, it is important to acknowledge that not all the relevant tests
 613 have been carried out on all Salish languages; in fact, for most languages, we have incomplete
 614 data, and in some cases, no information at all. Worse, more than half of all Salish languages are
 615 now moribund or extinct, with no hope of recovering the relevant data, and all the remaining
 616 extant members of the family are in peril, with a five to fifteen year window of opportunity to
 617 carry out further meaningful syntactic and semantic research. This means it is impossible to be
 618 absolutely certain that conclusions drawn from a few Salish languages are applicable to others
 619 where the relevant investigation has not been – and may never be – undertaken. Nevertheless,
 620 with respect to the PAH, we think it is possible to generalize our conclusions to less studied
 621 languages. This is because in surface syntactic and morphological characteristics, Salish
 622 languages are quite homogeneous: the superficial evidence *for* the PAH reviewed above is
 623 common to virtually every member of the family. This means in turn that the more subtle and
 624 deep-seated syntactic evidence *against* the PAH which we have reviewed here is also unlikely to
 625 vary. The reason has to do with the learnability of ‘macro-parameters’, such as that
 626 distinguishing pronominal argument systems from conventional ‘lexical argument’ systems. If
 627 Salish languages were split into pronominal argument and non-pronominal argument grammars
 628 then the learner would need access to ‘triggering data’ – surface-accessible cues as to pronominal
 629 argument status. But as far as we know, there are no such cues. The safest bet, in the absence of
 630 any positive evidence *for* the PAH, is to assume that *no* Salish language is a pronominal
 631 argument language.

632 In order to make this discussion more concrete, we have constructed the following table,
 633 bringing together all the relevant superficial and non-superficial predictions of the PAH for
 634 Salish (including several which we have not had space to discuss here).

635
 636 (28) *Predictions of the PAH for Salish*
 637

	NORTHERN STRAITS	OTHER CENTRAL	ST'ÁT'IMCETS	OTHER INTERIOR
<i>(i) Surface-accessible properties</i>				
(a) full and obligatory agreement paradigms	√	√	√	√
(b) optional overt DPs	√	√	√	√
(c) no argument-adjunct word order distinctions	√ (?)	√ (?)	√	√
(d) no unregistered argument DPs	√	*	*	?
(e) no unregistered argument CPs	*	*	*	*
(f) no interpretive differences between pronouns and overt DPs	*	*	*	*
(g) no VP ellipsis	√	√	*	√
(h) no VP coordination	?	?	*	?
(i) no pro VPs	?	?	*	*
(g) no DP anaphors	√	√	√	√
(h) no NP-movement	*	*	*	*
(i) no infinitives	√	√	*	*
<i>(ii) Surface-inaccessible properties</i>				
(j) no adjunct island effects	?	?	*	*
(k) no Condition C effects	?	*	*	*
(l) no strong crossover	?	?	*	*

(m) no weak crossover	?	*	*	?
(o) no variable binding asymmetries	?	?	*	?
(p) no superiority	?	?	*	?

638

639 Two things are particularly striking about the table in (28). The first is the number of question
 640 marks, particularly in the section on surface-inaccessible properties, and particularly in the
 641 column for Northern Straits Salish, the language on which Jelinek and Demers based their
 642 pronominal argument analysis of Salish. Second, in spite of the gaps in our knowledge, there
 643 appears to be *no* variation in surface-inaccessible properties. There are two logically possible
 644 interpretations of this finding: either all Salish languages are of the pronominal argument type, or
 645 none are. Given the evidence we have presented in the rest of this section, our conclusion is
 646 clear: *no Salish language is a pronominal argument language.*

647

648 **4. Tense**

649

650 We now turn from a much-debated syntactic question to a controversial semantic issue in the
 651 study of Salish: the question of whether Salish languages are tensed or tenseless.

652

653 **4.1. Past and present**

654

655 In Salish languages, there is no obligatory overt distinction between past and present tense. Each
 656 language possesses optional elements which indicate past time; some are illustrated in (29-31).

657

658 (29) nks + t + I t s-múχ^w- ši-t-anx t mé:lmx
 659 HAB + DET + PAST DET IMPERF-pay-APPL-TR-1SG.SUBJ DET children
 660 ‘I was paying it for children.’ (Cowlitz; Kinkade 2004: 248)

661

662 (30) wíkʔn aý Paul
 663 wík-tʔ-n aý Paul
 664 see-TR-(3AB)-1SS + PAST Paul
 665 ‘I saw Paul.’ (Moses-Columbia; Willett 2003: 320)

666

667 (31) kʷən-t-éʔnə́n ləʔ sən
 668 see-CTRAN-3OBJ(Ø)-DESID PAST 1SUBJ
 669 ‘I wanted to see it.’ (Saanich/Sənčáθən; Montler 1986: 210)

670

671 In the absence of overt temporal marking, the aspectual class of the predicate gives rise to
 672 predictable default temporal interpretations. Stative predicates across the family prefer a present
 673 tense interpretation, while temporally unmarked achievements or accomplishments are by default
 674 interpreted as past:

675

676 (32) a. kʷəy tə Jack
 677 get.hungry DET Jack
 678 ‘Jack is hungry.’¹⁹ [STATIVE: PRESENT] (Sənčáθən; Kiyota 2008: 28)

¹⁹ The root in (32a) is glossed as ‘get hungry’, because Kiyota argues that stage-level states in

679
680
681
682
683
684
685

- b. ləʔə sən kʷəʔ lətʰ-át tʰə nə-sqʷátən
AUX 1SG INF get.filled-CTR D my-bucket
'I filled up my bucket.' [ACCOMPLISHMENT: PAST]

(Sənčáθən; Kiyota 2008: 30)

686 The influence of aspectual class on temporal interpretation might lead one to infer that Salish
687 systems are 'aspect-driven' rather than 'tense-driven', and that tense is a by-product of aspect in
688 these languages cf. Smith et al.'s (2003) approach to Navajo, or Smith and Erbaugh (2005) on
689 Mandarin Chinese. However, the default temporal interpretations can be overridden by context in
690 at least St'át'imcets (Matthewson 2006b), Skw̥wú7mesh (Bar-el 2005), and Sənčáθən (Kiyota
691 2008).

692
693
694
695

- (33) a. *Context: A doctor talking about a specific time in the past when she was phoned
by someone from Mount Currie.*

696 ʔálsəm ti=kʷukʷpiʔ-íh=a
697 sick DET=chief-3PL.POSS=EXIS
698 'Their chief was sick.' [STATIVE: PAST] (St'át'imcets)

699
700
701
702
703
704

- b. máyš-ən-aš ta=káh=a kʷ=š=Bill
fix-DIR-3ERG DET=car=EXIS DET=NOM=Bill
'Bill is fixing the car.' [ACCOMPLISHMENT: PRESENT]
(St'át'imcets; Bar-el et al. 2005, cited in Matthewson 2006b: 677)

705 Furthermore, the default temporal interpretations vary from language to language. For example,
706 in Sənčáθən, activity predicates without past marking must be interpreted in the present tense
707 (Kiyota 2008: 31), but in St'át'imcets, temporally unmarked activities are freely interpreted as
708 either past or present (Matthewson 2006b, Davis 2006b; see also Currie 1996 for
709 Skw̥wú7mesh). This cross-linguistic variation casts doubt on an aspect-driven approach,
710 because it shows that the correlation between aspectual class and temporal interpretation cannot
711 be provided by a universal default mechanism.

712 Another interesting feature of Salish past tense marking is that it is not restricted to the
713 verbal domain, but freely appears on nouns within noun phrases (see Burton 1997, Wiltschko
714 2003, Matthewson 2005 for theoretical discussion, and almost any descriptive grammar for
715 similar facts (e.g., Hess 1995: 63 for Lushootseed, Suttles 2004: 370 for the Musqueam dialect of
716 Halkomelem). Past tense on an animate noun often indicates that the individual has passed away.
717

- 718 (34) a. čəda tu-/laχ-dxʷ tiʔiʔ **tu-d-s-/capaʔ**
719 1SGS-CONJ PAST-/remember-TR DET **PAST-1SG.POSS-NOM-/grandfather**
720 tə-c-əxʷ-u-/luχ-il ʔi tsiʔiʔ **tu-d-/kiaʔ**
721 PAST-1SG.-NOM-PNT-/old-INTR CONJ DET-F **PAST-1S.POSS-/grandmother**

Sənčáθən actually encode an initial change-of-state. See Bar-el (2005) for the same proposal for Skw̥wú7mesh (a.k.a. Squamish).

722 'I remember my grandfather and my grandmother who raised me.'
 723 (Lushootseed; Bates 2002: 18, from Bierwert 1996: 150-151)

724
 725 b. imex te-l si:lá-*lh*
 726 walk DET-1SG.POSS grandfather-*PAST*
 727 'My late grandfather walked.'
 728 ((Upriver) Halkomelem; Wiltschko 2003: 662, from Burton 1997: 73)

730 The presence of past marking inside noun phrases is one of Wiltschko's (2003) motivations for
 731 arguing that Halkomelem lacks a Tense head. Wiltschko follows Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) in
 732 assuming that universally, nominative Case results from an uninterpretable T(ense) feature on a
 733 determiner which needs to be checked and deleted. Tense marking within noun phrases as in
 734 (34b) is argued to show that in Halkomelem, the T feature on D is *interpretable*. This has the
 735 consequence that Halkomelem lacks nominative Case, and that Tense is not necessary as a
 736 syntactic head. The absence of the T head in turn derives the optionality of overt past tense
 737 marking.

738 In a reply to Wiltschko's paper, Matthewson (2004) argues that in neither Halkomelem
 739 nor St'át'imcets is there evidence for interpretable T features on the determiners. Matthewson
 740 argues that the presence of temporal elements within the noun phrase does not fundamentally
 741 differentiate Salish from English, which also allows cross-categorial temporal modification – for
 742 example with the element *then*, which can appear inside DPs and modify the predication time of
 743 the noun. Matthewson further observes that the temporal interpretation of the main predicate of
 744 the sentence can clash with that of the DP, as in (35). These data are hard to reconcile with the
 745 idea that an interpretable T feature inside DP is taking over the clausal function of tense.

746
 747 (35) a. čʔaš látiʔ ta=kʷúkʷpiʔ=a=*tuʔ* naš nkaʔ
 748 come DEIC DET=chief=EXIS=*PAST*²⁰ go get.stuck
 749 'Here comes the ex-chief who's going to jail.'
 750 (St'át'imcets; Matthewson 2004: 13)

751
 752 b. el-eliyemet-tsel-*cha* the-l sí:l-á:-*lh*
 753 REDUP-dream.about-1SG.SUBJ-*FUT* the(FEM)-my grandparent-*PAST*
 754 'I'll be dreaming about my late grandmother.'
 755 (Halkomelem; Matthewson 2004:13, citing Nordlinger and Sadler 2004: 782)

757 A second tenseless analysis of Halkomelem is proposed by Ritter and Wiltschko (2004,
 758 2005, to appear), who argue that Halkomelem encodes spatial rather than temporal notions in its
 759 Infl node. Instead of encoding temporal (non-)coincidence with the utterance time, Halkomelem
 760 Infl – instantiated by auxiliaries – encodes spatial (non-)coincidence with the utterance location.

761
 762 (36) a. [+distal]
 763 *lí* qw'eyílex tú-tl'ò
 764 *AUX* dance he

²⁰ The element *tuʔ*, glossed here as 'past', is actually analyzed by Davis and Matthewson (2003a) and Matthewson (2006b) as a temporal adverbial similar to English *then*.

765 'He was dancing (there).'
 766
 767 b. [-distal]
 768 í qw'eyílex tú-tl'ò
 769 AUX dance he
 770 'He was dancing (here).' (Halkomelem; Ritter and Wiltschko to appear)

771
 772 While Ritter and Wiltschko do provide evidence that spatial notions play an important role in
 773 interpreting Halkomelem clauses, they do not provide any convincing evidence that tense
 774 information is absent. For example, Matthewson (2006b) argues that there are obligatory
 775 temporal shifting effects in St'át'imcets embedded clauses which crucially derive from the
 776 presence of a tense morpheme in the matrix clause (see below for discussion of Matthewson's
 777 analysis). For a tenseless analysis to be convincing, we would either have to see that such
 778 temporal shifting effects are absent in Halkomelem, or that they can be reanalyzed successfully
 779 within a location-based system.

780 A third tenseless analysis of Salish is that of Currie (1997) (although the main focus of
 781 Currie's research on Skwxwú7mesh was the distinction between event-time and topic-time
 782 adverbials, not the tense node itself). Currie adopts a framework in which tense is a relational
 783 head that takes the utterance time and the topic time as its arguments and orders them (see
 784 Demirdache and Uribe-Etxeberria 2007).²¹ Since Skwxwú7mesh lacks obligatory morphological
 785 tense distinctions, Currie argues that the relation between the utterance time and the topic time is
 786 not specified by the tense head in this language. Instead, the topic time is specified by a temporal
 787 adverbial at the right edge of the sentence, or, if no overt temporal adverbial is present, then it is
 788 a *pro*, and it must receive its value from a topic time set up by a prior utterance.

789 While Currie's observed syntactic distinction between the event-time and topic-time
 790 interpretations of temporal adverbials in Skwxwú7mesh is fascinating and deserves further
 791 attention, we are not convinced by her arguments for the lack of a tense head. In support of the
 792 claim that the topic time is provided *only* by a temporal adverbial or by a prior utterance, Currie
 793 writes that (37) is 'uninterpretable if no topic time is available from the discourse' (1997: 77).

794
 795 (37) chen ílhen
 796 1SG.SUBJ eat
 797 'I eat / I'm eating (these days) / I ate.' (Skwxwú7mesh; Currie 1997: 77)

798
 799 However, it is not clear that (37) is actually uninterpretable; in fact, Currie herself in an earlier
 800 paper offers the three translations given in (37) and implies that they were volunteered by her
 801 Skwxwú7mesh consultants (Currie 1996: 23). It seems that (37) is simply ambiguous or vague if
 802 uttered out of the blue; this would make (37) parallel to utterances containing pronouns whose
 803 reference is unclear in out of the blue contexts. Importantly, the temporal vagueness of (37) does
 804 not mean that it contains no tense morpheme. On the contrary, Matthewson's (2006b) tensed
 805 analysis of St'át'imcets, to which we now turn, directly accounts for Currie's facts.

806 Matthewson (2006b) argues that St'át'imcets is tensed: it possesses an obligatory tense

²¹ The topic time (a.k.a. reference time) is the time about which an assertion is made, and may or may not coincide completely with the time of the event itself. Past tense orders the topic time before the utterance time. See Klein (1994), among many others, for discussion.

807 morpheme, which is phonologically null but present in every finite clause. This tense morpheme
 808 restricts the topic time to being *non-future*, and its exact value is narrowed down by temporal
 809 adverbials or context (just as the exact value of a past topic time in an English sentence like *John*
 810 *arrived* is provided by context). The lexical entry for the tense morpheme is given in (38); the
 811 framework adopted is that of Kratzer (1998).

812
 813 (38) $[[\text{TENSE}_i]]^{g,c}$ is only defined if no part of $g(i)$ is after t_c . If defined, $[[\text{TENSE}_i]]^{g,c} = g(i)$.

814
 815 According to (38), the TENSE morpheme requires that no part of the topic time provided by the
 816 assignment function g follows the utterance time. If this presupposition is satisfied, the TENSE
 817 morpheme denotes the non-future topic time. The analysis is applied to an example in (39).

- 818
 819 (39) a. matq k^w=š=Mary
 820 walk DET=NOM=Mary
 821 ‘Mary walked / Mary is walking.’
 822
 823 b. TP
 824 3
 825 T AspP
 826 g 3
 827 TENSE_i Asp VoiceP
 828 g 3
 829 PERF matq k^w=š=Mary
 830
 831 c. $[[(39a)]]^{g,c} = \lambda w \exists e [\text{walk}(e)(w) \ \& \ \text{agent}(\text{Mary})(e)(w) \ \& \ \tau(e) \subseteq g(i)]$ (where no
 832 part of $g(i)$ follows t_c).
 833
 834 d. There is an event e of Mary walking, whose running time τ is included in the
 835 contextually salient non-future topic time $g(i)$.
 836

837 According to this analysis, the St’át’imcets tense system shares fundamental similarities with
 838 that of English. The systems differ only in the semantic (under-)specification of the tense
 839 morphemes, and in phonological covertness. Both of these differences are uncontroversially
 840 admitted by standard theories: covert morphemes exist, and languages encode greater or lesser
 841 degrees of specification in their functional elements.²²

842 Returning to the Skw̥w̥ú7mesh data in (37) above, Matthewson’s underspecified
 843 analysis correctly predicts that in an out of the blue situation, the temporal reference will be
 844 underdetermined. The tensed analysis predicts that Salish tenses will pattern just like *pro* in
 845 languages with *pro*-drop for nominal arguments: discourse-initially, utterances containing *pro*
 846 are difficult to interpret, but we do not therefore assume that there is no pronominal present.

847
 848 **4.2. Future**
 849

²² In fact, Chung and Timberlake (1985: 204) observe that ‘[t]he direct encoding of three tenses is not particularly common. It is more usual to find only a two-way distinction in tense, either future vs. non-future or past vs. non-past.’

850 In contrast to past marking, future marking is obligatory in at least some Salish languages. (40)
 851 shows that in St'át'imcets, the morpheme *kəʔ* enforces a future interpretation, and (41) shows
 852 that sentences which are unmarked for future may not be interpreted as future and are therefore
 853 incompatible with future time-adverbials.

- 854
 855 (40) a. tayt=kán=kəʔ
 856 hungry=1SG.SUBJ=*FUT*
 857 '* I was hungry / * I am hungry / I will be hungry.'
 858
 859 b. k̄ax-añ=ʔkán=kəʔ
 860 dry-DIR=1SG.SUBJ=*FUT*
 861 '* I dried it / * I am drying it / I will dry it.'
 862 (St'át'imcets; Matthewson 2006b: 277)

- 863
 864 (41) a. * táyt=kan natx^w / zánux^{wə}m
 865 hungry=1SG.SUBJ *one.day.away* / *one.year.away*
 866 'I will be hungry tomorrow / next year.'
 867
 868 b. * k̄ax-añ=ʔkan natx^w / zánux^{wə}m
 869 dry-DIR=1SG.SUBJ *one.day.away* / *one.year.away*
 870 'I will dry it tomorrow / next year.' (St'át'imcets; Matthewson 2006b: 277)

871
 872 Across the Salish family, languages seem to differ in whether future tense requires obligatory
 873 overt marking. St'át'imcets represents one extreme, where even a future adverbial cannot license
 874 a future interpretation in the absence of a dedicated future morpheme.²³ For Skwxwú7mesh,
 875 Currie (1996: 24) states that a future adverbial alone *is* sufficient to license a future
 876 interpretation, and Ritter and Wiltschko (to appear) state that Upriver Halkomelem allows future
 877 interpretations in the absence of *any* marking of future at all:

- 878
 879 (42) álhtel te swíyeqe
 880 eat DET man
 881 'The man is eating.' / 'The man was eating.' / 'The man will be eating.'
 882 (Upriver Halkomelem; Ritter and Wiltschko to appear)

883
 884 Even within Halkomelem, there may be dialect differences. According to Gerdtts and Hukari (to
 885 appear), *some* marking for future is obligatory, which may be merely a future adverbial.
 886 However, Donna Gerdtts (p.c.) observes that the cases involving future adverbials may actually
 887 all contain some other temporal or aspectual marking (e.g., a motion verb, 'going to', or the
 888 perfect). Suttles (2004: 508) says of the Musqueam dialect that 'The use of *-əʔ* to express the
 889 past is not obligatory, but the use of *ceʔ* for the future may be.' Clearly, there is work to be done
 890 across the family on the issue of the (non-)optionality of future marking.^{24,25}

²³ The future morpheme is usually *kəʔ*, but *x^wuz̄* 'be going to' or a motion verb such as *naš* 'go' will also do the trick. See Glougie (2007) for discussion of St'át'imcets *x^wuz̄*, which she argues is not a progressive future (as assumed by Matthewson 2006b), but a prospective aspect.

²⁴ Brent Galloway (p.c. 2008) disagrees that (42) can have a future interpretation in Upriver

891 It is important to note that the possibility of future interpretations in the absence of a
 892 future marker is not in itself problematic for a tensed analysis, as English also allows such
 893 constructions:

- 894
 895 (43) a. I take the exam tomorrow.
 896 b. I'm meeting him next week.

897
 898 On the other hand, any language in which a future interpretation requires obligatory overt
 899 marking *is* problematic for a tenseless analysis, since as argued by Matthewson (2006b), a
 900 tenseless analysis cannot adequately explain the restriction of non-future-marked sentences to
 901 non-future times. For example, Currie's analysis of Skwxwú7mesh predicts that any sentence
 902 without overt temporal marking can (in fact, must) receive the topic time of the preceding
 903 utterance. But this does not seem to be correct for futures, as shown in (44). Even though the first
 904 sentence sets up a future topic time, the second sentence is interpreted as past (and the sentences
 905 are therefore not viewed as a coherent discourse).

