Against all expectations: The meaning of St'át'imcets *séna7*[*]

Henry Davis and Lisa Matthewson
University of British Columbia

Abstract: This paper provides a formal pragmatic analysis of the St'át'imcets discourse adverb *séna7*. We propose that when applied to a proposition, *séna7* invokes a second, contextually available true proposition, and conveys that the speaker does not expect both propositions to be true. We show how this allows us to use *séna7* as a diagnostic for distinguishing between entailments and implicatures in three different semantic domains: telicity, expressions of futurity, and motion verbs employed as prospective aspect markers.

Keywords: St'át'imcets, semantics, pragmatics, contrast, discourse

1   Introduction

The semantics and pragmatics of discourse-sensitive sentential adverbs constitutes one of the least well-understood (and least-studied) areas of Salish grammar. This is not surprising: though they are often common in both narrative and conversational contexts, the meaning of discourse adverbs is usually elusive and by definition context-dependent, so neither traditional text-based method-ologies nor conventional sentence-based elicitation procedures are very effective at elucidating their semantic contribution.

However, recent theoretical and methodological advances in the investigation of meaning beyond the level of single sentences, coupled with the urgent need for documentation of lesser-studied areas of Salish grammar, makes it both feasible and timely to begin to investigate the meaning of sentential adverbs in more detail. In this paper, we embark on this project, by analyzing a particularly ubiquitous yet semantically difficult member of the class, the St'át'imcets adverb *séna7*.[1]

Previously, *séna7* has been glossed as 'though' (Van Eijk 1997), 'counter-to-expectation' (Davis 2012), 'often untranslatable; expresses an unfulfilled condition, a change of mind or some other contradiction or contrast' (Van Eijk 2013), and as 'against expectations (either the speaker's, the hearer's, or

---

[1] St'át'imcets (šƛ̓áƛ̓yəmxəč), also known as Lillooet, is a Northern Interior Salish language spoken in the southwest interior of British Columbia, Canada. It is highly endangered, with fewer than 100 first-language speakers at the time of writing.

somebody else's); often difficult to translate into English' (Alexander et al. in prep.). These informal characterizations give something of the flavour of *séna7*, as well as the difficulties it causes for dictionary-type definitions; however, none of them offer full insight into its precise semantic and/or pragmatic contribution: this is the task we undertake in this paper.

Note that in contrast to the semantic difficulties it causes, *séna7* is syntactically unremarkable. It is one of a small closed class of invariant adverbs which generally occur after the first predicative element of a clause, like enclitics. Unlike enclitics, however, *séna7* is prosodically independent and may also occur clause-finally or – less frequently – in other post-predicative positions.

Initial examples are provided below. As is typical, in these cases *séna7* conveys such notions as the unexpected outcome of an event (1), the failure of an event to continue (2), or the failure of an event to take place in an optimal fashion (3).

(1) ka-mág-a=ku7   **séna7**, t'u7 áy=t'u7   kw=s=7áts'x-n-as
     CIRC-bright-CIRC=REP **CNTR** but NEG=EXCL DET=NMLZ=see-DIR-3ERG
     'It got brighter, but he still couldn't see it.' (Charlie Mack, in Davis 2012)[2]

(2) sáy'sez'=lhkán=tu7 **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz aylh kwenswá
     play=1SG.SBJ=DIST **CNTR** but NEG   now DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+IPFV

         sáy'sez'
         play
     'I was playing, but I'm not playing now.'

(3) wa7 aylh ka-7áts'x-m-a   **séna7**, t'u7 cw7áoy=t'u7 kw=s=7áma
     IPFV then CIRC-see-MID-CIRC **CNTR** but NEG=EXCL   DET=NMLZ=good
     'Then he could indeed see, but not very well.'

                                                        (Beverley Frank, in Davis 2012)

Our first challenge, obviously, is to provide a unified account for these apparently disparate semantic effects.