- 906
 907 (44) nam' chen *ek'* txwnach'aw'txw lhe-n sata7 k kwayl-es
 908 go I *FUT* go.next.door DET-my aunt SUBJ next.day-3.CONJ
 909 'I'm going next door to visit my auntie tomorrow.'
 910
 911 chen nam' p'i7-t ta sts'u \underline{k} wi7
 912 I go take-TR DET fish
 913 'I went to get the fish.' (Skwxwú7mesh; Peter Jacobs, p.c. 2008)

914
 915 (44) strongly suggests that we cannot simply derive temporal interpretation from preceding
 916 context. On the other hand, a tensed analysis correctly predicts (44), since the restriction to non-
 917 future times in the second sentence is lexically encoded by the non-future TENSE morpheme.

918 The reader might imagine that the non-future status of temporally unmarked clauses in at
 919 least some Salish languages follows from a distinction between realized vs. unrealized events.
 920 Unfortunately for this idea, Salish future markers are demonstrably *not* general irrealis markers
 921 but are specific to future readings (see argumentation in Matthewson 2006b, and cf. Suttles 2004:
 922 375 on the Halkomelem future clitic: 'This simply indicates future time.'). Nor is it relevant to
 923 argue that the future markers encode modal semantics, since the same is true of English future
 924 *will*. In fact, it is standard to assume that *will* itself is a modal, which *co-occurs with* a tense (cf.
 925 Abusch 1985 and much other work), and exactly the same can be said of the Salish future
 926 markers. Rullmann et al.'s (2008) analysis of the St'át'imcets future *kəʔ* is given in (45). For
 927 current purposes, the relevant feature of the analysis is that *kəʔ* induces both quantification over
 928 worlds (as it is a modal) and a temporal ordering restriction (as it is a future).

- 929
 930 (45) $[[kəʔ]]^{c,w,t}$ is only defined if *c* provides a circumstantial modal base *B*.

Halkomelem; he claims that the future tense marker is obligatory here. This disagreement about the data may result either from language change, or from differing elicitation techniques.

²⁵ N. Mattina (1999) discusses several strategies for marking future in Colville-Okanagan, but does not explicitly discuss whether they are obligatory. None of her future-time examples involve just an adverbial.

931 $[[kəʔ]]^{c,w,t} = \lambda f_{\langle st,st \rangle} . \lambda p_{\langle s, \langle i,t \rangle \rangle} . \forall w' [w' \in f(B(w)(t)) \rightarrow \exists t' [t < t' \wedge p(w')(t')]]$

932

933 The idea that the future markers co-occur with tense also accounts for so-called ‘past-future’
 934 readings, which in English surface with *would* as in (46). In these cases, the future morpheme
 935 places the topic time after some earlier time, rather than after the utterance time.

936

937 (46) a. A child was born who would become ruler of the world. (Kamp 1971)

938

b. Susan said two weeks ago that she would leave her husband in one week.

939

940 Past-future readings appear in at least St’át’imcets, Lushootseed (Bates and Hess 2001) and
 941 Halkomelem (Gerdts and Hukari to appear b), and probably other Salish languages.²⁶

942

943 (47) Situation: Mike Leech is currently chief of T’ít’q’et. His (deceased) mother was called
 944 Julianne.

945

946 *zwát-ən-aš* š=Julianne [k^w=wa=š k^wúk^wpi?*kəʔ*

947

know-DIR-3ERG NOM=Julianne [DET(NOM)=IMPF=3POSS chief=*FUT*

948

ta=šk^wúza?-š=a ?i=k^wíš=aš

949

DET=child-3POSS=EXIS] when.PAST=fall=3CONJ

950

‘Julianne knew when he was born that her child would become chief.’

951

(St’át’imcets; Matthewson 2006b: 689)

952

953 (48) *sis* ?əw̃ yə-θeỹ-t-əṁ ʔeʔtʔqə-t-əṁ təni? šni?s ce? k^ws nem̃-s

954

SUB LINK SER-make(IMP)-TR-PAS clear(IMP)-TR-PAS here place FUT that go-3POS

955

yə-ʔim̃əš-st-əṁ təni? ce? x^wk^was-t-əṁ ʔi q̣χəw̃ṭ x^wətəs

956

SER-walk-CS-PAS here *FUT* drag(IMP)-TR-PAS big war.canoe heavy

957

‘They cleared a path to make way to drag this big canoe, the heavy one.’

958

(Halkomelem; Gerdts and Hukari to appear b)

959

960 Bates and Hess (2001) give similar examples from Lushootseed, and argue that Lushootseed *tu-*
 961 is a relative future tense marker which places the topic time after an evaluation time (by default,
 962 the utterance time).²⁷ Of course, (46) shows that the Salish futures do not (pace Mithun 1999)
 963 differ from the English future in giving rise to past-future readings. The difference between
 964 Salish and English lies not in the future modal/temporal ordering operator, but in the co-
 965 occurring tense. In English, *will* changes to *would* in the past-future, but a language with a single
 966 non-future tense is predicted to use the same surface string for both an ordinary future and a past-
 967 future. On the other hand, it is quite difficult to see how a location-based analysis (as in Ritter
 968 and Wiltschko to appear) would deal with past-futures.

²⁶ Tom Hukari (p.c., 2009) confirms that the past-future reading appears spontaneously in stories in (Island) Halkomelem.

²⁷ Bates and Hess actually say that the prefix places the situation time after the reference time, but this does not accord with the standard way of using the terms in the tense literature. Bates and Hess state that *tu-* is optional, and Dawn Bates (p.c. 2008) confirms that at least in narratives, the future marker may be omitted on some predicates that signal time posterior to the moment described at that point in the narration.

969 One fascinating and as-yet unexplained issue in Salish tense is that some languages can
970 encode future interpretations by means of word order; see Currie (1996) on *Skw̓wú7mesh*,
971 Ritter and Wiltschko (to appear) on Halkomelem, and Bar-el et al. (2004) on Halkomelem and
972 *Skw̓wú7mesh*. For example, the intended future interpretation of the second sentence in
973 *Skw̓wú7mesh* (44) above is obtained by changing the word order so that the verb precedes the
974 person clitic (Peter Jacobs p.c. 2008). The Halkomelem facts are schematized in (49); note that
975 these schemas lack any overt spatial auxiliary:²⁸

976

977 (49) clitic-verb → past

978 verb-clitic → future

(Ritter and Wiltschko to appear)

979

980 Ritter and Wiltschko provide convincing arguments that in the clitic-verb order, there is a null
981 auxiliary (which they analyze as +distal); see also Davis (2000a) for arguments that clitic-first
982 orders in St'át'imcets involve a null auxiliary.²⁹ Ritter and Wiltschko explain the future
983 interpretation with the verb-clitic order by suggesting that in this order, the verb must raise to
984 Infl because there is no auxiliary (not even a null one). The absence of a locative auxiliary means
985 that the event is not located in the actual world, and this gives rise to a future interpretation, since
986 future events are not located in the actual world.

987 It is true that there is a connection between future time and irrealis. For example, in
988 Nlhe7kepmx̓tsín, the difference between 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow' is encoded solely by a
989 distal vs. an irrealis determiner: *lh spi7hawt* 'yesterday' versus *k spi7hawt* 'tomorrow' (Karsten
990 Koch p.c. 2008). However, events which are not located in the actual world are not limited to the
991 future; they include any kind of possible-world event. The possible-world analysis therefore
992 predicts that the verb-clitic order could be interpreted as any kind of modal statement, including
993 a counterfactual, a possibility assertion, and so on. The crucial fact that the event in the verb-
994 clitic order is placed *after the utterance time* is left unexplained by a tenseless analysis.

995 No-one has as yet attempted a tensed analysis of the use of word order to reverse
996 temporal orderings in *Skw̓wú7mesh* or Halkomelem. The issue remains open for now.

997

998 4.3. Summary

999

1000 We conclude is that there is no convincing reason to analyze the tense systems of Salish
1001 languages as radically different from those of languages like English. The cross-linguistic
1002 variation between English and Salish can be analyzed as consisting only in (a) the (under-)
1003 specification and (b) the phonetic covertness of the tense morphemes. The tensed analysis
1004 accounts for a larger range of facts than any extant tenseless analysis, and is consistent with our
1005 overall belief that there is no radical syntactic parametrization differentiating Salish and Indo-
1006 European.

1007

1008 5. Presuppositions

²⁸ The *Skw̓wú7mesh* facts as reported by Currie (1996) are broadly similar, but involve some subtleties based on aspectual class. For example, Currie says that the verb-clitic order with a stative predicate gives a present-tense interpretation.

²⁹ In St'át'imcets, the two possible orderings of clitic and verb correlate with imperfective versus perfective aspect, rather than tense.

1009

1010 In the previous section we argued that Salish languages do not differ fundamentally from English
1011 in their tense systems, but merely in the lexical semantics of their tense morphemes. The same
1012 theme repeats itself in other areas of the semantics which have been investigated in depth in
1013 Salish. For example, Rullmann et al. (2008) argue that while modals in St'át'imcets differ
1014 systematically from those of English in their denotations, the differences are non-fundamental
1015 and relate merely to which aspects of meaning each language chooses to lexically (under-)
1016 specify. Similarly, Matthewson et al. (2007) analyze evidentials in St'át'imcets as epistemic
1017 modals which are basically similar to epistemic modals in English, but differ in imposing
1018 additional constraints on information source which are not lexically encoded by English modals.

1019 In this section, we review a cluster of semantic/pragmatic differences between
1020 St'át'imcets and English which we argue do *not* reduce to mere lexical (under-)specification. The
1021 phenomena reviewed in this section instead reflect a much deeper cross-linguistic difference. In
1022 particular, we argue (following Matthewson 2006a, to appear) that St'át'imcets lacks any
1023 presuppositions which place constraints on the hearer's knowledge or belief state at the time of
1024 utterance. If this proposal is correct, it constitutes a (rather radical) pragmatic parameter
1025 differentiating St'át'imcets from languages like English.

1026 The first difference in presuppositional status relates to determiners, and is known to
1027 extend beyond St'át'imcets to a variety of Salish languages. As argued by Matthewson (1998)
1028 and as supported by all available descriptions of the languages, Salish determiner systems lack
1029 definite determiners (determiners which presuppose familiarity or uniqueness). This is illustrated
1030 for two languages in (50-51). We see in each case that the determiner which is appropriate for
1031 introducing a novel entity is also appropriate when referring to a familiar entity. This
1032 differentiates the Salish determiner systems from that of English, which must use an indefinite
1033 article for the novel case and a definite for the familiar.

1034

1035 (50) a. t'i súxwt-as [lhe 7úlhka7 slhánay]_i ...
1036 FACT saw-he [DET snake woman] ...
1037 'He saw [a snake-woman]_i ...' [NOVEL]

1038

1039 b. t'i tl'um s-kwal-s [lhe slhánay]_i: ...
1040 FACT then NOM-speak-her [DET woman]: ...
1041 'Then [the woman]_i said: ...' [FAMILIAR]

1042 (Sechelt; Matthewson 1998: 33, cited from Beaumont 1985:188)

1043

1044 (51) a. huy, šu-dx^w-əx^w [tiʔiʔ čx^wəluʔ]
1045 then see-TR-now [DET whale]
1046 'They saw [a whale]_i.' [NOVEL]

1047

1048 b. bapa-d-əx^w əlg^wəʔ [tiʔiʔ čx^wəluʔ]
1049 pester-TR-now 3PL [DET whale]
1050 'They pestered [the whale]_i.' [FAMILIAR]

1051 (Lushootseed; Matthewson 1998: 34, cited from Hess 1995:140)

1052

1053 Matthewson (1998) gives examples making the same point from St'át'imcets, Secwepemctsin
1054 (Kuipers 1974), and Sənčáθən (Montler 1986).

1055 We could analyze the absence of a definite determiner in Salish languages as merely a
1056 case of lexical semantics, as we did with tense. However, Matthewson (1998) proposes that there
1057 is a deeper parameter at work here, whereby determiners are banned in Salish from accessing the
1058 common ground of the discourse in any way.³⁰ This means that Salish determiners may not
1059 encode any distinction which places a constraint on the belief-state of the hearer of the utterance,
1060 with definites being ruled out as one sub-type of a common ground determiner.

1061 Subsequent research in a range of areas has revealed that other Salish constructions and
1062 elements also fail to encode presuppositional notions or place constraints on the common ground.
1063 For example, Davis et al. (2004) show that the cleft construction in Straits and St'át'imcets is
1064 non-presuppositional. While in English clefts introduce existence presuppositions, the same is
1065 not true in the Salish languages, as illustrated in (52) for Northern Straits. The consultant judges
1066 the clefted sentence as felicitous, even though the discourse context does not license an existence
1067 presupposition. Note the infelicity of the English translation:
1068

1069 (52) *Context: I am looking after my daughter, Mary, as well as two other children, Bill and*
1070 *Jill. Mary and Jill got slightly hurt when playing. When my wife comes home, this is what*
1071 *I say:*

1072
1073 ni† kʷsə Mary ʔiʔ Jill tə mɛʔkʷ†
1074 FOC DET Mary and Jill DET get.hurt
1075 'It was Mary and Jill that got hurt.' (Northern Straits; Davis et al. 2004: 114)

1076
1077 If the Salish non-presuppositional effects were limited to determiners and clefts, we could still
1078 actually analyze the issue as being restricted to determiners, as long as we adopt an analysis of
1079 clefts according to which they involve concealed definite descriptions (as in Percus 1997,
1080 Hedberg 2000).³¹ However, the non-presuppositional phenomena are even more widespread.
1081 Matthewson (2006a) argues that even prototypical presupposition triggers such as elements
1082 corresponding to 'again', 'more', 'also' and 'stop' do not place constraints on the hearer's belief
1083 state in St'át'imcets. The core fact which leads Matthewson to this conclusion is that von Fintel's
1084 (2004) 'Hey, wait a minute!' (HWAM) test fails to apply in St'át'imcets.

1085 The HWAM test is illustrated in (53) for the familiarity presupposition of English *the*. It
1086 is felicitous to challenge a failed presupposition with an expression of surprise, but it is not
1087 felicitous to challenge a previously unknown assertion in the same way. The test thus specifically
1088 detects presuppositions as opposed to asserted material.

1089
1090 (53) A: The mathematician who proved Goldbach's Conjecture is a woman.
1091 B: Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that someone proved Goldbach's Conjecture.
1092 B': #Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that that was a woman. (von Fintel 2004: 271)

³⁰ The common ground is the set of propositions believed by both speaker and hearer (Stalnaker 1974).

³¹ It has been argued that the 'clausal remnant' of clefts in at least some Salish languages (including St'át'imcets) is a bare CP rather than a full relative clause (Davis et al. 2004, Koch 2008). If so, the Hedberg/Percus analysis cannot in principal be extended to Salish, because it crucially depends on the semantics of the determiner which introduces the remnant. Thanks to Karsten Koch (p.c., 2008) for reminding us of this.

1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100

In English and other European languages, it is fairly easy to replicate HWAM results in a fieldwork situation.³² In St'át'imcets, in contrast, failure of the hypothesized presuppositions for presupposition triggers are never challenged by consultants in a way that distinguishes failed presuppositions from new asserted information. One example is given in (54). At the time of A's utterance, B had just walked into A's house and there had been no prior conversation apart from greetings. In spite of this, B did not challenge A's use of *hu7* 'more'.

1101 (54) A: wáʔ=ʔkax^w=ha χάλ^ʔ-miñ k^wu=**húʔ** k^wu=tíh
1102 IMPF=2SG.SUBJ=YNQ want-APPL DET=*more* DET=*tea*
1103 'Would you like some more tea?'

1104
1105 B: iy
1106 'Yes.' (St'át'imcets; Matthewson 2006a)

1107
1108 The reader is referred to Matthewson (2006a) for similar results for a range of other
1109 presupposition triggers, as well as arguments against a cultural analysis of the absence of
1110 HWAM responses. For example, Matthewson shows that St'át'imcets consultants are perfectly
1111 able and willing to challenge other types of infelicitous utterance, including utterances with
1112 unclear noun phrase reference, or utterances which entail pragmatically odd claims (such as that
1113 there are two suns).

1114 The absence of familiarity presuppositions throughout St'át'imcets extends even to third-
1115 person pronouns. Davis (2006a) and Matthewson (to appear) provide evidence that third-person
1116 pronouns in St'át'imcets can be uttered in indefinite contexts; examples are given in (55-56)
1117 (note the infelicitous English translations).

1118
1119 (55) šúx^wt-ən-aš ta=k^wúk^wpiʔ=a *pro*_{ERG}.
1120 recognize-DIR-3ERG DET=chief=EXIS *pro*_{ERG}.
1121 táʔ-ləx ʔayʔ š=Mary
1122 stand.up-AUT then NOM=*Mary*
1123 'She_i recognized the chief. # Then Mary_i stood up.' (St'át'imcets; Davis 2006a)

1124
1125 (56) na=š-pálaʔ-š=a [táy^t=wit], niʔ [š=waʔ=š
1126 DET=NOM-one-3POSS=EXIS [hungry=3PL] then [NOM=IMPF=3POSS
1127 x^wíʔ-əm k^wu=šʔíʔən ta=nk^yáp=a mútaʔ ta=šχ^ʔwálx^w=a
1128 seek-MID DET=food DET=*coyote*=EXIS and DET=*fox*=EXIS]
1129 # 'Once upon a time, they_i were hungry, so [a coyote and a fox]_i went looking for food.'

³² There are many subtleties to the application of the HWAM test, given the possibility for accommodation of a failed presupposition. The presupposition should not be too easy to accommodate by virtue of being too uncontroversial, unsurprising, or unimportant to the hearer. On the other hand, the relevant proposition cannot be *too* controversial, otherwise a 'surprise' response arises even with an unknown assertion. The personal relationship between the interlocutors and their relative social status also affect results. Nevertheless, there is a striking difference between the ease with which one can elicit HWAM responses in English, and the complete impossibility of eliciting them in St'át'imcets.

1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160

Data such as these lead us to conclude that St'át'imcets, unlike English, does not require presuppositions to be shared knowledge between speaker and hearer. Presuppositions do still exist in St'át'imcets, but of a different type from those in English. Following Matthewson (2006a), we adopt Gauker's (1998) analysis of presuppositions for St'át'imcets; this approach says that a presupposition merely represents the *speaker's own take* on the propositional context (where the propositional context contains propositions that 'are relevant to the conversational aims of the interlocutors, whether they are aware of these facts or not' (Gauker 1998:150)).³³ The effect of this is that it looks in St'át'imcets like presupposition accommodation always takes place. This means that although presuppositions exist in St'át'imcets, we will not detect them as easily as in English.³⁴

The claim that St'át'imcets lacks any presuppositions which place constraints on the hearer's belief state is a fairly radical one, involving cross-linguistic variation in the pragmatic component of a kind which we suspect many researchers would be reluctant to countenance. However, it is striking that every new area of St'át'imcets semantics which we investigate turns out to display the same absence of familiarity effects. The latest example involves discourse particles, which are frequently analyzed as placing constraints on the hearer's knowledge or belief state (cf. Kratzer 2004, Zimmermann 2007, among others). Research in progress by Angelika Kratzer and Lisa Matthewson suggests that even discourse particles in St'át'imcets do not encode anything about the hearer's knowledge. . In short, we are fairly convinced that the most fundamental way in which the semantics/pragmatics of Salish languages differs from that of Indo-European languages lies in the absence of familiarity presuppositions in Salish.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to St'át'imcets consultants Gertrude Ned, Laura Thevarge, Rose Agnes Whitley and the late Beverley Frank. We are also very grateful to our reviewers, Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and Tom Hukari, as well as to Karsten Koch for feedback on an earlier version of this paper. Beyond that, we thank all our Salishanist colleagues, past and present, for the work on which we build here. Errors are our own. This research is supported by SSHRC

³³ We do *not* adopt Gauker's analysis for English, since otherwise we could not explain the differences between English and St'át'imcets with respect to the HWAM test. See also arguments by von Stechow (2000) against applying Gauker's approach to English.

³⁴ Systematic work has not yet been done on whether other Salish languages lack English-style presuppositions, although the pan-Salish absence of definite determiners and the cleft properties discussed above suggest that the lack may hold family-wide. However, Koch (2008: 90-91) shows that in Nl̓he7kepmx̓tsín, use of the contrastive emphatic marker *m'* and the contrastive demonstrative *x7e* in a condition where there is no contrasting element leads to challenges from consultants like 'What is the other thing you are talking about?' Such challenges potentially constitute HWAM responses. However, before we can conclude that Nl̓he7kepmx̓tsín possesses a HWAM effect, we would need to ascertain whether the consultants also challenge *asserted* instances of the same propositional content, given that the crucial property of the HWAM test is not simply that it elicits a challenge, but that it distinguishes between presupposition and assertion.

1161 grants #410-2002-1715, #410-2003-1138, #410-2005-0875 and #410-2007-1046.