---

[2] St'át'imcets examples are given in the Van Eijk orthography employed throughout St'át'imc territory: see e.g., Van Eijk (1997) for a conversion chart to the APA. All unattributed examples come from original fieldwork by the authors. Morpheme glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules, with the following additions: ABS.DET = absent determiner, ACT = active intransitive, AUT = autonomous intransitive, CIRC = circumstantial modal, CNTR = contra expectation, CRE = consonant reduplication, DEIC = deictic, DES = desiderative, DIR = directive transitivizer, EPIS = epistemic modal, EXCL = exclusive focus particle, EXIS = existential enclitic, FRE = final reduplication, INCH = inchoative, NTS = non-topical subject, OOC = out-of-control, PROSP = prospective aspect, REP = reportative, RLT = relational transitivizer, SJV = subjunctive, STAT = stative. Clitic boundaries are indicated by an equals sign (=) and reduplicants are separated by bullets (•). Phonologically merged sets of clitics are indicated by a plus sign (+). Material which is underlyingly present but not pronounced is given inside square brackets [ ].

A second puzzle concerns the cross-clausal distribution of *séna7*. Though in (1)–(3), it consistently appears in the first clause of a bi-clausal structure, this is not always the case: it can also appear in mono-clausal environments, as shown in (4):

(4) ílhen=kélh=ti7   **séna7**.
     eat=PROSP=DEM **CNTR**
     'He'll eat anyway.'
     Consultant's volunteered context: "When there's a big line up, and they are running low on food, but they'll serve him anyway."

We will argue that in fact *séna7* does always relate two propositions, but one of them can be implicit, and contextually provided.

We will further show that *séna7* does not affect truth conditions, but instead merely imposes a felicity condition on the discourse context. More specifically, we will argue that *séna7* (p) is felicitous in a context c if c contains a true proposition q and the speaker does not expect p and q to both be true. We will henceforth gloss *séna7* as CNTR, for 'contra expectation'.

In the remainder of the introduction we provide some background on our data-collection methodologies. In Section 2 we illustrate the behaviour of *séna7* with predicates of all aspectual classes (Aktionsarten). Section 3 presents our analysis, and Section 4 discusses extensions to the empirical realms of markers of future time reference and motion verbs. Section 5 briefly compares *séna7* to the Bella Coola discourse adverbial *su* (Saunders and Davis 1977). Section 6 concludes.

1.1   Methodology

Several data collection methodologies were employed in this study. We began by examining the large number of instances of *séna7* which have arisen in our elicited data over the years, many of them spontaneously offered. We also conducted (both in the past and more recently) targeted elicitation on *séna7,* using standard semantic fieldwork methods involving controlled discourse contexts (see Matthewson 2004b, the papers in Bochnak and Matthewson 2005, Tonhauser and Matthewson 2015). In addition to the usual methods of eliciting acceptability judgments and translations in context, we utilized two less common techniques as a response to the radical context-dependence of *séna7*. First, we sometimes provided the consultants with a sentence containing *séna7* and asked them to provide a suitable discourse context in which the sentence could be uttered. Second, we conducted a variant of the cloze test familiar from language acquisition studies: we provided the speakers with a clause containing *séna7,* and asked them to provide a felicitous completion (i.e., a follow-up clause). Instances of this elicitation method are marked with '…' between the first and second clauses. (Thus, wherever the data includes a '…', the material after the dots was volunteered by the consultant.)

Finally, we checked our generalizations against all instances of *séna7* to be found in four separate text collections (Van Eijk and Williams 1981, Matthewson 2005, Callahan et al. in press, and Davis et al. in prep.), as well as all the example sentences in a forthcoming comprehensive English–Upper St'át'imcets dictionary (Alexander et al. in prep).

2 Data Set 1: *Séna7* and Aktionsarten

In this section, we present a systematic overview of the effect of *séna7* on Aktionsarten (lexical aspectual classes). We show that the interpretation of *séna7* is partially predictable based on Aktionsart; however, there is still some freedom in the range of attested meanings, with the very same predicate sometimes allowing different interpretations. In Section 3 below we will derive the attested range of meanings from a unified, context-dependent analysis.

2.1 States

With states, *séna7* is most frequently used when some expected outcome of the state fails to hold. Examples are provided in (5)–(11).

(5) k'ínk'net=ti7 **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz kw=s=wá7=wit   xan'
     dangerous=DEM **CNTR** but NEG   DET=NMLZ=IPFV=3PL get.hurt
     'It was dangerous, but they didn't seem to get hurt.'
                                      (Beverley Frank, in Matthewson 2005:92)

(6) zwát-en=lhkan   **séna7** kw=s=cuz'   kwis … mes=kán=t'u7
     know-DIR=1SG.SBJ **CNTR** DET=NMLZ=PROSP rain   but=1SG.SBJ=EXCL

          tsicw   mám'teq
          get.there go.for.walk
     'I knew it was going to rain … but I went for a walk anyway.'

(7) á7ma=t'u7 **séna7** k=Helen, t'u7 áy=s=t'u7   ku=melyíh-s-tal'i
     pretty=EXCL**CNTR** DET=H.   but NEG=3POSS=EXCL DET=marry-CAUS-NTS
     'Although Helen is very beautiful, nobody has married her yet.'

(8) *Context: A has to write a paper. The sun is shining, the birds are singing.*
     A: o, xát'-min'=lhkan   **séna7** kw=n=nas   ex•éxts áku7
        oh want-rlt=1sg.sbj   **cntr** det=1sg.poss=go   lie•cre deic

          [l=ti=]kwél'=a
          [in=DET=]sun=EXIS
     'I really want to go and lay out in the sun for a while.'

(9) áma=t'u7 **séna7** ti=wá7 zayten-mín-as ti=cúz'a
good=EXCL **CNTR** DET=IPFV business-RLT-3ERG DET=PROSP=EXIS

    meeting, t'u7 ícwlh=t'u7 ka-t'ák=s-a
    meeting but different=EXCL CIRC-go=3POSS-CIRC
'What she had done for the meeting was good, but it went quite
differently.'

(10) A: cúz'=lhkacw=ha saotatíh-am?
      PROSP=2SG.SBJ=Q saturday-MID
      'Are you going out partying this weekend?'

    B: ícwa7=lhkan **séna7** es=qláw'
      without=1SG.SBJ **CNTR** have=money
      'I don't have any money.'
    Consultant's comment: "I guess you're going, even though you're broke."

(11) *Context: Someone is trying to sell you something but you don't want it (you
have money but you don't want to spend it).*
wá7=lhkan **séna7** es=qláw'.
IPFV=1G.SBJ **CNTR** have-money
'I have money (but I won't spend it).'

    Sometimes, the expected outcome of a state is simply that it continues. This
is shown in (12)-(14), where *séna7* flags the fact that a state no longer holds.

(12) wá7=lhkan=tu7 **séna7** ka-táns-a i=wán
IPFV=1G.SBJ=DIST **CNTR** CIRC-dance-CIRC when.PST=IPFV+1SG.SJV

    twiw't, lán=t'u7 ao kwas áma
    youth already=EXCL NEG DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS good

    i=n-sq'wáxt=a lhkúnsa
    PL.DET=1SG.POSS-leg=EXIS now
'I used to be able to dance, but my legs don't work well any more.'

(13) tayt=lhkán=tu7 **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz aylh
hungry=1SG.SBJ=DIST **CNTR** but NEG now

    kwenswá tayt
    DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+IPFV hungry
'I was hungry but I'm not hungry now.'

(14) qlíl=lhkan=tu7 **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz aylh
angry=1SG.SBJ=DIST **CNTR** but NEG now

kwenswá qlil
DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+IPFV angry
'I was angry, but now I am not.'