1162

1163 **References cited**

1164

1165 Abusch, Dorit 1985. *On Verbs and Time*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts,
1166 Amherst.

1167 Austin, Peter and Joan Bresnan 1996. Nonconfigurality in Australian Aboriginal
1168 Languages. *NLLT* 14: 215-268.

1169 Baker, Mark 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford University Press, New York.

1170 Baptiste, Maxine 2002. Wh-Questions in Okanagan Salish. M.A. thesis, University of British
1171 Columbia.

1172 Bar-el, Leora 2005. Aspectual Distinctions in Skwxwú7mesh. Ph.D. dissertation, University of
1173 British Columbia.

1174 Bar-el, Leora, Henry Davis and Lisa Matthewson 2005. On Non-Culminating Accomplishments.
1175 *Proceedings of NELS 35*. GLSA, Amherst, MA.

1176 Bar-el, Leora, Carrie Gillon, Peter Jacobs, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Martina Wiltschko. Subject
1177 Clitics and their Effect on Temporal Interpretation: A Case Study of Skwxwú7mesh and
1178 Stó:lō Halq'eméylem. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade*
1179 (Donna B. Gerds and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 8-29. *UMOPL* 10: Missoula, MN.

1180 Bates, Dawn 2002. Narrative Functions of Past tense Marking in a Lushootseed Text. *Papers for*
1181 *ICSNL* 37: 17-34. *UBCWPL* 9, Vancouver, BC.

1182 Bates, Dawn, and Thom Hess. 2001. Tense or Aspect? A Prefix of Future Time in Lushootseed.
1183 *Papers for ICSNL* 36: 25-36. *UBCWPL* 6, Vancouver, BC.

1184 Beard, Robert 1995. *Lexeme-Morpheme Base Morphology, a General Theory of Inflection and*
1185 *Word Formation*. SUNY Linguistic Series: SUNY Press, Albany, NY.

1186 Beaumont, Ronald C. 1985. *She Shashishalhem, the Sechelt Language: Language, Stories and*
1187 *Sayings of the Sechelt Indian People of British Columbia*. Theytus Books, Penticton, B.C.

1188 Bierwert, Crisca (ed.) 1996. *Lushootseed Texts: An Introduction to Puget Salish Narrative*
1189 *Esthetics*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.

1190 Burton, Strang 1997. Past Tense on Nouns as Death, Destruction and Loss. *Proceedings of NELS*
1191 *27*: 65-77. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

1192 Chung, Sandra 1998. *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro*. University of
1193 Chicago Press, Chicago.

1194 Chung, Sandra and Alan Timberlake 1985. Tense, Aspect and Mood. In *Language Typology and*
1195 *Syntactic Description*, Vol. 3 (Timothy Shopen, ed.), 202-258. Cambridge University
1196 Press, Cambridge.

1197 Currie, Elizabeth 1996. Five Sqwxwú7mish Futures. *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 23-28. University of
1198 British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

1199 Currie, Elizabeth 1997. Topic Times: The Syntax and Semantics of Sqwxwú7mish Temporal
1200 Adverbs. M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.

1201 Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa 1993. Cyclicity and Stress in Moses-Columbia Salish (Nxa'amxcín).
1202 *NLLT* 11: 197-278.

1203 Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa and M. Dale Kinkade 1998. Salish Languages and Linguistics. In
1204 *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives* (Ewa
1205 Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, eds.), 1-68. Trends in Linguistics: Studies
1206 and Monographs 107. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

- 1207 Davis, Henry 1997. Deep Unaccusativity and Zero Syntax in St'át'imcets. In *Theoretical Issues*
1208 *at the Morphology-Syntax Interface* (Amaya Mendikoetxea and Myriam Uribe-
1209 Etxebarria, eds.), 55-96. Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Linguistics
1210 and Philology, Bilbao.
- 1211 Davis, Henry 2000a. Coordination and Constituency in St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 49-
1212 78. *UBCWPL 3*: Vancouver, B.C.
- 1213 Davis, Henry 2000b. Salish Evidence on the Causative-Inchoative Alternation. In *Morphological*
1214 *Analysis in Comparison* (Wolfgang U. Dressler, Oskar E. Pfeiffer, Markus Pöchtrager,
1215 and John R. Rennison, eds.), 25-60. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 201. John
1216 Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 1217 Davis, Henry 2004. VP Ellipsis and its Implications. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 117-140. *UBCWPL*
1218 14, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1219 Davis, Henry 2005. Constituency and Coordination in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). In *Verb*
1220 *First: On the Syntax of Verb Initial Languages* (Andrew Carnie, Sheila Anne Dooley and
1221 Heidi Harley, eds.), 31-64. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- 1222 Davis, Henry 2006a. The Status of Condition C in St'át'imcets. In *Studies in Salishan* (Shannon
1223 T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel Siddiqi, eds.), 49-92. MIT
1224 Working Papers in Linguistics on Endangered and Less Familiar Languages 7,
1225 Cambridge, MA.
- 1226 Davis, Henry 2006b. *A Teacher's Grammar of Upper St'át'imcets*. Ms., University of British
1227 Columbia.
- 1228 Davis, Henry 2008. WH-in-situ: Japanese Meets Salish. In *Individual Languages and Language*
1229 *Universals* (Michiko Takeuchi, ed.), 17-58. Special Issue, Kanagawa University Studies
1230 in Language. Kanagawa University, Yokohama.
- 1231 Davis, Henry 2009. Cross-linguistic Variation in Anaphoric Dependencies: Evidence from the
1232 Pacific Northwest. *NLLT 27*: 1-43.
- 1233 Davis, Henry and Hamida Demirdache 2000. On Lexical Verb Meanings: Evidence from Salish.
1234 In *Events as Grammatical Objects: The Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics*
1235 *and Syntax* (James Pustejovsky and Carol Tenny, eds.), 97-142. CSLI Publications,
1236 Stanford, CA.
- 1237 Davis, Henry, Dwight Gardiner and Lisa Matthewson 1993. A Comparative Look at WH-
1238 Questions in Northern Interior Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 79-95. University of
1239 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1240 Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 2003a. A Note on Remote: The Temporal Enclitic *tu7* in
1241 St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 47-64. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1242 Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 2003b. Quasi-Objects in St'át'imcets: On the
1243 (Semi)Independence of Agreement and Case. In *A Festschrift for Eloise Jelinek* (Andrew
1244 Carnie, Heidi Harley and Mary Ann Willie, eds.), 80-106. Linguistik Aktuell 62. John
1245 Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- 1246 Davis, Henry, Lisa Matthewson and Scott Shank 2004. Clefts vs. Nominal Predicates in Two
1247 Salish Languages. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna
1248 B. Gerds and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 100-117. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MN.
- 1249 Demirdache, Hamida 1997. Condition C. In *Atomism and Binding* (Hans Bennis, Pierre Pica and
1250 Johan Rooryck, eds.), 51-88. Foris, Dordrecht.
- 1251 Demirdache, Hamida, and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria 2007. The Syntax of Time Arguments.
1252 *Lingua 117*: 330-366.

- 1253 England, Nora 1991. Changes in Basic Word Order in Mayan languages. *IJAL* 57: 446-486.
- 1254 Gardiner, Dwight 1991a. Weak Crossover in Shuswap Salish. *Proceedings of WECOL 1991*:
1255 129-137. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno. Fresno, CA.
- 1256 Gardiner, Dwight 1993. Structural Asymmetries and Pre-verbal Positions in Shuswap. Ph.D.
1257 dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- 1258 Gardiner, Dwight, Lisa Matthewson, and Henry Davis 1993. A Preliminary Report on Word
1259 Order in Northern Interior Salish. *Papers for ICSNL* 28: 139-158. University of
1260 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1261 Gauker, Christopher 1998. What is a Context of Utterance? *Philosophical Studies* 91:149-172.
- 1262 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland
1263 Publishing.
- 1264 Gerdts, Donna B. 2006. Argument Realization in Halkomelem: A Study in Verb Classification.
1265 *Proceedings of WSCLA 11*: 61-81. *UBCWPL* 18, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1266 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 1998. Inside and Outside the Middle. *Papers for ICSNL*
1267 33: 166-220. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1268 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2006a. The Halkomelem Middle: A Complex Network
1269 of Constructions. *AL* 48: 44-81.
- 1270 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2006b. Classifying Halkomelem Causatives. *Papers for*
1271 *ICSNL* 41: 129-145. *UBCWPL* 18, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1272 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari to appear a. A Closer Look at Salish Transitive /
1273 Intransitive Alternations. *BLS* 32.
- 1274 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari to appear b. *Halkomelem*. Lincom Europa, Munich.
- 1275 Glougie, Jennifer 2007. Aspect in St'át'imcets Future Expressions. *Papers for ICSNL* 42: 220-
1276 235. *UBCWPL* 20, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1277 Hale, Kenneth and Samuel Jay Keyser 2002. *Prolegomena to a Theory of Argument Structure*.
1278 MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- 1279 Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the Typology of Inchoative/Causative Verb Alternations. In
1280 *Causatives and Transitivity* (Bernard Comrie and Maria Polinsky, eds.), 87-120. John
1281 Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- 1282 Hedberg, Nancy 2000. The Referential Status of Clefts. *Language* 76(4): 891-920.
- 1283 Hess, Thom 1993. A Schema for the Presentation of Lushootseed Verb Stems. In *American*
1284 *Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson* (Anthony
1285 Mattina and Timothy Montler, eds.), 113-127. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MN.
- 1286 Hess, Thom 1995. *Lushootseed Reader with Introductory Grammar, Volume I: Four Stories*
1287 *from Edward Sam*. *UMOPL* 11, Missoula, MN.
- 1288 Hukari, Thomas E. 1996. Anaphora in Hulq'umin'um'. Paper presented at the 4th Victoria
1289 Workshop on Salish Morpho-Syntax, University of Victoria.
- 1290 Jelinek, Eloise 1984. Empty categories, Case and Configurationality. *NLLT* 2: 39-76.
- 1291 Jelinek, Eloise 1994. Transitivity and Voice in Lummi. Paper presented at *ICSNL* 29, Pablo,
1292 Montana.
- 1293 Jelinek, Eloise 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In *Quantification in Natural Languages*
1294 (Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, eds.), 487-540.
1295 Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- 1296 Jelinek, Eloise 1996. Definiteness and Second Position Clitics in Straits Salish. In *Approaching*
1297 *Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena* (Aaron Halpern and Arnold
1298 Zwicky, eds.), 271-297. CSLI Lecture Notes 61. CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.

- 1299 Jelinek, Eloise 1998a. Prepositions in Northern Straits Salish and the Noun/Verb Question. In
1300 *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives* (Ewa
1301 Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade eds.), 325-346. Trends in Linguistics: Studies
1302 and Monographs 107. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 1303 Jelinek, Eloise. 1998b. Wh-Clefts in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 257-265. University of
1304 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1305 Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers 1994. Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in Straits
1306 Salish. *Language* 70: 697-736.
- 1307 Kamp, H. 1971. Formal Properties of 'Now'. *Theoria* 37: 227-273.
- 1308 Kinkade, M. Dale 1983. Salish Evidence against the Universality of 'Noun' and 'Verb.' *Lingua*
1309 60: 25-39.
- 1310 Kinkade, M. Dale 2004. *Cowlitz Dictionary and Grammatical Sketch*. UMOPL 18, Missoula,
1311 MN.
- 1312 Kiyota, Masaru 2008. Situation Aspect and Viewpoint Aspect: From Salish to Japanese. Ph.D.
1313 dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- 1314 Klein, Wolfgang 1994. *Time in Language*. Routledge, London.
- 1315 Koch, Karsten 2006. Transitive Word Order in Nl̓eʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). *Papers*
1316 *for ICSNL 41*: 192-220. UBCWPL 18, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1317 Koch, Karsten 2008. Intonation and Focus in Nl̓eʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). Ph.D.
1318 dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- 1319 Kratzer, Angelika 1998. More Structural Analogies Between Pronouns and Tenses. *Proceedings*
1320 *of SALT VIII*: 92-110. CLP, Ithaca, NY.
- 1321 Kratzer, Angelika 2004. Interpreting Focus: Presupposed or Expressive Meanings? A Comment
1322 on Geurts and van der Sandt. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 123-136.
- 1323 Kuipers, Aert 1974. *The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. Janua Linguarum,
1324 Series Practica 225. Mouton, The Hague.
- 1325 Matthewson, Lisa 1998. *Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from*
1326 *Salish*. Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.
- 1327 Matthewson, Lisa 2005. On the Absence of Tense on Determiners. *Lingua* 115 (12): 697-735.
- 1328 Matthewson, Lisa 2006a. Presuppositions and Cross-Linguistic Variation. *Proceedings of NELS*
1329 36. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 1330 Matthewson, Lisa 2006b. Temporal Semantics in a Supposedly Tenseless Language. *Linguistics*
1331 *and Philosophy* 29: 673-713.
- 1332 Matthewson, Lisa to appear. Pronouns, Presuppositions, and Semantic Variation. *Proceedings of*
1333 *SALT XVIII*. CLP, Ithaca, NY.
- 1334 Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis and Dwight Gardiner 1993. Coreference in Northern Interior
1335 Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 217-232. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1336 Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Hotze Rullmann 2007. Evidentials as Epistemic Modals in
1337 St'át'imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7: 201-254.
- 1338 Mattina, Nancy 1996. Aspect and Category in Okanagan Word Formation. Ph.D. dissertation,
1339 Simon Fraser University.
- 1340 Mattina, Nancy 1999. Future in Colville-Okanagan Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 34*: 215-230.
1341 Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 1342 Mithun, M. 1999. *The Languages of Native North America*. Cambridge University Press,
1343 Cambridge.

- 1344 Montler, Timothy 1986. *An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits*
1345 *Salish*. UMOPL 4, Missoula, MN.
- 1346 Nordlinger, Rachel and L. Sadler 2002. Nominal tense in cross-linguistic perspective. *Language*
1347 80: 776-806.
- 1348 Percus, Orin 1997. Prying Open the Cleft. *Proceedings of NELS 27*: 337-351. GLSA, Amherst,
1349 MA.
- 1350 Pesetsky, David and Esther Torrego 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and Consequences. In *Ken*
1351 *Hale: A Life in Language* (Michael Kensotwicz, ed.), 325-426. MIT Press, Cambridge,
1352 MA.
- 1353 Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon*. Cambridge University Press,
1354 Cambridge.
- 1355 Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko 2004. The Lack of Tense as a Syntactic Category:
1356 Evidence from Blackfoot and Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 341-370. UBCWPL
1357 14, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1358 Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko 2005. Anchoring Events to Utterances without Tense.
1359 *Proceedings of WCCFL 24* (John Alderete, Chung-Hye Han, and Alexei Kochetov eds.),
1360 343-351. Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA.
- 1361 Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko to appear. Varieties of INFL: TENSE, LOCATION, and
1362 PERSON. In *Alternatives to Cartography* (Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, ed.). Mouton de
1363 Gruyter, Berlin.
- 1364 Rullmann, Hotze, Lisa Matthewson and Henry Davis 2008. Modals as Distributive Indefinites.
1365 *NLS 16*: 317-357.
- 1366 Smith, Carlota, Ted Fernald and Ellavina Perkins 2003. Temporal Interpretation in Navajo.
1367 *Proceedings of SULA 2*: 175-192. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 1368 Smith, Carlota and M. Erbaugh 2005. Temporal Interpretation in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistics*
1369 43: 713-756.
- 1370 Stalnaker, Robert. 1974. Pragmatic Presuppositions. In *Semantics and Philosophy* (M.K. Munitz
1371 and P.K. Unger, eds.), 197-213. New York University, New York.
- 1372 Suttles, Wayne 2004. *Musqueam Reference Grammar*. UBC Press, Vancouver, B.C .
- 1373 Thomason, Lucy 1994. Transitivity-Related Morphological Alternations in Montana Salish.
1374 *Papers for ICSNL 29*: 265-287. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.
- 1375 Thomason, Sarah G., Dorothy Berney, Gail Coelho, Jeffrey Micher, and Daniel Everett 1994.
1376 Montana Salish Root Classes: Evidence from the 19th-Century Jesuit Dictionary. *Papers*
1377 *for ICSNL 29*: 288-312. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.
- 1378 Thomason, Sarah G. and Daniel Everett 1993. Transitivity in Flathead. *Papers for ICSNL 28*:
1379 317-344. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1380 Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. The Control System: A Major Category in the Grammar of
1381 Salishan Languages. In *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages* (Barbara S.
1382 Efrat, ed.), 154-176. British Columbia Provincial Museum, Victoria, B.C.
- 1383 Thompson, Laurence C. 1985. Control in Salish Grammar. In *Relational Typology* (Frans Plank,
1384 ed.), 391-428. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 28. Mouton de Gruyter,
1385 Berlin.
- 1386 Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Dale Kinkade 1990. Languages. In *Handbook of North*
1387 *American Indians, Volume 7: Northwest Coast* (Wayne Suttles, ed.), 30-51. Smithsonian
1388 Institute, Washington, D.C.
- 1389 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1987. Dictionary of the Lillooet Language. Ms., University of Victoria.

- 1390 van Eijk, Jan 2008. A Bibliography of Salish Linguistics. *Journal of Northwest Linguistics* 2(4):
 1391 1-128.
- 1392 von Fintel, Kai 2000. What is Presupposition Accommodation? Ms., MIT.
- 1393 Von Fintel, Kai 2004. Would You Believe It? The King of France is Back! Presuppositions and
 1394 Truth Value Intuitions. In *Descriptions and Beyond* (A. Bezuidenhout and M. Reimer,
 1395 eds.), 261-296. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 1396 Willett, Marie-Louise 2003. A Grammatical Sketch of Nxa'amxcin (Moses-Columbia Salish).
 1397 Ph.D. dissertation, University of Victoria.
- 1398 Wiltschko, Martina 2001. The Syntax of Transitivity and its Effects. Evidence from Halkomelem
 1399 Salish. *Proceedings of WCCFL 20*: 593-606. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- 1400 Wiltschko, Martina 2003. On the interpretability of Tense on D and its Consequences for Case
 1401 Theory. *Lingua* 113(7): 659-696.
- 1402 Zimmermann, Malte 2007. Discourse Particles. Ms., Universität Potsdam.

1403

1404

1405 **Bibliography of Work on Salish Syntax and Semantics**

1406

1407 This bibliography contains a fairly comprehensive selection of descriptive and theoretical work
 1408 on Salish morphosyntax, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, organized by theme. It includes
 1409 monographs, journal articles, book chapters, working papers, Ph.D. dissertations, and M.A.
 1410 theses. We have not included texts, collections of papers, dictionaries, grammars, or general
 1411 overviews of Salish: to reference these, the should reader consult Jan van Eijk's comprehensive
 1412 (2008) bibliography of work on Salish languages. In order to ensure accessibility, we have also
 1413 excluded papers that were only read at conferences but not published. Where papers were
 1414 published first in conference proceedings or working papers and later in a journal without
 1415 significant changes, we have included only the later version here. Many items are cross-listed,
 1416 and therefore appear under two or more headings.

1417

1418 Abbreviations: AL = Anthropological Linguistics, BLS = Berkeley Linguistics Society, CLA =
 1419 Canadian Linguistic Association, CLP = Cornell Linguistics Publications, CLS = Chicago
 1420 Linguistics Society, DAI = Dissertation Abstracts International, ESCOL = Eastern States
 1421 Conference on Linguistics, GLSA = Graduate Linguistic Student Association, ICSL =
 1422 International Conference on Salish Languages, ICSNL = International Conference on Salish and
 1423 Neighbo(u)ring Languages, IJAL = International Journal of American Linguistics, IULC =
 1424 Indiana University Linguistics Club, KWPL = Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, LACUS =
 1425 Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States, MITWPL = Massachusetts Institute of
 1426 Technology Working Papers in Linguistics, NELLS = North Eastern Linguistic Society, NLLT =
 1427 Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, NLS = Natural Language Semantics, RQL = Revue
 1428 Québécoise de Linguistique, SALT = Semantics and Linguistic Theory, SASP = Sacramento
 1429 Anthropology Society Papers, SBWPL = Santa Barbara Working Papers in Linguistics, TWPL
 1430 = Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics, UBCWPL = University of British Columbia Working
 1431 Papers in Linguistics, UCPL = University of California Publications in Linguistics, UHWPL =
 1432 University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics, UMOP = University of Massachusetts
 1433 Occasional Papers in Linguistics, UMOPL = University of Montana Occasional Papers in
 1434 Linguistics, UWWPL = University of Washington Working Papers in Linguistics, WAIL =
 1435 Workshop on Amerindian Languages, WCCFL = West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics,

1436 WECOL = Western Conference on Linguistics, WPLCUV = Working Papers of the Linguistics
1437 Circle of the University of Victoria, WSCLA = Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the
1438 Languages of the Americas.

1439

1440 *Applicatives / Ditransitives*

1441

1442 Carlson, Barry F. 1980. Two-Goal Transitive Stems in Spokane Salish. *IJAL* 46: 21-26.

1443 Gerdts, Donna B. 2004a. The Grammaticalization of Halkomelem 'Face' into a Dative
1444 Applicative Suffix. *IJAL* 70: 227-250.

1445 Gerdts, Donna B. 2004b. Halkomelem Directional Applicatives. *Papers for ICSNL* 39: 189-200.
1446 *UBCWPL* 14, Vancouver, B.C.

1447 Gerdts, Donna B. and Mercedes Q. Hinkson 2003. An Applicative Use of the Halkomelem
1448 Lexical Suffix FACE. *Papers for ICSNL* 38: 65-90. *UBCWPL* 11, Vancouver, B.C.