Finally, sometimes *séna7* appears on states not to signal the failure of an outcome, but merely to signal an unexpected co-occurrence of a state with another eventuality:

(15) n-qwnúxw-alhts'a7 **séna7** s-7ít'-em-s=a s=Mary,
LOC-sick-inside **CNTR** NMLZ-sing-MID-3POSS=EXIS NMLZ=Mary

t'u7 áma **séna7** ta=scwákwekw-s=a
but good **SÉNA7** DET=heart-3POSS=EXIS
'Mary's song/singing was sad, but she was happy.'

If *séna7* marks the failure of an expected outcome, we expect it to be infelicitous in cases where the expected outcome is entailed or strongly implicated. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (16)-(17):

(16) # q'7-al'men=lhkán=tu7 **séna7** i=kel7=át t'iq,
eat-DES=1SG.SBJ=DIST **CNTR** when.PST=first=1PL.SJV arrive

nilh n=s=q'a7
COP 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=eat
'I was hungry when we first arrived, so I ate.'

(17) # guy't-ál'men=lhkan **séna7**, nilh n=s=ka-gúy't-a
sleep-DES=1SG.SBJ **CNTR** COP 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=CIRC-sleep-CIRC
'I was tired, so I fell asleep.'

Summarizing the data on the co-occurrence of *séna7* with stative predicates, we see that *séna7* typically appears when there has been a failure of an expected outcome, including a failure of the state to continue. *Séna7* may also appear in cases of an unexpected co-occurrence with another eventuality.

2.2 Activities

The behaviour of activity predicates with *séna7* is very similar to that of statives. As shown in (18)–(20), *séna7* is licensed with activities when some expected outcome of the event fails to happen. These are typically not lexical entailments

of the activity predicate, but rather are pragmatic expectations about what normally happens when one performs an activity.[3]

(18) píxem'=wit **séna7** áku7 sqwém=a,   t'u7 áy=t'u7
     hunt=3PL **CNTR** DEIC mountain=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

     kw=s=7ats'x-en-ítas   ku=ts'í7
     DET=NMLZ=see-DIR-3PL.ERG   DET=deer
     'They went hunting in the mountains, but they didn't see any deer.'

(19) lán=lhkan   aylh **séna7** k'wzús-em … t'u7 ay=s
     already=1SG.SBJ   now **CNTR** work-MID   but NEG=3POSS

     xaq'-en-tsálem
     pay-DIR-1SG.PASS
     'I'm already working … but I'm not getting paid.'

(20) it'-em=lhkán=t'u7   **séna7**   l=ti=s-gáw'-p=a …
     sing-MID=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR**   at=DET=NMLZ-meet-INCH=EXIS

     t'u7 áoy=t'u7   swat ku=k'alán'-min'-ts-as
     but NEG=EXCL who   DET=listen-RLT-1SG.OBJ-3ERG
     'I sang at the gathering … but nobody listened.'

Just like with states, we see that sometimes, the expected outcome of an activity is simply that it continues:

(21) say'sez'=lhkán=tu7 **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz aylh
     play=1SG.SBJ=DIST **CNTR** but NEG   now

     kwenswá   sáy'sez'
     DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+IPFV play
     'I was playing, but I'm not playing now.'

Just like with states, the contrastive relation between two clauses with activities cannot always be characterized as the outcome of a causal relation. In (22), for example, it is not that having a bath has as an expected consequence

---

[3] The effect of *séna7* on activities appears to be more variable than its effect on states, but this is because unlike states, activities can consist of heterogeneous stages. For example, hunting (*píxem'*) involves a trip to the hunting grounds, a search for game, and then a variably successful outcome (depending on one's aim, luck, and the abundance of game). *Séna7* appears to be felicitous with *píxem'* as long as (i) the trip was undertaken and (ii) the hunt was not a total success (e.g., either no game was spotted, as in (18), game was spotted but the hunter failed to catch anything, or the hunter got a few animals but not as many as anticipated). In other words, it appears that *séna* can felicitously apply to any stage of an activity with heterogeneous stages, as long as one of the stages goes counter to expectations.

that one washes one hair. It is simply that the speaker usually washes her hair when taking a bath, so *not* washing her hair under these circumstances is an unexpected outcome.

(22) sácw-em=lhkan   **séna7** i=n'án'atcw=as,   t'u7 áy=t'u7
      bathe-MID=1SG.SBJ **CNTR** when.PST=morning=3SJV   but NEG=EXCL

      kw=ka-ts'áw'-s-an-a
      DET+NMLZ=CIRC-wash-CAUS-1SG.ERG-CIRC

      i=n-máqin=a
      PL.DET=1SG.POSS-hair=EXIS
      'I had a bath this morning, but I didn't wash my hair.'

A final set of cases with activities involves contexts where the activity denoted by the predicate is not performed successfully. These are illustrated in (23)–(26). (Note that these are cases where *séna7* does not correspond to English *but*.)

(23) *Context: Lisa has been trying to make baskets but she is really bad at it.*
      wa7 **séna7** lhk'wál'us   k=Lisa,   t'u7 áy=tu7
      IPFV **CNTR** make.baskets DET=Lisa   but NEG=EXCL

      kwas   ka-xílh-a
      DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS   CIRC-do-CIRC
      'Lisa has been making baskets, but she didn't manage.'

(24) A: wa7   kán-em   k=Marion?
         IPFV   whether-MID   DET=Marion
         'What is Marion doing?'

      B: lhk'wál'us=t'u7   **séna7**
         make.baskets=EXCL   **CNTR**
         'I THINK she's making a basket / She's trying to make a basket.'
      Consultant's comments: "She's not really"; "Probably just learning."

(25) ít'-em=t'u7   **séna7**   k=Henry
      sing-MID=EXCL   **CNTR**   DET=Henry
      'Henry tried to sing.'

(26) ít'-em=lhkan,   siq'úta=lhkan   t'it **séna7**
      sing-MID=1SG.SBJ   dance=1SG.SBJ   also **CNTR**
      'I sang, and I also danced.'
      Consultant's comment: "Okay, if you didn't really know how to siq'úta
      ['dance']."

(27) t'ák=kan **séna7** k'ák'em-l'ec, nilh n=s=hul'qs,
　　go.along=1SG.SBJ **CNTR** sneak-AUT　COP 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=sneeze

　　　q'áy-lec=tu7　　　aylh　na=ts'í7=a
　　　run.away-AUT=DIST　now　ABS.DET=deer=EXIS
　　'I was sneaking along but then I sneezed, so the deer took off.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Alexander et al. in prep.)

　　Summarizing the data for activities, *séna7* appears when there is a failure of an expected outcome (including a failure of the activity to continue), or more generally when something unexpected happens during or after the activity, including cases where the activity is not performed successfully.[4]

2.3　Achievements vs. accomplishments

An interesting property of *séna7* is that it clearly distinguishes between achievements, which entail culmination in the perfective aspect, and accomplishments with control transitivizers, which do not.[5] The phenomenon of non-culminating accomplishments is relatively well documented in the Salish literature; see Matthewson (2004a), Bar-el et al. (2005) on St'át'imcets, J. Davis (1978), Watanabe (2003) on Comox–Sliammon, Bar-el (2005), Bar-el et al. (2005), Jacobs (2011) on Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, Gerdts (2008) on Halkomelem and Kiyota (2008), Turner (2011) on SENĆOŦEN. The basic St'át'imcets facts are illustrated in (28)–(29). The same root, √*mays* 'get fixed', has an entailment of culmination when it surfaces without (in-)transitivizing morphology (28), but only has a (cancellable) implicature of culmination when it appears with the directive ('control') transitivizer (29):

(28) # **mays**　　ti=q'láxan=a,　　t'u7 áoy=t'u7
　　get.fixed DET=fence=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

　　　kw=s=ka-máys=ts-a
　　　DET=NMLZ=CIRC-get.fixed=3POSS-CIRC
　　'The fence got fixed, but it couldn't get fixed.'
　　Consultant's comment: "Contradiction."