1449 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2003. Halkomelem Psych Applicatives. *Papers for*
1450 *ICSNL* 38: 127-160. *UBCWPL* 11, Vancouver, B.C.

1451 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2005a. The Function of Salish Applicatives. *Proceedings*
1452 *of WSCLA* 10: 84-94. *UBCWPL* 17, Vancouver, B.C.

1453 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2005b. Discourse Functions of Salish Applicatives.
1454 *Papers for ICSNL* 40: 98-124, *UBCWPL* 16, Vancouver, B.C.

1455 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2007. Combinatorial Properties of Salish Applicatives.
1456 *Papers for ICSNL* 42: 176-219. *UBCWPL* 20, Vancouver, B.C.

1457 Hess, Thom and Dawn Bates 2004. Lushootseed Applicatives and their Ilk. In *Studies in Salish*
1458 *Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, eds.),
1459 172-196. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MT.

1460 Kinkade, M. Dale 1980. Columbian Salish -xí, -ł, -túł . *IJAL* 46: 33-36.

1461 Kiyosawa, Kaoru 1999. Classification of Applicatives in Salishan Languages. *Papers for ICSNL*
1462 34: 112-152. Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.

1463 Kiyosawa, Kaoru 2004. The Distribution of Possessive Applicatives in Interior Salish
1464 Languages. *Papers for ICSNL* 39: 241-252. *UBCWPL* 14, Vancouver, B.C.

1465 Kiyosawa, Kaoru 2006. Applicatives in Salish Languages. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser
1466 University.

1467 Kiyosawa, Kaoru, and Nile Thompson. 2000. An Initial Look at Twana Applicatives. *Papers for*
1468 *ICSNL* 35: 127-132. *UBCWPL* 3, Vancouver, B.C.

1469 Mattina, Anthony 1994. *tult*, and More on Okanagan Transitive Forms: A Working Paper.
1470 *Papers for ICSNL* 29: 204-231. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.

1471 Mattina, Nancy J. 1993. Some Lexical Properties of Colville-Okanagan Ditransitives. *Papers for*
1472 *ICSNL* 28: 265-284. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

1473 Nakamura, Yumiko 2002. Disjoint Reference and Possessor Raising in Shuswap. *Proceedings*
1474 *of NWLC 2001*: 133-142. *UBCWPL* 8, Vancouver, B.C.

1475 Shapard, Jeffrey 1980. Interior Salishan (Di)transitive Systems. *Papers for ICSNL* 15: 229-282,
1476 Vancouver, B.C.

1477 Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry 1980. Thompson Salish //-xi//. *IJAL* 46:27-32.

1478

1479 *Adverbials*

1480

1481 Arregui, Ana and Lisa Matthewson 2001. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective on the Expression of

- 1482 Manner. *Proceedings of SALT X. CLP*, Ithaca, NY.
- 1483 Bar-el, Leora. 1998. Verbal Plurality and Adverbial Quantification: A Case Study of
1484 Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish Salish). M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- 1485 Dolinina, Inga, and David Beck. 1997. The Dual Unselectivity of Adverbial Quantifiers: The
1486 Case of Bella Coola. *The 24th LACUS Forum* (S. Embleton, ed.), 79-89. Chapel Hill, NC.
- 1487 Jelinek, Eloise 2004. Adverbs of Quantification in Straits Salish and the LINK 'u'. In *Studies in*
1488 *Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa
1489 Matthewson, eds.), 224-234. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MN.
- 1490 Matthewson, Lisa 2000a. One at a Time in St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL* 35: 133-146.
1491 *UBCWPL* 3, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1492 Matthewson, Lisa 2000b. On Distributivity and Pluractionality. *Proceedings of SALT IX. CLP*,
1493 Ithaca, NY.
- 1494
- 1495 *Auxiliaries*
- 1496
- 1497 Beaumont, Ronald C. 1976. Two Sechelt Auxiliaries: ku- and t'i-. *Papers for ICSL* 11.
- 1498 Davis, Henry 2004. VP Ellipsis and its Implications. *Papers for ICSNL* 39: 117-140. *UBCWPL*
1499 14: Vancouver, B.C.
- 1500 Demers, Richard A. 1981. The AUX in Lummi. In *An Encyclopedia of AUX: A Study of Cross-*
1501 *Linguistic Equivalence* (Steele, Susan, et al., eds.). MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- 1502 Kinkade, M. Dale. 1992. Pseudo-Auxiliaries in Upper Chehalis. *Papers for ICSNL* 27: 22-43.
1503 Secwépemc Cultural Education Society/ Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 1504 Montler, Timothy R. 2003. Auxiliaries and Other Categories in Straits Salishan. *IJAL* 69(2): 103-
1505 134.
- 1506 Poggi, Claudine. 1981. Klallam Auxiliaries: A Subclass of Predicatives. In *The Working Papers*
1507 *of the XVI ICSL* (Anthony Mattina and Timothy Montler, eds.), 63-69. *UMOPL* 2.
1508 Missoula, MN.
- 1509
- 1510 *Clause chaining*
- 1511
- 1512 Hukari, Thomas E. 1982. Conjunctive /so'/ in Cowichan. *Papers for ICSNL* 17: 107-117.
1513 Portland, OR.
- 1514 Kroeber, Paul D. 1996. Notes on the Syntax of Clause Chaining in Thompson River Salish.
1515 *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 197-202. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1516 Saunders, Ross and Philip Davis 1978. Conjunctive Particle Usage in Bella Coola. *Linguistics*
1517 207: 27-52.
- 1518
- 1519 *Clitics*
- 1520
- 1521 Bar-el, Leora, Carrie Gillon, Peter Jacobs, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Martina Wiltschko. Subject
1522 Clitics and their Effect on Temporal Interpretation: A Case Study of Skwxwú7mesh and
1523 Stó:lō Halq'eméylem. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade*
1524 (Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 8-29. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, Montana.
- 1525 Davis, Henry 1995. On the Clitic-Affix Distinction in Radical Head-Marking Languages. *Papers*
1526 *from the CLS Parasession on Clitics*, 64-78. University of Chicago, Chicago.
- 1527 Davis, Henry 1996. On Agreement in St'át'imcets. *Actes du Deuxième Colloque de Langue et*

- 1528 *Grammaire* 8, 79-94. Université de Paris, Paris.
- 1529 Jelinek, Eloise 1996. Definiteness and Second Position Clitics in Straits Salish. In *Approaching*
1530 *Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena* (Aaron Halpern and Arnold
1531 Zwicky, eds.), 271-297. CSLI Lecture Notes 61: CSLI Publication, Stanford, CA.
- 1532 Kroeber, Paul D. 1992. Notes on the Position of Conjunctive Enclitics in Thompson Salish.
1533 *Papers for ICSNL 27*: 44-48. Secwépemc Cultural Education Society/ Simon Fraser
1534 University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 1535 van Eijk, J. 2001. Word, Clitic and Sentence in Lillooet. *Proceedings of WSCLA 5*:119-122.
1536 *UBCWPL 5*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1537
- 1538 *Cognitive Semantics*
- 1539
- 1540 Galloway, Brent D. 2001. Integrated Cognitive Semantics Applied to Halkomelem. *Papers for*
1541 *ICSNL 36*: 91-112. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1542 Galloway, Brent D. 2006. Semantic Roles in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 41*: 99-
1543 128. *UBCWPL 18*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1544 Hinkson, Mercedes Q. 1999. Salishan Lexical Suffixes: A Study in the Conceptualization of
1545 Space. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- 1546
- 1547 *Complementation*
- 1548
- 1549 Bates, Dawn. 1997b. Person Marking in Lushootseed Subordinate Clauses. *IJAL* 63: 316-333.
- 1550 Beck, David. 2000. Nominalization as Complementation in Bella Coola and Lushootseed. In
1551 *Complementation: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives* (Kaoru Horie, ed.), 121-147.
1552 John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 1553 Davis, Henry, and Lisa Matthewson 1996. Subordinate Clauses and Functional Projections in
1554 St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 31*: 59-73. University of British Columbia, Vancouver,
1555 B.C.
- 1556 Davis, Henry, and Lisa Matthewson 1997. Unselective Determiners. *Proceedings of the CLA*:
1557 143-154. University of Calgary, Calgary, AB.
- 1558 Davis, Henry, and Lisa Matthewson 1998. Definiteness, Finiteness, and the Event/Entity
1559 Distinction. *Proceedings of NELS 28*: 95-109. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 1560 Davis, John H. 1978. Sliammon Subordinate Clauses with the Proclitic //s// and a Possible
1561 Syntactic Change. *Papers for ICSL 13*: 237-241. Victoria, B.C.
- 1562 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1984. Propositional Organization: The *s-* and *si-* Prefixes in
1563 Bella Coola. *IJAL* 50: 208-231.
- 1564 Gardiner, Dwight 1985. Propositional Configurations and their Expression in Shuswap Salish.
1565 M.A. thesis, Simon Fraser University.
- 1566 Gillon, Carrie and Martina Wiltschko 2004. Missing Determiners/Complementizers in Wh-
1567 Questions: Evidence from Skwxwú7mesh and Halq'eméylem. *Papers for ICSNL 39*:
1568 215-230. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1569 Jacobs, Peter. 1992. Subordinate Clauses in the Squamish Language. M.A. thesis, University of
1570 Oregon, Eugene.
- 1571 Kroeber, Paul D. 1990. A Note on Case Marking of Subordinate Clauses in Thompson Salish.
1572 *Papers for ICSNL 25*: 213-220. Vancouver, B.C.
- 1573 Kroeber, Paul D. 1991. Comparative Syntax of Subordination in Salish. Ph.D. dissertation,

- 1574 University of Chicago.
- 1575 Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax*. The University of
1576 Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- 1577 Nakayama, Toshihide 1991. On the Position of the Nominalizer in Squamish. *Papers for ICSNL*
1578 *26*: 293-300. Vancouver, B.C.
- 1579 Wiltschko, Martina 2006a. Inlocatives in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 41*: 286-310
1580 *UBCWPL 18*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1581 Wiltschko, Martina 2006b. C-Selection is Unique. *Proceedings of WCCFL 25* (Donald Baumer,
1582 David Montero, and Michael Scanlon, eds.), 444-452. Cascadia Press, Somerville, MA.
1583
- 1584 *Configurationality*
- 1585
- 1586 Davis, Henry 1994. A Configurational Pronominal Argument Language. *Proceedings of WECOL*
1587 *1993*: 53-67. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno, CA.
- 1588 Davis, Henry 1999. Word Order and Configurationality in St'at'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 34*:
1589 61-82. Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 1590 Davis, Henry 2000. Coordination and Constituency in St'at'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 49-78.
1591 *UBCWPL 3*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1592 Davis, Henry 2004. VP Ellipsis and its Implications. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 117-140. *UBCWPL*
1593 *14*: Vancouver, B.C.
- 1594 Davis, Henry 2005. Constituency and Coordination in St'at'imcets (Lillooet Salish). In *Verb*
1595 *First: On the Syntax of Verb Initial Languages* (Andrew Carnie, Sheila Anne Dooley and
1596 Heidi Harley, eds.), 31-64. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- 1597 Gardiner, Dwight 1991a. Weak Crossover in Shuswap Salish. *Proceedings of WECOL 4*: 129-
1598 137. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno. Fresno, CA.
- 1599 Gardiner, Dwight 1993. Structural Asymmetries and Pre-verbal Positions in Shuswap. Ph.D.
1600 dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- 1601 Hukari, Thomas E. 1983. Halkomelem and Configuration. *Papers for ICSNL 18*: 214-238,
1602 Seattle, WA.
- 1603 Jelinek, Eloise 1982. Adjoined Clauses in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 17*: 201-245, Portland, OR.
- 1604 Jelinek, Eloise 1983. On the Absence of Empty Categories in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 18*:
1605 313-333. Seattle, WA.
- 1606 Jelinek, Eloise 1985. Constraints on Arguments in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 20*: 169-188.
1607 Vancouver, B.C.
- 1608 Jelinek, Eloise 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In *Quantification in Natural Languages*
1609 (Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, eds.), 487-540.
1610 Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- 1611 Jelinek, Eloise 1996. Definiteness and Second Position Clitics in Straits Salish. In *Approaching*
1612 *Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena* (Aaron Halpern and Arnold
1613 Zwicky, eds.), 271-297. *CSLI Lecture Notes 61*: CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.
- 1614 Jelinek, Eloise 1998. Prepositions in Northern Straits Salish and the Noun/Verb Question. In
1615 *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives* (Ewa
1616 Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, eds.), 325-346. Trends in Linguistics:
1617 Studies and Monographs 107, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 1618 Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers 1994. Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in Straits
1619 Salish. *Language 70*: 697-736.

- 1620 Koch, Karsten 2006. Against Antisymmetry: Possession Marking in Nl̓e'kepmxcin (Thompson
1621 River Salish). *Proceedings of WSCLA 11*: 109-121. *UBCWPL* 19, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1622
- 1623 *Control and Out of Control*
- 1624
- 1625 Beaumont, Ronald. C. 1977. Causation and Control in Sechelt. *Papers for ICSL 12*.
- 1626 Carlson, Barry F. 1996. Situation Aspect and a Spokane Control Morpheme. *IJAL* 62: 59-69.
- 1627 Carlson, Barry F. and Laurence C. Thompson 1982. Out of Control in Two (Maybe More) Salish
1628 Languages. *AL* 24: 51-65.
- 1629 Davis, Henry, Lisa Matthewson and Hotze Rullmann to appear. 'Out of Control' Marking as
1630 Circumstantial Modality in St'át'imcets. In *Cross-Linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect*
1631 *and Modality* (Lotte Hogeweg, Helen de Hoop and Andrey Malchukov, eds.). John
1632 Benjamins, Oxford.
- 1633 Davis, Philip and Ross Saunders 1986. Control and Development in Bella Coola. *IJAL* 52: 212-
1634 226.
- 1635 Demirdache, Hamida 1997. Out of Control in St'át'imcets Salish and Event (De-)Composition.
1636 In *Theoretical Issues at the Morphology-Syntax Interface* (Amaya Mendikoetxea and
1637 Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, eds.), 55-96. Supplements of the International Journal of
1638 Basque Linguistics and Philology, Bilbao.
- 1639 Galloway, Brent D. 1978. Control and Transitivity in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSL 13*:
1640 105-156, Victoria, B.C.
- 1641 Galloway, Brent D. 1997. Nooksack Pronouns, Transitivity, and Control. *Papers for ICSNL 32*:
1642 197-243. Port Angeles, WA.
- 1643 Jacobs, Peter. 2007. Txw as an Out of Control Marker in Skwxwú7mesh. *Papers for ICSNL 42*:
1644 256-284. *UBCWPL* 20, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1645 Kinkade, M. Dale 1982. Columbian (Salish) C²-Reduplication. *AL* 24: 66-72.
- 1646 Saunders, Ross and Philip Davis 1982. The Control System of Bella Coola. *IJAL* 48: 1-15.
- 1647 Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. The Control System: A Major Category in the Grammar of
1648 Salishan Languages. In *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages* (Barbara S.
1649 Efrat, ed.), 154-176. British Columbia Provincial Museum, Victoria, B.C.
- 1650 Thompson, Laurence C. 1985. Control in Salish Grammar. In *Relational Typology* (Frans Plank,
1651 ed.), 391-428. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 28. Mouton de Gruyter,
1652 Berlin.
- 1653 Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson 1981. More on the Control System of
1654 Thompson Salish. In *The Working Papers of the XVI ICSL* (Anthony Mattina and
1655 Timothy Montler, eds.), 126-131. *UMOPL* 2, Missoula, MN.
- 1656 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1990. Intransitivity, Transitivity and Control in Lillooet Salish. In *Unity in*
1657 *Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th Birthday* (Harm Pinkster and
1658 Inge Genee, eds.), 47-64. Foris, Dordrecht.
- 1659
- 1660 *Coreference and Binding*
- 1661
- 1662 Davis, Henry 2006. The Status of Condition C in St'át'imcets. In *Studies in Salishan* (Shannon
1663 T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel Siddiqi, eds.), 49-92. MIT
1664 Working Papers in Linguistics on Endangered and Less Familiar Languages 7,
1665 Cambridge, MA.

- 1666 Davis, Henry 2009. Cross-Linguistic Variation in Anaphoric Dependencies: Evidence from the
1667 Pacific Northwest. *NLLT* 27: 1-43.
- 1668 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1984. An Expression of Coreference in Bella Coola. In *The*
1669 *Syntax of Native American Languages* (Eung-Do Cook and Donna B. Gerds, eds.), 149-
1670 168. Syntax and Semantics 16: Academic Press, New York.
- 1671 Demirdache, Hamida 1997. Condition C. In *Atomism and Binding* (Hans Bennis, Pierre Pica and
1672 Johan Rooryck, eds.), 51-88. Foris, Dordrecht.
- 1673 Gardiner, Dwight 1991a. Weak Crossover in Shuswap Salish. *Proceedings of WECOL 4*: 129-
1674 137. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno. Fresno, CA.
- 1675 Gardiner, Dwight 1991b. The Binding Properties of Possessive Constructions in Shuswap.
1676 *Papers for ICSNL 26*: 121-128. Vancouver, B.C.
- 1677 Koch, Karsten 2006. Transitive Word Order in Nl̓'kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). *Papers*
1678 *for ICSNL 41*: 192-220. *UBCWPL* 18, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1679 Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis and Dwight Gardiner 1993. Coreference in Northern Interior
1680 Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 217-232. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1681 Nakamura, Yumiko 2002. Disjoint Reference and Possessor Raising in Shuswap. *Proceedings*
1682 *of NWLC 2001*: 133-142. *UBCWPL* 8, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1683
- 1684 *Ergativity*
- 1685
- 1686 Estival, Dominique, and John Myhill 1988. Formal and Functional Aspects of the Development
1687 from Passive to Ergative Systems. In *Passive and Voice* (Masayoshi Shibatani, ed.).
1688 Typological Studies in language 16: John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 1689 Gardiner, Dwight and Ross Saunders 1991. Split Ergativity in Shuswap Salish. *Amerindia* 16:
1690 79-101.
- 1691 Gerds, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland
1692 Publishing.
- 1693 Jelinek, Eloise 1993. Ergative Splits and Argument Types. In *Papers on Case and Agreement I*
1694 (Jonathan Bobaljik and Colin Phillips, eds.), 15-42. *MITWPL* 18, Cambridge, MA.
- 1695 Kroeber, Paul D. 1988. Discourse and Functional Factors in the Development of Southern
1696 Interior Salish Ergative Case Marking. *BLS* 14: 114-123.
- 1697 Roberts, Taylor 1999. Grammatical Relations and Ergativity in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish).
1698 *IJAL* 65: 275-302.
- 1699 Wiltschko, Martina 2000. Is Halkomelem Split Ergative? *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 249-268.
1700 *UBCWPL* 3, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1701 Wiltschko, Martina 2003a. On Ergative (and Other) Splits in Salish. *Proceedings of WSCLA 8*:
1702 83-89. *UBCWPL* 12, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1703 Wiltschko, Martina 2003b. On the Surface Nature of Ergative Agreement in Upriver
1704 Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 253-273. *UBCWPL* 11, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1705 Wiltschko, Martina 2005. On "Ergativity" in Halkomelem Salish (and How to Split and Derive
1706 It). In *Ergativity: Emerging Issues* (Alanah Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal
1707 Ndayiragije, eds.), 197-228. Springer, Dordrecht.
- 1708 Wiltschko, Martina 2006. On Ergative Agreement and Anti-Agreement in Halkomelem Salish.
1709 In *Studies in Salishan* (Shannon T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel
1710 Siddiqi, eds.), 241-273. MIT Working Papers on Endangered and Less Familiar
1711 Languages 7, Cambridge, MA.

- 1712
 1713 *Grammatical Relations and Thematic Roles*
 1714
- 1715 Bates, Dawn 2003. An Agentive Suffix in Lushootseed. *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 1-6. *UBCWPL*
 1716 11, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1717 Beck, David. 1996a. Is There a Syntactic Subject in Lushootseed? *Papers for ICSNL 31*:1-13,
 1718 University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1719 Beck, David 1996b. Subjecthood, Agency, and Topicality in Lushootseed. *TWPL 15*: 1-29.
- 1720 Beck, David 2000. Semantic Agents, Syntactic Subjects, and Discourse Topics: How to Locate
 1721 Lushootseed Sentences in Space and Time. *Studies in Language 24*: 277-317.
- 1722 Davis, John H. 1973. Permutations of a Sliammon Sentence. *Papers for ICSL 8*, Eugene, OR.
- 1723 Doak, Ivy G. 1997. Coeur d'Alene Grammatical Relations. Ph.D. dissertation, University of
 1724 Texas at Austin.
- 1725 Farrell, Patrick M. 1992. Semantic Relations vs. Abstract Syntactic Relations: Evidence from
 1726 Halkomelem. *BLS 18*: 76-87. Berkeley, CA.
- 1727 Galloway, Brent D. 2006. Semantic Roles in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 41*: 99-
 1728 128. *UBCWPL 18*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1729 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Garland Publishing, New
 1730 York.
- 1731 Gerdts, Donna B. 1993. Mapping Halkomelem Grammatical Relations. *Linguistics 31*: 591-622.
- 1732 Hess, Thom 1971. Prefix Constituents with /x^w/. In *Studies in Northwest Indian Languages*
 1733 (*Papers of the 5th ICSL*) (James E. Hoard and Thom Hess, eds.), 43-69. *SASP 11*,
 1734 Sacramento, CA.
- 1735 Hess, Thom 1973. Agent in a Coast Salish Language. *IJAL 39*: 89-94.
- 1736 Hess, Thom and Dawn Bates 1998. Semantic Role Assignment in Lushootseed Causatives.
 1737 *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 221-235, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1738 Jelinek, Eloise 1995. The Compositionality of Argument Structure in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL*
 1739 *30*: 18-25. University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.
- 1740 Jelinek, Eloise, and Richard A. Demers 2002. A Note on "Psych" Nouns in Lummi. *Papers for*
 1741 *ICSNL 37*: 181-188. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1742 Roberts, Taylor 1994. Subject and Topic in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). M.A. thesis,
 1743 University of British Columbia.
- 1744 Roberts, Taylor 1999. Grammatical Relations and Ergativity in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish).
 1745 *IJAL 65*: 275-302.
- 1746
- 1747 *Imperatives*
 1748
- 1749 Doak, Ivy 1996. Coeur d'Alene Imperative Constructions. *Papers for ICSNL 31*:119-126.
 1750 University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1751 Mattina, Anthony 1980. Imperative Formations in Colville-Okanagan and in the Other Interior
 1752 Languages. *Glossa 14*: 212-232.
- 1753 Mattina, Nancy J. 1999. Moses-Columbia Imperatives and Interior Salish. *AL 41*: 1-27.
 1754
- 1755 *Information Structure: Topic and Focus*
 1756
- 1757 Beck, David 1996. Subjecthood, Agency, and Topicality in Lushootseed. *TWPL 15*: 1-29.

- 1758 Toronto, ON.
- 1759 Beck, David 1997. Rheme, Theme, and Communicative Structure in Lushootseed and Bella
1760 Coola. In *Recent Trends in Meaning-Text Theory* (L. Wanner, ed.), 93-135. John
1761 Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 1762 Beck, David 1998. On the Syntactic Expression of Topic and Rheme in Two Salishan
1763 Languages. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Focus: 13-36. UMOP 21: GLSA, Amherst,*
1764 *MA.*
- 1765 Beck, David 2000. Semantic Agents, Syntactic Subjects, and Discourse Topics: How to Locate
1766 Lushootseed Sentences in Space and Time. *Studies in Language 24: 277-317.*
- 1767 Davis, Henry, Lisa Matthewson and Scott Shank 2004. Clefts vs. Nominal Predicates in Two
1768 Salish Languages. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna
1769 B. Gerds and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 100-117. *UMOPL 10, Missoula, MN.*
- 1770 Gardiner, Dwight 1998. Topic and Focus in Shuswap (Secwepemctsin). In *Salish Languages and*
1771 *Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives* (Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and M.
1772 Dale Kinkade, eds.), 275-304. *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 107.*
1773 *Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.*
- 1774 Koch, Karsten 2007a. Don't Get stressed! Non-Stress Focus Strategies in Nl̓he7kepmxcin
1775 (Thompson River Salish). In *Proceedings of the CLA* (Milica Radisic, ed.). Available on-
1776 line at: <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2007/actes2007.html>.
- 1777 Koch, Karsten 2007b. Focus projection in Nl̓he7kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish).
1778 *Proceedings of WCCFL 26: 348-356.* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- 1779 Koch, Karsten 2007c. Questions and Answers in N̓e7kepmxcin: Facilitating Transfer from
1780 Theoretical Linguistics to Education. *Papers for ICSNL 42: 293-323. UBCWPL 20,*
1781 *Vancouver, B.C.*
- 1782 Koch, Karsten 2008. Intonation and Focus in N̓e7kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). Ph.D.
1783 dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- 1784 Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax.* The University of
1785 Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- 1786 Roberts, Taylor 1994. Subject and Topic in St'at'imcets (Lillooet Salish). M.A. thesis,
1787 University of British Columbia.
- 1788 Shank, Scott. 2001. And-Fronting and the Copula in Upper Chehalis. *Papers for ICSNL 36: 265-*
1789 *290. UBCWPL 6, Vancouver, B.C.*
- 1790
- 1791 *Intonation and Syntax / Semantics*
- 1792
- 1793 Beck, David 1996. Some Notes on Phonological Phrasing in Lushootseed. *TWPL 15(2): 37-50.*
- 1794 Bennet, David and David Beck 2007. Extending the Prosodic Hierarchy: Evidence from
1795 Lushootseed Narratives. *Northwest Journal of Linguistics 1: 1-34.*
- 1796 Jacobs, Peter 2007. Intonation of Yes/No Questions in Sk̓w̓x̓wú7mesh. *Papers for ICSNL 42:*
1797 *236-255. UBCWPL 20, Vancouver, B.C.*
- 1798 Koch, Karsten 2007a. Don't Get stressed! Non-Stress Focus Strategies in Nl̓he7kepmxcin
1799 (Thompson River Salish). In *Proceedings of the CLA* (Milica Radisic, ed.) Available on-
1800 line at: <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2007/actes2007.html>.
- 1801 Koch, Karsten 2007b. Questions and Answers in N̓e7kepmxcin: Facilitating Transfer from
1802 Theoretical Linguistics to Education. *Papers for ICSNL 42: 293-323. UBCWPL 20,*
1803 *Vancouver, B.C.*

- 1804 Koch, Karsten 2008. Intonation and Focus in Nt̓eʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). Ph.D.
 1805 dissertation, University of British Columbia.
 1806
- 1807 *(In)transitivity*
 1808
- 1809 Barthmaier, Paul. 2000. Lushootseed Argument Structure and the Discourse Function of the
 1810 Morpheme /-b/. *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 1-18. *UBCWPL 3*, Vancouver, B.C.
 1811 Barthmaier, Paul 2002. Transitivity and Lexical Suffixes in Okanagan. *Papers for ICSNL 37*: 1-
 1812 17. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
 1813 Beaumont, Ronald. C. 1977. Causation and Control in Sechelt. *Papers for ICSL 12*.
 1814 Beck, David 1996. Transitivity and Causation in Lushootseed Morphology. *CJL 41*: 109-140.
 1815 Beck, David 1997. Unitariness and Partial Identification in the Bella Coola Middle Voice. In
 1816 *Studies in Native American Languages IX* (John Kyle, Hangyoo Khym and Supath
 1817 Kookiattikoon, eds.), 11-32. *KWPL 22(2)*, Lawrence, KS.
 1818 Beck, David 2000. Unitariness of Participant and Event in the Bella Coola (Nuxalk) Middle
 1819 Voice. *IJAL 66*: 218-256.
 1820 Beck, David 2007. A Taxonomy of Lushootseed Valency-Increasing Affixes. *Papers for ICSNL*
 1821 *42*: 28-88. *UBCWPL 20*, Vancouver, B.C.
 1822 Brown, Jason C., Karsten Koch and Martina Wiltschko 2005. On Certain Unexpected Gaps in
 1823 Transitive Paradigms and their Implication. *Papers for ICSNL 40*: 65-88. *UBCWPL 16*,
 1824 Vancouver, B.C.
 1825 Darnell, Michael. 1990. Squamish /-m/ Constructions. *BLS 16*: 19-31. Berkeley, CA.
 1826 Davis, Henry 1994. Intransitive Predicates in St'át'imcets. *Proceedings of the CLA*: 131-142.
 1827 *TWPL*, Toronto, ON.
 1828 Davis, Henry 1997. Deep Unaccusativity and Zero Syntax in St'át'imcets. In *Theoretical Issues*
 1829 *at the Morphology-Syntax Interface* (Amaya Mendikoetxea and Myriam Uribe-
 1830 Etxebarria, eds.), 55-96. Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Linguistics
 1831 and Philology, Bilbao.
 1832 Davis, Henry 2000b. Salish Evidence on the Causative-Inchoative Alternation. In *Morphological*
 1833 *Analysis in Comparison* (Wolfgang U. Dressler, Oskar E. Pfeiffer, Markus Pöchtrager,
 1834 and John R. Rennison, eds.), 25-60. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 201. John
 1835 Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
 1836 Davis, Henry and Hamida Demirdache 2000. On Lexical Verb Meanings: Evidence from Salish.
 1837 In *Events as Grammatical Objects: The Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics*
 1838 *and Syntax* (James Pustejovsky and Carol Tenny, eds.), 97-142. CSLI Publications,
 1839 Stanford, CA.
 1840 Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 2003. Quasi-Objects in St'át'imcets: On the
 1841 (Semi)Independence of Agreement and Case. In *A Festschrift for Eloise Jelinek* (Andrew
 1842 Carnie, Heidi Harley and Mary Ann Willie, eds.), 80-106. *Linguistik Aktuell 62*. John
 1843 Benjamins, Amsterdam.
 1844 Davis, John H. 1973. Permutations of a Sliammon Sentence. *Papers for ICSL 8*, Eugene, OR.
 1845 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1976. The Syntax of CAUSE and EFFECT in Bella Coola.
 1846 *Glossa 10*: 155-174.
 1847 Davis, Philip and Ross Saunders 1989. Language and Intelligence: The Semantic Unity of -m- in
 1848 Bella Coola. *Lingua 78*: 113-158.
 1849 Demers, Richard A. 1974. Alternating Roots in Lummi. *IJAL 40*: 15-21.

- 1850 Dilts, Philip 2006. An Analysis of the Okanagan “Middle” Marker -m. *Papers for ICSNL 41*: 77-
1851 98. *UBCWPL 18*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1852 Doak, Ivy G. 1993. Discourse Use of the Coeur d’Alene -st(u)- Transitivity. In *American Indian*
1853 *Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson* (Anthony Mattina and
1854 Timothy Montler, eds.), 73-92. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MT.
- 1855 Galloway, Brent 1978. Control and Transitivity in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSL 13*:
1856 105-156, Victoria, B.C.
- 1857 Galloway, Brent D. 1997. Nooksack Pronouns, Transitivity, and Control. *Papers for ICSNL 32*:
1858 197-243. Port Angeles, WA.
- 1859 Gerdts, Donna B. 1980a. Antipassives and Causatives in Halkomelem. *BLS 6*: 300-314.
1860 Berkeley, CA.
- 1861 Gerdts, Donna B. 1980b. Causal to Object Advancements in Halkomelem. *CLS 16*: 83-101.
1862 Chicago, IL.
- 1863 Gerdts, Donna B. 1984. A Relational Analysis of Halkomelem Causals. In *The Syntax of Native*
1864 *American Languages* (Eung-Do Cook and Donna B. Gerds, eds.), 169-204. *Syntax and*
1865 *Semantics 16*: Academic Press, New York.
- 1866 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Garland Publishing, New
1867 York.
- 1868 Gerdts, Donna B. 1991. Unaccusative Mismatches in Halkomelem Salish. *IJAL 57*: 230-250.
- 1869 Gerdts, Donna B. 1992. Morphologically Mediated Relational Profiles. *BLS 18*: 322-337.
1870 Berkeley, CA.
- 1871 Gerdts, Donna B. 1993a. Mapping Halkomelem Grammatical Relations. *Linguistics 31*: 591-622.
- 1872 Gerdts, Donna B. 1993b. Mapping Transitive Voice in Halkomelem. *BLS 19* (Special Session on
1873 Syntactic Issues in Native American languages): 22-34. Berkeley, CA.
- 1874 Gerdts, Donna B. 1994. Mapping Halkomelem Causatives. *Proceedings of WECOL 1993*: 162-
1875 177. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno. Fresno, CA.
- 1876 Gerdts, Donna B. 1995. The A/B Parameter: A Typology of Unergatives, Passives and
1877 Antipassives. *Proceedings of the 1995 Annual Conference of the CLA*: 191-201. *TWPL*,
1878 Toronto, ON.
- 1879 Gerdts, Donna B. 1998. Intransitive Verb Classes in Halkomelem Salish. In *American Indian*
1880 *Languages: Description and Theory* (Leanne Hinton and Pamel Munro, eds.), 97-203.
1881 *UCPL 131*, Los Angeles, CA.
- 1882 Gerdts, Donna B. 2004. Halkomelem Directional Applicatives. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 189-200.
1883 *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1884 Gerdts, Donna B. 2006. Argument Realization in Halkomelem: A Study in Verb Classification.
1885 *Proceedings of WSCLA 11*: 61-81. *UBCWPL 19*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1886 Gerdts, Donna B. to appear. Combinatory Conditions on Halkomelem Causatives. *Linguistics*.
- 1887 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2003. Halkomelem Psych Applicatives. *Papers for*
1888 *ICSNL 38*: 61-81. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1889 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2005. The Function of Salish Applicatives. *Proceedings*
1890 *of WSCLA 10*: 84-94. *UBCWPL 17*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1891 Gerdts, Donna B. and Kaoru Kiyosawa 2007. Combinatorial Properties of Salish Applicatives.
1892 *Papers for ICSNL 42*: 176-219. *UBCWPL 20*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1893 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 1998. Inside and Outside the Middle. *Papers for ICSNL*
1894 *33*: 166-220. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1895 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2000a. Stacked Antipassives in Halkomelem Salish.

- 1896 ICSNL 35: 95-106. *UBCWPL* 3, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1897 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2000b. The Dual Structure of Halkomelem Motion
1898 Verbs. *Proceedings of the Workshop on American Indigenous languages 2000*: 33-46.
1899 *SBWPL* 10, Santa Barbara, CA.
- 1900 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2004a. Determiners and Transitivity in Halkomelem
1901 Texts. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts
1902 and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 151-171. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MN.
- 1903 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2004b. Halkomelem Denominal Verbs. *Papers for*
1904 *ICSNL 39*: 201-214. *UBCWPL* 14, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1905 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2005. Multiple Antipassives in Halkomelem Salish.
1906 *BLS* 26: 51-62. Berkeley, CA.
- 1907 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2006a. The Halkomelem Middle: A Complex Network
1908 of Constructions. *AL* 48: 44-81.
- 1909 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2006b. Classifying Halkomelem Causatives. *Papers for*
1910 *ICSNL 41*: 129-145. *UBCWPL* 18, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1911 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari to appear. A Closer Look at Salish Transitive /
1912 Intransitive Alternations. *BLS* 32. Berkeley, CA.
- 1913 Hagiwara, Robert E. 1989. Pronominal Arguments and the Syntax of Lushootseed Transitives.
1914 *Papers for ICSNL 24*: 61-75, Steilacoom, WA.
- 1915 Hagiwara, Robert E. 1990. Lushootseed (Salish) Transitives: Pronominal Morphology and
1916 Licensing of Noun Phrases. M.A. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 1917 Hébert, Yvonne M. 1982a. Transitivity in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan. Ph.D. dissertation,
1918 University of British Columbia. *DAI* 43A: 3896.
- 1919 Hébert, Yvonne M. 1982b. Aspect and Transitivity in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan. In *Transitivity*
1920 (S.A. Thompson and P. Hooper, eds.), 195-215. *Syntax and Semantics* 15: Academic
1921 Press, New York.
- 1922 Hess, Thom 1967. The morph /-(ə)b/ in Snohomish. *Papers for ICSL* 2, Seattle, WA.
- 1923 Hess, Thom 1990. Another Component of Meaning for {-nəx^w}. *Papers for ICSNL* 25: 173-176.
1924 Vancouver, B.C.
- 1925 Hess, Thom 1993. A Schema for the Presentation of Lushootseed Verb Stems. In *American*
1926 *Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson* (Anthony
1927 Mattina and Timothy Montler, eds.), 113-127. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MN.
- 1928 Hess, Thom and Dawn Bates 1998. Semantic Role Assignment in Lushootseed Causatives.
1929 *Papers for ICSNL* 33: 221-235. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1930 Hess, Thom and Dawn Bates. 2004. Lushootseed Applicatives and their Ilk. In *Studies in Salish*
1931 *Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, eds.),
1932 172-196. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MT.
- 1933 Howett, Catherine D. 1993. On the Classification of Predicates in Nl̓e'képmx (Thompson River
1934 Salish). M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- 1935 Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. Transitivity in Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSL* 11: 69-119, Seattle, WA.
- 1936 Hukari, Thomas E. 1979. Oblique Objects in Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSL* 14: 158-172,
1937 Bellingham, WA.
- 1938 Hukari, Thomas E. 2001. The Dual Structure of Halkomelem Motion Verbs. *Proceedings of*
1939 *WAIL 2000*: 33-46. *SBWPL* 10, Santa Barbara, CA.
- 1940 Kinkade, M. Dale 1981. Transitive Inflection in (Moses) Columbian Salish. In *The Working*
1941 *Papers of the XVI ICSL* (Anthony Mattina and Timothy Montler, eds.), 103-110. *UMOPL*

- 1942 2, Missoula, MN.
- 1943 Kinkade, M. Dale 1982. Transitive Inflection in Moses-Columbian Salish. *KWPL* 7: 49-62.
- 1944 Lawrence, KS.
- 1945 Kiyosawa, Kaoru 1999. Classification of Applicatives in Salishan Languages. *Papers for ICSNL*
- 1946 34: 112-152. Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 1947 Kiyosawa, Kaoru 2006. Applicatives in Salish Languages. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser
- 1948 University.
- 1949 Kiyosawa, Kaoru, and Nile Thompson. 2000. An Initial Look at Twana Applicatives. *Papers for*
- 1950 *ICSNL* 35: 127-132. *UBCWPL* 3, Vancouver, B.C.
- 1951 Kuipers, Aert 1968. The Categories Verb-Noun and Transitive-Intransitive in English and
- 1952 Squamish. *Lingua* 21: 610-626.
- 1953 Kuipers, Aert 1970. Shuswap Transitive Verbs. *Papers for ICSL* 5.
- 1954 Kuipers, Aert 1992. The Shuswap Complex Transitivity. *Papers for ICSNL* 27: 49-53.
- 1955 Secwépemc Cultural Education Society/Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 1956 Mattina, Anthony 1978. Parallels between the Colville Transitives and Pseudo-Intransitives.
- 1957 *Proceedings of WECOL* 8, 104-109.
- 1958 Mattina, Anthony 1982. The Colville-Okanagan Transitive System. *IJAL* 48: 421-435.
- 1959 Mattina, Anthony 1994. *tult*, and More on Okanagan Transitive Forms: A Working Paper.
- 1960 *Papers for ICSNL* 29: 204-231. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.
- 1961 Mattina, Anthony 2004. The Okanagan Transitive Sentence Prototype. In *Studies in Salish*
- 1962 *Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, eds.),
- 1963 279-288. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MN.
- 1964 Mattina, Nancy J. 1993. Some Lexical Properties of Colville-Okanagan Ditransitives. *Papers for*
- 1965 *ICSNL* 28: 265-284. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1966 Mattina, Nancy 1994. Roots, Bases, and Stems in Colville-Okanagan. *Papers for ICSNL* 29: 232-
- 1967 242. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.
- 1968 Mattina, Nancy 1996. Aspect and Category in Okanagan Word Formation. Ph.D. dissertation,
- 1969 Simon Fraser University.
- 1970 Reichard, Gladys A. 1945. Composition and Symbolism of Coeur d'Alene Verb Stems. *IJAL* 11:
- 1971 47-63.
- 1972 Rowicka, Grażyna J. 2006. Transitive Linker in Upper Chehalis (Salish). In *What's in a Verb?*
- 1973 *Studies in the Verbal Morphology of the Languages of the Americas* (Grażyna J. Rowicka
- 1974 and Eithne B. Carlin, eds.), 73-92. Landelijke Onderzoeksschool Taalwetenschap
- 1975 (Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics) Occasional Series 5.
- 1976 Shapard, Jeffrey 1980. Interior Salishan (Di)transitive Systems. *Papers for ICSNL* 15: 229-282,
- 1977 Vancouver, B.C.
- 1978 Thomason, Lucy 1994. Transitivity-Related Morphological Alternations in Montana Salish.
- 1979 *Papers for ICSNL* 29: 265-287. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.
- 1980 Thomason, Sarah G. 1997. Plurals and Transitivity in Montana Salish. *Papers for ICSNL* 32:
- 1981 352-362. Port Angeles, WA.
- 1982 Thomason, Sarah G., Dorothy Berney, Gail Coelho, Jeffrey Micher, and Daniel Everett 1994.
- 1983 Montana Salish Root Classes: Evidence from the 19th-Century Jesuit Dictionary. *Papers*
- 1984 *for ICSNL* 29: 288-312. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, MN.
- 1985 Thomason, Sarah G., and Daniel Everett 1993. Transitivity in Flathead. *Papers for ICSNL* 28:
- 1986 317-344. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 1987 Thompson, Laurence C. 1973. Thompson Transitive Formations. *Papers for ICSL* 8, Eugene,

- 1988 OR.
- 1989 Thompson, Nile R. and Douglas Isaacson 1984. Lexical Representation of Salish Verb Roots
1990 (Amerindian Linguistics III). *KWPL* 9(2): 31-46. Lawrence, KS.
- 1991 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1990. Intransitivity, Transitivity and Control in Lillooet Salish. In *Unity in*
1992 *Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th Birthday* (Harm Pinkster and
1993 Inge Genee, eds.), 47-64. Foris, Dordrecht.
- 1994 Watanabe, Honoré. 1996. Sliammon (Mainland Comox) Transitive Constructions with -'əm, -ni,
1995 and -mi. *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 327-338. University of British Columbia, Vancouver,
1996 B.C.
- 1997 Wiltschko, Martina 2001. The Syntax of Transitivity and its Effects. Evidence from Halkomelem
1998 Salish. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 20: 593-606. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- 1999 Winter, Anne. 1996. Transitivity and Intransitivity in Lushootseed. M.A. thesis, Arizona State
2000 University.
- 2001
- 2002 *Lexical aspect (Aktionsarten)*
- 2003
- 2004 Bar-el, Leora 2004. On the Relevance of Initial Points: Skwxwú7mesh Activities and
2005 Accomplishments. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 23: 71-84. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- 2006 Bar-el, Leora 2005a. Aspectual Distinctions in Skwxwú7mesh. Ph.D dissertation, University of
2007 British Columbia.
- 2008 Bar-el, Leora 2005b. Minimal and Maximal Events. *Proceedings of WSCLA* 10: 29-42.
2009 *UBCWPL* 17, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2010 Bar-el, Leora, Henry Davis and Lisa Matthewson 2005. On Non-Culminating Accomplishments.
2011 *Proceedings of NELS* 35. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2012 Beaumont, Ronald C. 1973. Sechelt Statives. *CJL* 18: 102-112.
- 2013 Burton, Strang, and Henry Davis 1996. Stative Aspect and Possession in Salish. *ICSNL* 31: 13-
2014 22. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2015 Carlson, Barry F. 1996. Situation Aspect and a Spokane Control Morpheme. *IJAL* 62: 59-69.
- 2016 Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa 2006. Form and Function in the Nxa'amxcín Inchoative.
2017 *Proceedings of WSCLA* 11: 40-52. *UBCWPL* 19, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2018 Davis, Henry and Hamida Demirdache 2000. On Lexical Verb Meanings: Evidence from Salish.
2019 In *Events as Grammatical Objects: The Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics*
2020 *and Syntax* (James Pustejovsky and Carol Tenny, eds.), 97-142. CSLI Publications,
2021 Stanford, CA.
- 2022 Harris, Barbara P. 1974. Aspect and the Pronominal System of Coeur d'Alene: A Re-Analysis of
2023 Reichard's Material. *Papers for ICSL* 9: 60-80, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2024 Hébert, Yvonne M. 1979. A Note on Aspect in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan. *Papers for ICSL* 14:
2025 173-209, Bellingham, WA.
- 2026 Hébert, Yvonne M. 1982a. Transitivity in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan. Ph.D. dissertation,
2027 University of British Columbia. *DAI* 43A: 3896.
- 2028 Hébert, Yvonne M. 1982b. Aspect and Transitivity in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan. In *Transitivity*
2029 (S.A. Thompson and P. Hooper, eds.), 195-215. *Syntax and Semantics* 15: Academic
2030 Press, New York.
- 2031 Kinkade, M. Dale 1989. Inchoatives in Columbian Salish. *Papers for ICSNL* 24: 114-119.
2032 Steilacoom, WA.
- 2033 Kinkade, M. Dale 1996. Reconstructing Aspect in Salishan Languages. *Papers for ICSNL* 31:

- 2034 185-196. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2035 Kinkade, M. Dale and Masaru Kiyota 2004. Changing State in Salishan Languages. *Papers for*
- 2036 *ICSNL 39*: 231-240. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2037 Kiyota, Masaru 2004. Aspectual Classification of Verbs in Səncáθən. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 253-
- 2038 268. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2039 Kiyota, Masaru 2007. Aspectual Properties of Unaccusatives and Transitives in Saanich. *Papers*
- 2040 *for ICSNL 42*: 285-292. *UBCWPL 20*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2041 Kiyota, Masaru 2008. Situation Aspect and Viewpoint Aspect: From Salish to Japanese. Ph.D.
- 2042 dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- 2043 Kroeber, Paul D. 1980. The Formation of the Continuative Aspect in Southern Interior Salishan.
- 2044 B.A. Honors thesis, Harvard University.
- 2045 Kroeber, Paul D. 1986. Antipassives and the Differentiation of Progressive Aspect in Southern
- 2046 Interior Salish. *Proceedings of CLS 22, Part I*: 75-88, Chicago, IL.
- 2047 Kroeber, Paul D. 1988b. Inceptive Reduplication in Comox and Interior Salishan. *IJAL 54*: 141-
- 2048 167.
- 2049 Matthewson, Lisa 2004. On the Absence of Telic Accomplishments in St'át'imcets. *Proceedings*
- 2050 *of WSCLA 9*: 65-78. *UBCWPL 15*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2051 Mattina, Anthony 1993. Okanagan Aspect: A Working Paper. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 233-264,
- 2052 University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2053 Mattina, Nancy 1996. Aspect and Category in Okanagan Word Formation. Ph.D. dissertation,
- 2054 Simon Fraser University.
- 2055 Raffo, Yolanda A. 1971. Songish Aspectual System. In *Studies in Northwest Indian Languages.*
- 2056 *[Papers of the 5th ICSL]* (James E. Hoard and Thom Hess, eds.), 117-122. *SASP 11*,
- 2057 Sacramento, CA.
- 2058 Saunders, Ross and Philip Davis 1993. Natural Aspect in Bella Coola. In *American Indian*
- 2059 *Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson* (Anthony Mattina and
- 2060 Timothy Montler, eds.), 265-278. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MN.
- 2061 Turner, Claire Kelly 2005. Resultatives and Actuals in SENĆOFEN. *Papers for ICSNL 40*: 245-
- 2062 263. *UBCWPL 16*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2063 Turner, Claire Kelly 2006. The SENĆOFEN Resultive Construction. M.A. Thesis, University of
- 2064 Victoria.
- 2065 Turner, Claire Kelly 2007. The SENĆOFEN Resultive Construction. *Northwest Journal of*
- 2066 *Linguistics 1*(3): 1-92.
- 2067
- 2068 *Lexical Categories*
- 2069
- 2070 Beck, David 1995. A Conceptual Approach to Lexical Categories in Bella Coola. *Papers for*
- 2071 *ICSNL 30*, Victoria, B.C.
- 2072 Beck, David 1999a. Adjectives and the Organization of Lexical Inventories. *TWPL 17*:18-57,
- 2073 Toronto, ON.
- 2074 Beck, David 1999b. The Typology of Parts of Speech Systems. Ph.D. dissertation, University of
- 2075 Toronto.
- 2076 Beck, David to appear. Conceptual Autonomy and the Typology of Parts of Speech. In *Bringing*
- 2077 *Non-Indo-European Languages into Focus: Studies in Cognitive Linguistics* (Casad, G.,
- 2078 and G. Palmer, eds.). Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2079 Birch, Barbara M. 1993. Another look at Salish Nouns and Verbs. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 19-26.

- 2080 University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2081 Davis, Henry 2002. Categorical Restrictions on Modification in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish).
2082 *Papers for ICSNL 37*: 61-76. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2083 Davis, Henry 2003. Mind the Gap: On Plural Agreement and A'-Extraction in St'át'imcets
2084 (Lillooet Salish). *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 23-46. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2085 Davis, Henry, I-Ju Sandra Lai, and Lisa Matthewson 1997. Cedar Roots and Singing Detectives:
2086 Attributive Modifications in Salish and English. *Papers for ICSNL 32*: 291-316. Port
2087 Angeles, WA.
- 2088 Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 1999. On the Functional Determination of Lexical
2089 Categories. *RQL 27*: 27-69.
- 2090 Demers, Richard A. and Eloise Jelinek 1984. Word-Building Rules and Grammatical Categories
2091 of Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 19*: 39-49. *WPLCUV 4 (2)*, Victoria, B.C.
- 2092 Demirdache, Hamida, and Lisa Matthewson 1995. On the Universality of Syntactic Categories.
2093 *Proceedings of NELS 25*: 79-94. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2094 Galloway, Brent D., George Adams and Catalina Renteria 2004. What A Nooksack Story Can
2095 Tell Us about Morphology and Syntax. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 149-166. *UBCWPL 14*,
2096 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2097 Haag, Marcia 1998. Word-Level Evidence for Lexical Categories in Salishan Languages. *IJAL*
2098 *64*: 379-393.
- 2099 Hébert, Yvonne M. 1983. Noun and Verb in a Salishan Language. *KWPL 8*: 31-81. Lawrence,
2100 KS.
- 2101 Hukari, Thomas E. 1983. Halkomelem and Configuration. *Papers for ICSNL 18*: 214-238.
2102 Seattle, WA.
- 2103 Kuipers, Aert 1968. The Categories Verb-Noun and Transitive-Intransitive in English and
2104 Squamish. *Lingua 21*: 610-626.
- 2105 Jelinek, Eloise 1998. Prepositions in Northern Straits Salish and the Noun/Verb Question. In
2106 *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives* (Ewa
2107 Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, eds.), 325-346. Trends in Linguistics:
2108 Studies and Monographs 107. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2109 Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers 1994. Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in Straits
2110 Salish. *Language 70*: 697-736.
- 2111 Kinkade, M. Dale 1983. Salish Evidence against the Universality of 'Noun' and 'Verb.' *Lingua*
2112 *60*: 25-39.
- 2113 Kinkade, M. Dale 2000. An Initial Study of Some Adjectival Modifiers in Upper Chehalis.
2114 *ICSNL 35*: 119-126. *UBCWPL 3*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2115 Matthewson, Lisa, and Hamida Demirdache. 1995. Syntactic categories in St'át'imcets (Lillooet
2116 Salish). *Papers for ICSNL 30*: 69-75, Victoria, B.C.
- 2117 Mattina, Nancy 1996. Aspect and Category in Okanagan Word Formation. Ph.D. dissertation,
2118 Simon Fraser University.
- 2119 Montler, Timothy R. 2003. Auxiliaries and Other Categories in Straits Salishan. *IJAL 69(2)*: 103-
2120 134.
- 2121 Van Eijk, Jan P., and Thom Hess 1986. Noun and Verb in Salish. *Lingua 69*: 319-331.
- 2122 Weichel, Lindsay 2004. The Demarcation of Nouns and Verbs in Various Amerindian
2123 Languages. In *Proceedings of WSCLA 9*: 129-142. *UBCWPL 15*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2124 Wiltschko, Martina. 2005. The Syntax of Precategorial Roots. *Proceedings of WSCLA 10*: 245-
2125 258. *UBCWPL 17*, Vancouver, B.C.

- 2126
 2127 *Lexical Suffixation*
 2128
 2129 Barthmaier, Paul 2002. Transitivity and Lexical Suffixes in Okanagan. *Papers for ICSNL 37*: 1-
 2130 17. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
 2131 Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa 2004. The Morphological and Phonological Status of Nxa'amxcin
 2132 Lexical Suffixes. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna
 2133 B Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 72-99. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MT.
 2134 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1973. Lexical Suffix Copying in Bella Coola. *Glossa 7*:
 2135 231-252.
 2136 Gerdts, Donna B. 1998. Incorporation. In *Handbook on Morphology* (Andrew Spencer and
 2137 Arnold Zwicky, eds.), 84-100. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
 2138 Gerdts, Donna B. 1999. The Combinatorial Properties of Halkomelem Lexical Suffixes. *Papers*
 2139 *for ICSNL 34*: 83-95. Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
 2140 Gerdts, Donna B. 2003. The Morphosyntax of Halkomelem Lexical Suffixes. *IJAL 69*: 345-356.
 2141 Gerdts, Donna B. 2004. The Grammaticalization of Halkomelem 'Face' into a Dative
 2142 Applicative Suffix. *IJAL 70*: 227-250.
 2143 Gerdts, Donna B. to appear a. The Combinatorial Properties of Halkomelem Lexical Suffixes.
 2144 *BLS 25*. Berkeley, CA.
 2145 Gerdts, Donna B. to appear b. The Classificatory Properties of Salish Lexical Suffixes.
 2146 *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*.
 2147 Gerdts, Donna B. and Mercedes Q. Hinkson 2003. An Applicative Use of the Halkomelem
 2148 Lexical Suffix FACE. *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 65-90. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
 2149 Gerdts, Donna B. Mercedes Q. Hinkson 2004. Salish Numeral Classifiers: A Lexical Means to a
 2150 Grammatical End. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 57*: 247-279.
 2151 Gerdts, Donna B., Mercedes Q. Hinkson and Thomas E. Hukari 2002. Numeral Classifiers in
 2152 Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 37*: 147-180. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
 2153 Hagège, Claude 1976. Lexical Suffixes and Incorporation in Mainland Comox. *Papers for ICSL*
 2154 11.
 2155 Hamp, Eric P. 1968. Quileute and Salish Lexical Suffixes. *Papers for ICSL 3*.
 2156 Hinkson, Mercedes Q. 1999. Salishan Lexical Suffixes: A Study in the Conceptualization of
 2157 Space. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
 2158 Hinkson, Mercedes Q. 2001. The semantics of the lexical suffix *wil. *Papers for ICSNL 36*: 155-
 2159 174. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
 2160 Kinkade, M. Dale 1998. Origins of Salishan Lexical Suffixes. *ICSNL 33*: 266-295. University of
 2161 Washington, Seattle, WA.
 2162 Newman, Stanley 1968. A Comparative Study of Salish Lexical Suffixes. *ICSL 3*.
 2163 Newman, Stanley 1989. Lexical Morphemes in Bella Coola. In *General and Amerindian*
 2164 *Ethnolinguistics: In Remembrance of Stanley Newman* (Mary Ritchie Key and Henry M.
 2165 Hoenigswald, eds.), 289-301. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 55. Mouton de
 2166 Gruyter, Berlin.
 2167 Watanabe, Honoré 2001. Lexical Suffixes and Two Intransitive Suffixes in Sliammon Salish. In
 2168 *Languages of the North Pacific Rim* (Osahito Miyaoka and Fubito Endo, eds.), 157-170.
 2169 Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim, vol. 6. Faculty of Informatics, Osaka Gakuin
 2170 University, Suita, Japan.
 2171

- 2172 *Locatives*
2173
2174 Davis, Henry 2004. Locative Relative Clauses in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). *Papers for*
2175 *ICSNL 39*: 83-116. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
2176 Gillon, Carrie 2009. Deictic Features: Evidence from Skwxwú7mesh. *IJAL 75*: 1-27.
2177 Hess, Thom 1968. Directive Phrases: A Consideration of One Facet of Puget Salish Syntax.
2178 *Papers for ICSL 3*, Victoria, B.C.
2179 Kinkade, M. Dale 1974. Position Indicators in Columbian Salish. *ICSL 9*:1-11, Vancouver, B.C.
2180 Montler, Timothy 2004. Klallam from A to B. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 303-316. *UBCWPL 14*,
2181 Vancouver, B.C.
2182 Montler, Timothy 2008. Serial Verbs and Complex Paths in Klallam. *Northwest Journal of*
2183 *Linguistics 2*: 1-26.
2184 Wiltschko, Martina 2006. Inlocatives in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 41*: 286-310.
2185 *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
2186
2187 *Miscellaneous morphology*
2188
2189 Gerdts, Donna B. 1987. A Relational Typology of Desideratives. In *Native American Languages*
2190 *and Grammatical Typology* (Paul D. Kroeber and Roger E. Moore, eds.), 74-104. *IULC*,
2191 Bloomington, IN.
2192 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988c. Semantic Linking and Relational Structure in Desideratives. *Linguistics*
2193 *26*: 843-872.
2194 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2008. Halkomelem Denominal Verb Constructions.
2195 *IJAL 74*(4): 489-510.
2196 Kinkade, M. Dale 1981. Interior Salishan Particles. *AL 23*: 327-343.
2197 Lonsdale, Deryle 2001. A Two-Level Implementation for Lushootseed Morphology. *Papers for*
2198 *ICSNL 36*: 203-214. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
2199 Lonsdale, Deryle 2002. A Categorical Grammar Fragment for Lushootseed. *Papers for ICSNL 37*:
2200 215-232. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
2201 Lonsdale, Deryle 2003. Doing Lushootseed Morphology by Analogy. *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 175-
2202 184. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
2203 Mattina, Anthony 1981. Colville -ít. In *The Working Papers of the XVI ICSL* (Anthony Mattina
2204 and Timothy Montler, eds.), 132-142. *UMOPL 2*, Missoula, MT.
2205 Mattina, Anthony, and Sarah Peterson 1997. Diminutives in Colville-Okanagan. *Papers for*
2206 *ICSNL 32*: 317-324. Port Angeles, WA.
2207 Newman, Stanley 1976. Salish and Bella Coola Prefixes. *IJAL 42*: 228-242.
2208 Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson 1981. Affective Derivatives in Thompson
2209 River Salish. *UHWPL 13*: 119-127. Honolulu, HI.
2210
2211 *Mood and modality*
2212
2213 Davis, Henry, Lisa Matthewson and Hotze Rullmann to appear. 'Out of Control' Marking as
2214 Circumstantial Modality in St'át'imcets. In *Cross-Linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect*
2215 *and Modality* (Lotte Hogeweg, Helen de Hoop and Andrey Malchukov, eds.). John
2216 Benjamins, Oxford.
2217 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1985. How to Get Things Done in Bella Coola: The

- 2218 Expression of Mood. Pp. 243-256 of *For Gordon H. Fairbanks* (Veneeta Z. Acson, and
 2219 L. Leed, eds.). Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications 20, Honolulu, HI.
- 2220 Kinkade, M. Dale 1998. Is Irrealis a Grammatical Category in Upper Chehalis? *AL* 40: 234-244.
- 2221 Kinkade, M. Dale 2001. Proto-Salish Irrealis. *Papers for ICSNL 36*: 189-200. *UBCWPL 6*,
 2222 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2223 Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Hotze Rullmann 2007. Evidentials as Epistemic Modals in
 2224 St'át'imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 7*: 201-254.
- 2225 Mattina, Anthony 1996. Interior Salish *to-be* and *intention* Forms: A Working Paper. *Papers for*
 2226 *ICSNL 31*: 239-248, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2227 Rullmann, Hotze, Lisa Matthewson and Henry Davis 2006. Modality in St'át'imcets. *Studies in*
 2228 *Salishan* (Shannon T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel Siddiqi,
 2229 eds.), 93-112. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics on Endangered and Less Familiar
 2230 Languages, Cambridge, MA.
- 2231 Rullmann, Hotze, Lisa Matthewson and Henry Davis 2008. Modals as Distributive Indefinites.
 2232 *NLS* 16: 317-357.
- 2233
- 2234 *Negation*
- 2235
- 2236 Davis, Henry 2005. On the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Salish. *IJAL* 71: 1-55.
- 2237 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1978. Bella Coola Syntax: Negation and Particles. *Papers*
 2238 *for ICSL 13*: 242-272, Victoria, B.C.
- 2239 Davis, Philip W., and Ross Saunders 1992. The Semantics of Negation in Bella Coola. In *For*
 2240 *Henry Kučera: Studies in Slavic Philology and Computational Linguistics* (Andrew W.,
 2241 Mackie, Tatyana K. McAuley, and Cynthia Simmons, eds.), 101-124. Michigan Slavic
 2242 Publications, Ann Arbor, MI.
- 2243 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 2002. The Position of Negation and its Consequences.
 2244 *Papers for ICSNL 36*: 29-42. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2245 Demers, Richard A. 1997. Negation and Assignment of Arguments in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL*
 2246 *32*: 189-196, Port Angeles, WA.
- 2247 Gillon, Carrie. 2001. Negative Generic Sentences in Skwxwú7mesh Salish. *Papers for ICSNL*
 2248 *36*: 145-154. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2249 Kinkade, M. Dale 1976. The Copula and Negatives in Inland Olympic Salish. *IJAL* 42: 17-23.
- 2250 Kroeber, Paul D. 1991. Comparative Syntax of Subordination in Salish. Ph.D. dissertation,
 2251 University of Chicago.
- 2252 Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax*. The University of
 2253 Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- 2254 Wiltschko, Martina 2002. Sentential Negation in Upriver Halkomelem. *IJAL* 68: 253-286.
- 2255
- 2256 *Noun Phrase and Determiner Syntax and Semantics*
- 2257
- 2258 Davis, Philip and Ross Saunders 1975a. Bella Coola Deictic Usage. Pp. 13-35 of *Studies in*
 2259 *Cultural Anthropology* (Frederic C. Gamst, ed.). *RUS* 61.
- 2260 Davis, Philip and Ross Saunders 1975b. Bella Coola Nominal Deixis. *Language* 51: 845-858.
- 2261 Davis, Philip and Ross Saunders 1976. Bella Coola Deictic Roots. *IJAL* 42: 319-330.
- 2262 Gardiner, Dwight 1996. Determiner Phrases in Secwepemctsin (Shuswap). *Papers for ICSNL*
 2263 *31*: 175-184. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

- 2264 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2003. The Expression of NPs in Halkomelem Texts.
2265 *ICSNL 38*: 91-126. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2266 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2004. Determiners and Transitivity in Halkomelem
2267 Texts. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts
2268 and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 151-171. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MN.
- 2269 Gillon, Carrie 2006. The Semantics of Determiners: Domain Restrictions in Skwxwú7mesh.
2270 Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- 2271 Gillon, Carrie 2009. Deictic Features: Evidence from Skwxwú7mesh. *IJAL 75*:1-27.
- 2272 Jelinek, Eloise 1993. Languages without Determiner Quantification. *BLS 19*: 406-422. Berkeley,
2273 CA.
- 2274 Jelinek, Eloise 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In *Quantification in Natural Languages*
2275 (Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, eds.), 487-540.
2276 Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- 2277 Jelinek, Eloise, and Richard A. Demers 2002. A Note on “Psych” Nouns in Lummi. *Papers for*
2278 *ICSNL 37*: 181-188. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2279 Jones, Michael K. 1974. Island Halkomelem Determiners. *Papers for ICSL 9*:81-87, Vancouver,
2280 B.C.
- 2281 Matthewson, Lisa 1997a. Parametric Variation in Determiner Systems: Salish vs. English. In
2282 *Theoretical Issues at the Morphology-Syntax Interface* (Amaya Mendikoetxea and
2283 Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, eds.), 255-284. Supplements of the International Journal of
2284 Basque Linguistics and Philology, Bilbao.
- 2285 Matthewson, Lisa 1997b. Salish Evidence on DP-Internal Quantification. In *Proceedings of*
2286 *ESCOL*.
- 2287 Matthewson, Lisa 1997c. The Semantics of Salish Determiners: A Parametric Account.
2288 *Proceedings of WCCFL 15*.
- 2289 Matthewson, Lisa 1998. *Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from*
2290 *Salish*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- 2291 Matthewson, Lisa 1999. On the Interpretation of Wide Scope Indefinites. *NLS 7*: 79-134.
- 2292 Matthewson, Lisa 2001. Quantification and the Nature of Cross-Linguistic Variation. *NLS 9*:
2293 145-189.
- 2294 Matthewson, Lisa, Tim Bryant and Tom Roeper 2001. A Salish Stage in the Acquisition of
2295 English Determiners: Unfamiliar ‘Definites.’ *The Proceedings of SULA: The Semantics*
2296 *of Under-Represented Languages in the Americas*. *UMOP 25*: GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2297 Matthewson, Lisa, and Henry Davis 1995. The Structure of DP in St’at’imcets (Lillooet Salish).
2298 *Papers for ICSNL 30*: 54-68. University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.
- 2299 Matthewson, Lisa, and Charlotte Reinholtz 1996. The Syntax and Semantics of Determiners: A
2300 Comparison of Salish and Cree. *Papers for ICSNL 31*: 211-238, University of British
2301 Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2302 Mattina, Nancy J. 2002. Notes on Determiner Phrases in Moses-Columbia Salish. *Papers for*
2303 *ICSNL 37*: 261-286. *UBCWPL 9*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2304 Mattina, Nancy J. 2006. Determiner Phrases in Moses-Columbia Salish. *IJAL 72*: 97-134.
- 2305 Montler, Timothy 2007. Klallam Demonstratives. *Papers for ICSNL 42*: 409-425. *UBCWPL 20*,
2306 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2307 Schaeffer, Jeannette and Lisa Matthewson 2005. Grammar and Pragmatics in the Acquisition of
2308 Article Systems. *NLLT 23*: 53-101.
- 2309 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1974. Deictics in Lillooet. *Papers for ICSL 9* (Dutch Contributions). Vancouver,

- 2310 B.C.
- 2311 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1980. Lillooet Articles. *Papers for ICSL 15*: 187-195. Vancouver, B.C.
- 2312 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1982. Lillooet Local Deictics. *Papers for ICSNL 17*: 409-415, Portland, OR.
- 2313 Werle, Adam. 2000. Semantic Incorporation in Lillooet. *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 219-226.
- 2314 *UBCWPL 3*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2315 Wiltschko, Martina to appear. What's in a Determiner and How Did It Get There? In
- 2316 *Determiners: Universals and Variation* (Jila Ghomeshi, Ileana Paul, and Martina
- 2317 Wiltschko, eds.). John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2318
- 2319 *Passive and Inverse*
- 2320
- 2321 Blake, Susan J. 1996. Passive and Object Control in Mainland Comox (Salish): A Reanalysis of
- 2322 Raising-to-Object. Syntax Generals Paper, University of British Columbia.
- 2323 Blake, Susan J. 1997. Another Look at Passives in Sliammon (Salish). *Papers for ICSNL 32*:86-
- 2324 143, Port Angeles, WA.
- 2325 Boelscher, Marianne 1990. Passive and Agency in Shuswap Narrative Discourse. *Papers for*
- 2326 *ICSNL 25*: 61-72. Vancouver, B.C.
- 2327 Chinchor, Nancy 1975. A Treatment of Passives and Pronouns in Lummi Matrix Sentences.
- 2328 *Papers for ICSL 10*: 135-154, Ellensburg, WA.
- 2329 Darnell, Michael 1997. A Functional Analysis of Voice in Squamish. Ph.D. dissertation,
- 2330 University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- 2331 Davis, John H. 1980. The Passive in Sliammon. *BLS 6*: 278-6. Berkeley, CA.
- 2332 Davis, Philip W. 1995. The Way of Language: Dimensions of VOICE. In *Alternative*
- 2333 *Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Modes* (Philip W. Davis, ed.), 45-76. John
- 2334 Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2335 Forrest, Linda B. 1994. The De-Transitive Clauses in Bella Coola: Passive vs. Inverse. In *Voice*
- 2336 *and Inversion* (Talmy Givón, ed.), 147-168. Typological Studies in Language 28: John
- 2337 Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2338 Gerdts, Donna B. 1998a. Mapping Halkomelem Voice. In *Salish Languages and Linguistics:*
- 2339 *Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives* (Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale
- 2340 Kinkade, eds.), 305-324. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 107, Mouton de
- 2341 Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2342 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988b. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Garland Publishing, New
- 2343 York.
- 2344 Gerdts, Donna B 1989. Object Agreement in the Halkomelem Salish Passive: A Morphological
- 2345 Explanation. In *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics: In Remembrance of Stanley*
- 2346 *Newman* (Mary Ritchie Key and Henry M. Hoenigswald, eds.), 185-200. Contributions to
- 2347 the Sociology of Language 55, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2348 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2001a. Argument Linking and Passives in Halkomelem.
- 2349 *Papers for ICSNL 36*: 113-144. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2350 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2001b. A-Subjects and Control in Halkomelem. *Papers*
- 2351 *from the 7th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*.
- 2352 Available online at: <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG00>.
- 2353 Jacobs, Peter 1994. The Inverse in Squamish. In *Voice and Inversion* (Talmy Givón, ed.), 121-
- 2354 146. Typological Studies in Language 28, John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2355 Hukari, Thomas E. 1977. The Passive in Halkomelem. *Proceedings of WECOL*, Victoria, B.C.

- 2356 Kinkade, M. Dale 1987. Passives and the Mapping of Thematic Roles in Upper Chehalis
 2357 Sentences. *Papers for ICSNL* 22: 109-124. Victoria, B.C.
- 2358 Newman, Stanley 1985. Reinterpreting the Data: The Salish Passive. *IJAL* 51: 521-523.
- 2359 Suttles, Wayne 1976. A Note on the Subordinate Passive in Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSL* 11.
- 2360 Wiltschko, Martina 2001. Passive in Halkomelem and Squamish Salish. *Papers for ICSNL* 36:
 2361 319-345. *UBCWPL* 6, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2362
- 2363 *Person Hierarchies*
- 2364
- 2365 Gardiner, Dwight, and Ross Saunders 1990. On the Grammatical Status of Shuswap /-əs/. *Papers*
 2366 *for ICSNL* 25: 153-172, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2367 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. A Nominal Hierarchy in Halkomelem Clausal Organization. *AL* 30: 20-
 2368 36.
- 2369 Hess, Thom 1973. Agent in a Coast Salish Language. *IJAL* 39: 89-94.
- 2370 Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. Person in a Coast Salish Language. *IJAL* 42: 305-318.
- 2371 Jelinek, Eloise 1983. The Agent Hierarchy and Voice in Some Coast Salish Languages. *IJAL* 49:
 2372 167-185.
- 2373 Kinkade, M. Dale 1989. Some Agent Hierarchies in Upper Chehalis In *General and Amerindian*
 2374 *Ethnolinguistics: In Remembrance of Stanley Newman* (Mary Ritchie Key and Henry M.
 2375 Hoenigswald, eds.), 213-218. *Contributions to the Sociology of Language* 55: Mouton de
 2376 Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2377 Wiltschko, Martina 2008. Person Hierarchy Effects without a Person Hierarchy. In *Agreement*
 2378 *Restrictions* (Hrafn G. Hrafnbjargarson, R. d'Allessandro, and S. Fischer, eds.), 281-314.
 2379 Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2380 Wiltschko, Martina and Strang Burton 2004. On the Sources of Person Hierarchy Effects. *CJL*
 2381 49: 51-71.
- 2382
- 2383 *Plurality and Number Marking*
- 2384
- 2385 Anderson, Gregory D. S. 1999. Reduplicated Numerals in Salish. *IJAL* 65(4): 407-48.
- 2386 Bar-el, Leora 1998. Verbal Plurality and Adverbial Quantification: A Case Study of
 2387 *Skwxwú7mesh* (Squamish Salish). M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- 2388 Bar-el, Leora, Peter Jacobs, and Martina Wiltschko 2001. A [+Interpretable] Number Feature in
 2389 Squamish Salish. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 20: 43-55. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- 2390 Davis, Henry 2003. Mind the Gap: On Plural Agreement and A'-Extraction in St'át'imcets
 2391 (Lillooet Salish). *Papers for ICSNL* 38: 23-46. *UBCWPL* 11, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2392 Doak, Ivy, and Anthony Mattina 1997. Okanagan -lx, Coeur d'Alene -lš, and Cognate Forms.
 2393 *IJAL* 63: 334-361.
- 2394 Galloway, Brent D. 1977. Numerals and Numeral Classifiers in Upriver Halkomelem.
 2395 *Proceedings of WECOL*, Victoria, B.C.
- 2396 Kinkade, M. Dale 1975. Pluralization in Upper Chehalis. *Papers for ICSL* 10: 1-55, Ellensburg,
 2397 WA.
- 2398 Kinkade, M. Dale 1981. Singular vs. Plural Roots in Salish. *AL* 23: 262-270.
- 2399 Kinkade, M. Dale 1995. A Plethora of Plurals: Inflection for Number in Upper Chehalis. *AL* 37:
 2400 347-365.
- 2401 Matthewson, Lisa 2000a. One at a Time in St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL* 35: 133-146.

- 2402 UBCWPL 3, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2403 Matthewson, Lisa 2000b. On Distributivity and Pluractionality. *Proceedings of SALT 9. CLP*,
2404 Ithaca, NY.
- 2405 Thomason, Sarah G. 1997. Plurals and Transitivity in Montana Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 32*:
2406 352-362, Port Angeles, WA.
- 2407 Watanabe, Honoré 1997. Mainland Comox “Plurals”: A Working Paper. *Papers for ICSNL 32*:
2408 363-375, Port Angeles, WA.
- 2409 Watanabe, Honoré 1998. On Indicating “Plurality” in Mainland Comox. *Languages of the North
2410 Pacific Rim 4*: 17-32. Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University.
- 2411 Wiltschko, Martina 2004. On Number of Halkomelem Salish or The Problem with “*the two
2412 man*”. *Proceedings of WSCLA 9*: 143-158. UBCWPL 15, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2413 Wiltschko, Martina 2005a. A part of Wood is not a Tree: on the Absence of the Count/Mass
2414 Distinction in Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 40*: 264-288. UBCWPL 16, Vancouver,
2415 B.C.
- 2416 Wiltschko, Martina 2005b. Expletive Categorical Features. A Case Study of Number in
2417 Halkomelem. *Proceedings of NELS 34*. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2418 Wiltschko, Martina 2008. The Syntax of Non-Inflectional Plural Marking. *NLLT 26*: 639-694.
2419
- 2420 *Possession*
- 2421
- 2422 Gardiner, Dwight 1996. Determiner Phrases in Secwepemetsín (Shuswap). *ICSNL 31*:175-184,
2423 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2424 Gerdts, Donna B. 1999. Mapping External Possessors. In *External Possession and Related Noun
2425 Incorporation Phenomena* (Doris L Payne and Immanuel Barshi, eds.), 137-163.
2426 Typological Studies in Language 39. John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2427 Ghulam, Hasnain H. 1977. Morphemes of Possession in Twana. *Papers for ICSL 12*, Colville
2428 Confederated Tribes.
- 2429 Hess, Thom 1974. How Do You Say “You Are Our Father” in Salish? *Papers for ICSL 9*: 53-59,
2430 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2431 Kinkade, M. Dale 1971. Third Person Possessives in Cowlitz. *Papers for ICSL 6*, Victoria, B.C.
- 2432 Koch, Karsten. 2006. Against Antisymmetry: Possession Marking in Nl̓e'kepmxcin (Thompson
2433 River Salish). *Proceedings of WSCLA 11*: 109-121. UBCWPL 19, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2434 Matthewson, Lisa, and Henry Davis 1995. The Structure of DP in St'at'imcets (Lillooet Salish).
2435 *Papers for ICSNL 30*: 54-68. University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.
- 2436 Nakamura, Yumiko 2002. Disjoint Reference and Possessor Raising in Shuswap. *Proceedings
2437 of NWLC 2001*: 133-142. UBCWPL 8, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2438 Thompson, Nile 1977. Possession in Twana. *Papers for ICSL 12*.
- 2439 Wiltschko, Martina 1998. Halq'eméylem Possessives. *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 448-472. University
2440 of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2441
- 2442 *Pragmatics*
- 2443
- 2444 Davis, Henry, Lisa Matthewson and Scott Shank 2004. Clefts vs. Nominal Predicates in Two
2445 Salish Languages. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna
2446 B. Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 100-117. UMOPL 10, Missoula, MN.
- 2447 Matthewson, Lisa 2006. Presuppositions and Cross-Linguistic Variation. *Proceedings of NELS*

- 2448 36. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2449 Matthewson, Lisa to appear. Pronouns, Presuppositions, and Semantic Variation. *Proceedings of*
2450 *SALT XVIII. CLP*, Ithaca, NY.
- 2451 Saunders, Ross and Philip Davis 1979. The Expression of the Cooperative Principle in Bella
2452 Coola. In *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages* (Barbara Efrat, ed.), 33-
2453 61. British Columbia Provincial Museum, Victoria, B.C.
- 2454 Schaeffer, Jeannette and Lisa Matthewson 2005. Grammar and Pragmatics in the Acquisition of
2455 Article Systems. *NLLT* 23: 53-101.
- 2456
- 2457 *Pronouns / Agreement*
- 2458
- 2459 Bates, Dawn 1997. Person Marking in Lushootseed Subordinate Clauses. *IJAL* 63: 316-333.
- 2460 Brown, Jason C., Karsten Koch and Martina Wiltschko 2005. On Certain Unexpected Gaps in
2461 Transitive Paradigms and their Implication. *Papers for ICSNL 40*: 65-88. *UBCWPL* 16,
2462 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2463 Chinchor, Nancy 1975. A Treatment of Passives and Pronouns in Lummi Matrix Sentences.
2464 *Papers for ICSL 10*: 135-154, Ellensburg, WA.
- 2465 Davis, Henry 1993. Levels of Analysis in the Lillooet Salish Pronominal System. *TWPL* 12: 61-
2466 73. Toronto, ON.
- 2467 Davis, Henry 1995. On the Clitic-Affix Distinction in Radical Head-Marking Languages. *Papers*
2468 *from the CLS Parasession on Clitics*, 64-78. Chicago, IL.
- 2469 Davis, Henry 1996. On Agreement in St'át'imcets. *Actes du Deuxième Colloque de Langue et*
2470 *Grammaire* 8, 79-94. Université de Paris, Paris.
- 2471 Davis, Henry 1999. Subject Inflection in Salish. *Current Research on Language and Linguistics*:
2472 181-239. *UBCWPL* 1, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2473 Davis, Henry 2000. Remarks on Proto-Salish Subject Inflection. *IJAL* 66: 499-520.
- 2474 Davis, Henry, and Martina Wiltschko 1999. Inflection is Syntactic: Evidence from Salish.
2475 *Proceedings of WCCFL 18*: 94-105. : Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- 2476 Davis, John 1978. Pronominal Paradigms in Sliammon. *Papers for ICSL 13*: 208-236, Victoria,
2477 B.C.
- 2478 Demers, Richard A. and Eloise Jelinek 1982. The Syntactic Function of Person Marking in
2479 Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 17*: 24-47, Portland, OR.
- 2480 Elouazizi, Noureddine and Martina Wiltschko. 2006. The Categorical Status of (Anti-) (Anti-)
2481 Agreement. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 25* (Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael
2482 Scanlon, eds.), 150-158. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- 2483 Galloway, Brent 1997. Nooksack Pronouns, Transitivity, and Control. *Papers for ICSNL 32*:
2484 197-243, Port Angeles, WA.
- 2485 Gardiner, Dwight and Ross Saunders 1990. On the Grammatical Status of Shuswap /-əs/. *Papers*
2486 *for ICSNL 25*: 153-172, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2487 Harris, Barbara P. 1974. Aspect and the Pronominal System of Coeur d'Alene: A Re-Analysis of
2488 Reichard's Material. *Papers for ICSL 9*: 60-80, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2489 Harris, Herbert R. II. 1975. A Case Grammar of Comox 'Objective' Suffixes. *Proceedings of the*
2490 *Mid-America Linguistics Conference*, 191-201.
- 2491 Lai, I-Ju Sandra 1998. Secwepemctsin Independent Pronouns: Evidence for Subject-Object
2492 Asymmetry. *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 307-321. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2493 Lai, I-Ju Sandra and Marianne Ignace 1998. A Preliminary Analysis of Secwepemc Language

- 2494 Acquisition by a Young Child. *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 322-334. University of
2495 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2496 Koch, Karsten 2005. Double Subject Marking in Nle'kepmxcin: Synchronic Evidence for
2497 Subject Paradigm Shifts. *Papers for ICSNL 40*: 125-139. *UBCWPL 16*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2498 Kiyosawa, Kaoru. 2004. Form and Function of the Two Object Suffix Sets. In *Studies in Salish*
2499 *Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdtz and Lisa Matthewson, eds.),
2500 235-256. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MT.
- 2501 Matthewson, Lisa to appear. Pronouns, Presuppositions, and Semantic Variation. *Proceedings of*
2502 *SALT XVIII. CLP*, Ithaca, NY.
- 2503 Mattina, Anthony 2001. Okanagan Sentence Types: A Preliminary Working Paper. *Papers for*
2504 *ICSNL 36*: 215-236. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2505 Montler, Timothy R. 1996. Some Klallam Paradigms. *Papers for ICSNL 31*: 257-264. University
2506 of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2507 Newman, Stanley 1969. Bella Coola Paradigms. *IJAL 35*: 299-306.
- 2508 Newman, Stanley 1977. The Salish Independent Pronoun System. *IJAL 43*: 302-314.
- 2509 Newman, Stanley 1979a. A History of the Salish Possessive and Subject Forms. *IJAL 45*: 207-
2510 223.
- 2511 Newman, Stanley 1979b. The Salish Object Forms. *IJAL 45*: 299-308.
- 2512 Newman, Stanley 1980. Functional Changes in the Salish Pronominal System. *IJAL 46*: 155-167.
- 2513 Rowicka, Grażyna J. 2006. Pronominal markers in Quinault (Salish). *IJAL 72*: 451-476.
- 2514 Shank, Scott 2003. A Preliminary Semantics for Pronominal Predicates. *Papers for ICSNL 38*:
2515 215-236. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver B.C.
- 2516 Van Eijk, Jan P. 2006. Agreement and Quantization in Lillooet. *Proceedings of WSCLA 11*: 152-
2517 159. *UBCWPL 19*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2518 Willett, Marie Louise. 1996. Some Patterns of *wa* in Nxa'amxcín (Moses- Columbia Salish).
2519 *Proceedings of the 11th Northwest Linguistics Conference, WPLCUV 13*, Victoria, B.C.
- 2520 Wiltschko, Martina 1998. On the Internal and External Syntax of Independent Pronouns in
2521 Halq'eméylem. *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 428-447. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2522 Wiltschko, Martina 1999. The Syntax of Pronouns and Determiners: A Cross-Linguistic Study.
2523 *Current Research on Language and Linguistics. UBCWPL 1*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2524 Wiltschko, Martina 2000. Is Halkomelem Split Ergative? *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 249-268.
2525 *UBCWPL 3*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2526 Wiltschko, Martina 2002. The Syntax of Pronouns. Evidence from Halkomelem Salish. *NLLT*
2527 20: 157-195.
- 2528 Wiltschko, Martina 2003a. On Ergative (and Other) Splits in Salish. *Proceedings of WSCLA 8*:
2529 83-89. *UBCWPL 12*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2530 Wiltschko, Martina 2003b. On the Surface Nature of Ergative Agreement in Upriver
2531 Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL 38*: 253-273. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2532 Wiltschko, Martina 2005. On "Ergativity" in Halkomelem Salish (and How to Split and Derive
2533 It). In *Ergativity: Emerging Issues* (Alanah Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal
2534 Ndayiragije , eds.), 197-228. Springer, Dordrecht.
- 2535 Wiltschko, Martina 2006. On Ergative Agreement and Anti-Agreement in Halkomelem Salish.
2536 In *Studies in Salishan* (Shannon T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel
2537 Siddiqi, eds.), 241-273. MIT Working Papers on Endangered and Less Familiar
2538 Languages 7, Cambridge, MA.
- 2539

- 2540 *Quantification*
2541
2542 Bar-el, Leora. 1998. Verbal Plurality and Adverbial Quantification: A Case Study of
2543 Sk̓w̓wú7mesh (Squamish Salish). M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.
2544 Demirdache, Hamida, Dwight Gardiner, Peter Jacobs, and Lisa Matthewson 1994. The Case for
2545 D-Quantification in Salish: ‘All’ in St’át’imcets, Squamish and Secwepemctsin. *Papers*
2546 *for ICSNL* 29: 145-203. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, Montana.
2547 Demers, Richard A, and Eloise Jelinek 1996. Reduplication, Quantification and Aspect in Straits
2548 Salish. *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 75-78. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
2549 Demers, Richard A. and Dale M. Kinkade. 1996. Reduplication as a Quantifier in Salish. *MAL*
2550 63: 302-315.
2551 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Garland Publishing, New
2552 York.
2553 Jelinek, Eloise 1993. Languages without Determiner Quantification. *BLS* 19: 406-422. Berkeley,
2554 CA.
2555 Jelinek, Eloise 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In *Quantification in Natural Languages*
2556 (Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, eds.), 487-540.
2557 Kluwer, Dordrecht.
2558 Jelinek, Eloise 2004. Adverbs of Quantification in Straits Salish and the LINK ‘u’. In *Studies in*
2559 *Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa
2560 Matthewson, eds.), 224-234. *UMOPL* 10, Missoula, MT.
2561 Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers 1997. Reduplication as a Quantifier in Salish. *IJAL* 63: 302-
2562 315.
2563 Matthewson, Lisa 1998. *Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from*
2564 *Salish*. Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.
2565 Matthewson, Lisa 2001. Quantification and the Nature of Cross-Linguistic Variation. *NLS* 9:
2566 145-189.
2567
2568 *Raising / Control*
2569
2570 Black, Dierdre. 1994. Subject Raising from Tensed Clauses: Evidence from Bella Coola
2571 Complex ‘ay Constructions. *WPLCUV* 12: 75-91, Victoria, B.C.
2572 Blake, Susan J. 1996. Passive and Object Control in Mainland Comox (Salish): A Reanalysis of
2573 Raising-to-Object. Syntax Generals Paper, University of British Columbia.
2574 Davis, Henry 1996. On Agreement in St’át’imcets. *Actes du Deuxième Colloque de Langue et*
2575 *Grammaire* 8 :79-94. Université de Paris, Paris.
2576 Davis, Henry, and Lisa Matthewson 1996. Subordinate Clauses and Functional Projections in
2577 St’át’imcets. *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 59-73, Vancouver, B.C.
2578 Davis, John H. 1980. The Passive in Sliammon. *BLS* 6: 278-6. Berkeley, CA.
2579 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari. 2001. A-Subjects and Control in Halkomelem. *Papers*
2580 *from the 7th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*.
2581 Available online at: <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG00>.
2582
2583 *Reference Tracking*
2584
2585 Barthmaier, Paul. 2000. Lushootseed Argument Structure and the Discourse Function of the

- 2586 Morpheme /-b/. *Papers for ICSNL 35*: 1-18. *UBCWPL 3*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2587 Bates, Dawn 1997. Semantic Roles and Referent Tracking in Martha Lamont's "Pheasant and
2588 Raven." *Papers for ICSNL 32*: 1-21. Port Angeles, WA.
- 2589 Bates, Dawn 2004. The Expression of NPs in Lushootseed Texts. *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 1-44.
2590 *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2591 Beck, David 1997. Rheme, Theme, and Communicative Structure in Lushootseed and Bella
2592 Coola. In *Recent Trends in Meaning-Text Theory* (L. Wanner, ed.), 93-135. John
2593 Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2594 Beck, David 1998. Eliding the Obvious: Zero Subjects in Lushootseed. *Proceedings of the First
2595 WAIL. SBWPL 8*: 15-29. Santa Barbara, CA.
- 2596 Beck, David 2000. Semantic Agents, Syntactic Subjects, and Discourse Topics: How to Locate
2597 Lushootseed Sentences in Space and Time. *Studies in Language 24*: 277-317.
- 2598 Boelscher, Marianne 1990. Passive and Agency in Shuswap Narrative Discourse. *Papers for
2599 ICSNL 25*: 61-72. Vancouver, B.C.
- 2600 Davis, Henry 1994. Tali-Ho! *Papers for ICSNL 29*: 117-144. Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo,
2601 MT.
- 2602 Doak, Ivy G. 1993. Discourse Use of the Coeur d'Alene -st(u)- Transitivity. In *American Indian
2603 Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson* (Anthony Mattina and
2604 Timothy Montler, eds.), 73-92. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MT.
- 2605 Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Garland Publishing, New
2606 York.
- 2607 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2003. The Expression of NPs in Halkomelem Texts.
2608 *ICSNL 38*: 91-126. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2609 Gerdts, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari 2004. Determiners and Transitivity in Halkomelem
2610 Texts. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade* (Donna B. Gerdts
2611 and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 151-171. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MN.
- 2612 Kinkade, M. Dale 1989. When Patients are Topics: Topic Maintenance in North American
2613 Indian Languages. *Papers for ICSNL 24*: 1-41. Steilacoom, WA.
- 2614 Kinkade, M. Dale 1990. Sorting Out Third Persons in Salishan Discourse. *IJAL 56*: 341-360.
- 2615 Willett, Marie Louise. 1996. Some Patterns of *wa* in Nxa'amxcín (Moses- Columbia Salish).
2616 *Proceedings of the 11th Northwest Linguistics Conference, WPLCUV 13*, Victoria, B.C.
- 2617
- 2618 *Reflexives and Reciprocals*
- 2619
- 2620 Davis, Henry 2003. Disjoint Anaphora and Reciprocals in Salish. *Proceedings of WECOL 2002*:
2621 161-172. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno. Fresno, CA.
- 2622 Gerdts, Donna B. 1989. Relational Parameters of Reflexives: The Halkomelem Evidence. In
2623 *Theoretical Perspectives on Native American Languages* (Donna B. Gerdts and Karin
2624 Michelson, eds.), 259-280. State University of New York Press, New York.
- 2625 Gerdts, Donna B. 1998. The Double Life of Halkomelem Reflexive Suffixes. *Proceedings of the
2626 First WAIL, SBWPL 8*: 70-83. Santa Barbara, CA.
- 2627 Gerdts, Donna B. 2000. Combinatory Restrictions on Halkomelem Reflexives and Reciprocals.
2628 In *Reciprocals: Forms and Functions* (Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Traci S. Curl, eds.),
2629 133-160. John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- 2630 Kinkade, M. Dale 1981. The Source of the Upper Chehalis Reflexive. *IJAL 47*: 336-339.
- 2631 Thompson, James J., and Peter Jacobs. 2004. Prolegomenon to a New Analysis of Salish /*-

- 2632 səwt/. *Proceedings of WSCLA 9*: 107-120. *UBCWPL 15*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2633 Van Eijk, Jan P. 1980. Reflexive Forms in Lillooet. *Papers for ICSL 15*: 196-199. Vancouver,
- 2634 B.C.
- 2635 Wiltschko, Martina. 2004. Reflexives in Upriver Halkomelem. *IJAL 70*: 101-127.
- 2636
- 2637 *Relative Clauses / Attributive constructions*
- 2638
- 2639 Davis, Henry 2004. Locative Relative Clauses in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). *Papers for*
- 2640 *ICSNL 39*: 83-116. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2641 Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders 1998. The Place of Bella Coola (Nuxalk) in a Typology of
- 2642 the Relative Clause. In *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive*
- 2643 *Perspectives* (Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, eds.), 219-234. Trends in
- 2644 Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 107, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2645 Demirdache, Hamida, and Lisa Matthewson 1995. On the Universality of Syntactic Categories.
- 2646 *Proceedings of NELS 25*: 79-94. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2647 Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. A Comparison of Relative Clause Constructions in Two Coast Salish
- 2648 Languages. *Papers for ICSL X*.
- 2649 Hukari, Thomas E. 1977. A Comparison of Attributive Clause Constructions in Two Coast
- 2650 Salish Languages. *Glossa 11*: 48-73.
- 2651 Hukari, Thomas E. 1981. Cowichan Relative Clauses. *WPLCUV 1*:79-99. Victoria, B.C.
- 2652 Jelinek, Eloise. 1987. Headless Relatives and Pronominal Arguments: A Typological
- 2653 Perspective. In *Native American Languages and Grammatical Typology* (Paul D. Kroeber
- 2654 and Roger E. Moore, eds.), 136-148. *IULC*, Bloomington, IN.
- 2655 Koch, Karsten 2004. On Predicate Modification in Nl̓e'kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish).
- 2656 *Papers for ICSNL 39*: 269-282. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2657 Koch, Karsten 2005. Prenominal Modifiers in Nl̓e'kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish).
- 2658 *Proceedings of WSCLA 10*: 136-149. *UBCWPL 17*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2659 Koch, Karsten 2006. Nominal Modification in Nl̓he7kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). In
- 2660 *Studies in Salishan* (Shannon T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel
- 2661 Siddiqi, eds.), 127-158. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics on Endangered and Less
- 2662 Familiar Languages 7, Cambridge, MA.
- 2663 Kroeber, Paul D. 1991. Comparative Syntax of Subordination in Salish. Ph.D. dissertation,
- 2664 University of Chicago.
- 2665 Kroeber, Paul D. 1997. Relativization in Thompson River Salish. *AL 39*: 376-422.
- 2666 Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax*. The University of
- 2667 Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- 2668 Montler, Timothy R. 1989. Attributive Constructions in Saanich. *Papers for ICSNL 24*: 46-60,
- 2669 Steilacoom, WA.
- 2670 Montler, Timothy R. 1993. Relative Clauses and Other Attributive Constructions in Salish. In
- 2671 *American Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson*.
- 2672 (Anthony Mattina and Timothy Montler, eds.), 241-262. *UMOPL 10*, Missoula, MT.
- 2673
- 2674 *Tense*
- 2675
- 2676 Bar-el, Leora, Carrie Gillon, Peter Jacobs, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Martina Wiltschko. Subject
- 2677 Clitics and their Effect on Temporal Interpretation: A Case Study of Skwxwú7mesh and

- 2678 Stó:lō Halq'eméylem. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honour of M. Dale Kinkade*
2679 (Donna B. Gerds and Lisa Matthewson, eds.), 8-29. *UMOPL* 10: Missoula, MN.
- 2680 Bates, Dawn 2002. Narrative Functions of Past tense Marking in a Lushootseed Text. *Papers for*
2681 *ICSNL* 37: 17-34. *UBCWPL* 9, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2682 Bates, Dawn, and Thom Hess. 2001. Tense or Aspect? A Prefix of Future Time in Lushootseed.
2683 *Papers for ICSNL* 36: 25-36. *UBCWPL* 6, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2684 Burton, Strang 1997. Past Tense on Nouns as Death, Destruction and Loss. *Proceedings of NELS*
2685 27: 65-77. GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2686 Currie, Elizabeth. 1996. Five Sqwxw7mish Futures. *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 23-28. University of
2687 British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2688 Currie, Elizabeth 1997. Topic Times: The Syntax and Semantics of SqwXwu7mish Temporal
2689 Adverbs. M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- 2690 Davis, Henry and Lisa Matthewson 2003. A Note on Remote: The Temporal Enclitic *tu7* in
2691 St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL* 38: 47-64. *UBCWPL* 11, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2692 Demirdache, Hamida. 1996. *The Chief of the United States* Sentences in St'át'imcets (Lillooet
2693 Salish): A Cross-Linguistic Asymmetry in the Temporal Interpretation of Noun Phrases
2694 and its Implications. *Papers for ICSNL* 31: 79-100. University of British Columbia,
2695 Vancouver, B.C.
- 2696 Galloway, Brent D. 1975. Two Lessons in Time in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSL* 10:
2697 56-66, Ellensburg, WA.
- 2698 Glougie, Jennifer 2007. Aspect in St'át'imcets Future Expressions. *Papers for ICSNL* 42: 220-
2699 235. *UBCWPL* 20, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2700 Matthewson, Lisa 2003. An Underspecified Tense in St'át'imcets. *Proceedings of WECOL 2002*:
2701 161-172. Department of Linguistics, California State University, Fresno. Fresno, CA.
- 2702 Matthewson, Lisa 2005. On the Absence of Tense on Determiners. *Lingua* 115(12): 1697-1735.
- 2703 Matthewson, Lisa 2006. Temporal Semantics in a Supposedly Tenseless Language. *Linguistics*
2704 *and Philosophy* 29: 673-713.
- 2705 Mattina, Nancy 1999. Future in Colville-Okanagan Salish. *Papers for ICSNL* 34: 215-230,
2706 Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 2707 Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko 2004. The Lack of Tense as a Syntactic Category:
2708 Evidence from Blackfoot and Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL* 39: 341-370. *UBCWPL*
2709 14, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2710 Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko 2005. Anchoring Events to Utterances without Tense. In
2711 *Proceedings of WCCFL 24* (Alderete, J., C-h. Han, and A. Kochetov, eds.), 343-351.
2712 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA.
- 2713 Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko to appear. Varieties of INFL: TENSE, LOCATION, and
2714 PERSON. In *Alternatives to Cartography* (Jeroen Craenenbroeck, ed.). Mouton de
2715 Gruyter, Berlin.
- 2716 Wiltschko, Martina 2003. On the interpretability of Tense on D and its Consequences for Case
2717 Theory. *Lingua* 113(7): 659-696.
- 2718 Wiltschko, Martina 2006. Inlocatives in Upriver Halkomelem. *Papers for ICSNL* 41: 286-310.
2719 *UBCWPL* 11, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2720
- 2721 *Verb movement / Predicate Raising*
- 2722
- 2723 Davis, Henry 2004. VP Ellipsis and its Implications. *Papers for ICSNL* 39: 117-140. *UBCWPL*

- 2724 14: Vancouver, B.C.
- 2725 Jelinek, Eloise 2000. Predicate Raising in Lummi, Straits Salish. In *The Syntax of Verb Initial*
- 2726 *Languages* (Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle, eds.). Oxford University Press, New
- 2727 York.
- 2728 Thompson, Nile R. 1979a. Predicate Raising in Twana. M.A. thesis, University of Washington,
- 2729 Seattle.
- 2730 Thompson, Nile R. 1979b. Predicate Raising in Twana. *UWWPL* 5: 54-61. Seattle, WA.
- 2731
- 2732 *Viewpoint Aspect*
- 2733
- 2734 Bar-el, L. 2003. Imperfectivity in Squamish. In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on the*
- 2735 *Semantics of Under-represented Languages of the Americas* (J. Anderssen, P. Menendez-
- 2736 Benito, and A. Werle, eds.). GLSA, Amherst, MA.
- 2737 Bar-el, Leora 2005. Aspectual Distinctions in Sk̓w̓wú7mesh. Ph.D dissertation, University of
- 2738 British Columbia.
- 2739 Bates, Dawn 1999. Distance in Narrative Time and Space: Aspect Markers and Determiner
- 2740 Choice in Martha Lamont's "Pheasant and Raven." *Papers for ICSNL* 34: 1-11. Simon
- 2741 Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 2742 Gardiner, Dwight and Ross Saunders 1990. On the Grammatical Status of Shuswap /-əs/. *Papers*
- 2743 *for ICSNL* 25: 153-172, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2744 Glougie, Jennifer 2007. Aspect in St'át'imcets Future Expressions. *Papers for ICSNL* 42: 220-
- 2745 235. *UBCWPL* 17, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2746 Hukari, Thomas E. 1984. The Truth about Cowichan Imperfectives. *Papers for ICSNL* 19: 147-
- 2747 161. *WPLCUV* 4(2). Victoria B.C.
- 2748 Kinkade, M. Dale 1983. The Non-Perfective Suffix(es) of Columbian (Salish). *Amerindia* 8: 7-
- 2749 15.
- 2750 Kinkade, M. Dale 1994. *s*-Prefixation on Upper Chehalis (Salish) Imperfective Predicates.
- 2751 *Survey of California and other Indian Languages*. Report 8: 21-30.
- 2752 Kiyota, Masaru. 2006. Semantics of the Particle kʷɬ and Event Representations in Sənčáθən.
- 2753 *Proceedings of WSCLA* 11: 95-108. *UBCWPL* 19, Vancouver, B.C..
- 2754 Kiyota, Masaru 2008. Situation Aspect and Viewpoint Aspect: From Salish to Japanese. Ph.D.
- 2755 dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- 2756 Kroeber, Paul D. 1997. Prehistory of the Upper Chehalis (Q'way'áyilq') continuative aspect. In
- 2757 *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Current Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives*
- 2758 (Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, eds.), 421-52. Mouton de Gruyter,
- 2759 Berlin.
- 2760 Montler, Timothy 1989. Infixation, Reduplication, and Metathesis in the Saanich Actual Aspect.
- 2761 *SWIL* 9: 92-107.
- 2762
- 2763 *WH-Questions*
- 2764
- 2765 Baptiste, Maxine 2002. Wh-Questions in Okanagan Salish. M.A. thesis, University of British
- 2766 Columbia.
- 2767 Davis, Henry 2008. WH-in-situ: Japanese Meets Salish. In *Individual Languages and Language*
- 2768 *Universals* (Michiko Takeuchi, ed.), 17-58. Special Issue, Kanagawa University Studies
- 2769 in Language. Kanagawa University, Yokohama.

- 2770 Davis, Henry, Dwight Gardiner and Lisa Matthewson 1993. A Comparative Look at WH-
 2771 Questions in Northern Interior Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 79-95. University of
 2772 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2773 Gardiner, Dwight and Ross Saunders 1990. On the Grammatical Status of Shuswap /-əs/. *Papers*
 2774 *for ICSNL 25*: 153-172, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2775 Gillon, Carrie and Martina Wiltschko 2004. Missing Determiners/Complementizers in Wh-
 2776 Questions: Evidence from Skwxwú7mesh and Halq'eméylem. *Papers for ICSNL 39*:
 2777 215-230. *UBCWPL 14*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2778 Hagiwara, Robert E. 1987. Lushootseed Copular and Wh-Deixis in a Government and Binding
 2779 Model of Grammar. *Papers for ICSNL 22*: 101-108. Victoria, B.C.
- 2780 Jelinek, Eloise. 1998. Wh-Clefts in Lummi. *Papers for ICSNL 33*: 257-265. University of
 2781 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2782 Kroeber, Paul D. 1991. Comparative Syntax of Subordination in Salish. Ph.D. dissertation,
 2783 University of Chicago.
- 2784 Kroeber, Paul 1997. Wh-Question Particles in Some Languages of the Southern Northwest
 2785 Coast. *Papers for ICSNL 32*: 265-279, Port Angeles, WA.
- 2786 Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax*. The University of
 2787 Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.
- 2788 Shank, Scott 2001. And-Fronting and the Copula in Upper Chehalis. *Papers for ICSNL 36*: 265-
 2789 290. *UBCWPL 6*, Vancouver, B.C.

2790
 2791 *Word order*
 2792

- 2793 Davis, Henry 1999. Word Order and Configurationality in St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 34*:
 2794 61-82. Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 2795 Gardiner, Dwight 1992. Pre-Verbal Positions in Shuswap Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 27*: 6-15,
 2796 Secwépemc Cultural Education Society / Simon Fraser University, Kamloops, B.C.
- 2797 Gardiner, Dwight 1993. Structural Asymmetries and Pre-verbal Positions in Shuswap. Ph.D.
 2798 dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- 2799 Gardiner, Dwight, Lisa Matthewson, and Henry Davis 1993. A Preliminary Report on Word
 2800 Order in Northern Interior Salish. *Papers for ICSNL 28*: 139-158. University of
 2801 Washington, Seattle, WA.
- 2802 Hukari, Thomas E. 1974. Is Puget a VSO Language? *WECOL 3*.
- 2803 Ingram, David 1975. A Note on Word Order in Proto-Salish. *IJAL 41*:165-168.
- 2804 Jones, Michael K. and R. M. Richardson 1974. An Enumeration and Syntax of Satellites of the
 2805 Predicate-Head in Coast Salish: A Comparison of Two Languages. *Papers for ICSL 9*:
 2806 209-237, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2807 Koch, Karsten 2006. Transitive Word Order in Nl̓e'kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). *Papers*
 2808 *for ICSNL 41*: 192-220. *UBCWPL 11*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2809 Morgan, Lawrence R. 1990. Northwest Languages in Search of a Universal Word Order. *Papers*
 2810 *for ICSNL 20*, Vancouver, B.C.
- 2811 Noonan, Michael. 1976. On Proto-Salish Word Order: A Reply to Ingram. *IJAL 42*: 363-366.
- 2812 van Eijk, Jan 1995. POS and PSO in Lillooet. *Papers for ICSNL 30*: 112-113. University of
 2813 Victoria, Victoria, B.C.

2814
 2815

2816
2817