---

[4] We predict that a parallel interpretation will arise with states, but at the time of writing we have not yet tested this.

[5] The perfective is phonologically null in St'át'imcets. It is signalled by the absence of the imperfective auxiliary *wa7*.

(29) **máys-en**=lhkan   ti=q'láxan=a, t'u7 cw7áy=t'u7
  get.fixed-DIR=1SG.SBJ DET=fence=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

  kw=s=tsúkw-s-an
  DET=NMLZ-finish-CAUS-1SG.ERG
 'I fixed a fence, but I didn't finish.'

  When *séna7* is added to achievements and accomplishments, the former allow a subset of the interpretations allowed for the latter. With achievements, there are two main contexts where *séna7* appears. The first is when the expected result state of the event doesn't hold, as in (30)–(34).

(30) t'íq=k'a **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz kwas   wa7 lhkúnsa
  arrive=EPIS **CNTR** but NEG   DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS be now
  'He must have arrived, but he's not there now.'

(31) ts'áqw=t'u7 **séna7** ti=sts'úqwaz'=a … t'u7 cw7ít=t'u7 i=wá7
  get.eaten=EXCL**CNTR** DET=fish=EXIS   but much=EXCL PL.DET=IPFV

  s-k'wilh
  STAT-left
  'The fish got eaten … but there were lots of leftovers.'

(32) máys=t'u7 **séna7** inatcwas, … t'u7 plan múta7 qv<u>l</u>-wí<u>l</u>'c
  get.fixed=EXCL **CNTR** yesterday but already again bad-become
  'It got fixed yesterday … but it's already broken again.'

(33) tsícw=kan=t'u7   **séna7**… t'u7 xwem-7úl kw=s=tsem'p=s,
  get.there=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR** but quick-too DET=NMLZ=finish=3POSS

  nílh=t'u7 múta7 n=s=7úxwal'.
  COP=EXCL again 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=go.home.
  'I got there … but it was over already, so I came home.'

(34) *Context: I was invited to a meeting. I arrived there, and Lisa phoned.*
  Lisa: tsícw=kacw=ha?
    get.there=2SG.SBJ=Q
    'Did you get there?'

  Me: tsícw•ecw=kan   **séna7**, t'u7 áy=t'u7
    get.there•FRE=1SG.SBJ **CNTR** but NEG=EXCL

    kwas   wa7 k=Laura
    DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS be DET=Laura
    'I got there, but Laura wasn't there.'

The second interpretation for *séna7* on achievements is that the event didn't turn out well, as in (35)–(36). Both (32) above and (35) are the consultant's volunteered completions of sentences containing the same predicate, but they illustrate different ways in which the outcome of the event counts as unexpected.

(35) máys=t'u7   **séna7**   ti=q'láxan=a … t'u7 áoz=t'u7
     get.fixed=EXCL **CNTR**   DET=fence=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

      kwas   áma kw=s=xilh-ts-twítas
      DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS good DET=NMLZ=do-CAUS-3PL.ERG
      'The fence got fixed … but what they didn't wasn't good.'

(36) nq'íxts=t'u7 **séna7** ti=nk'wanústen=a, t'u7 áy=t'u7
     closed=EXCL **CNTR** DET=window=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

      kwas   stexw   ka-q'íxts-a
      DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS   really   CIRC-close-CIRC
      'The window was closed, but something was not right with it. Something is wrong with the window, it can't be closed properly.'

Accomplishments with the control transitivizer also have these two types of interpretation, plus an extra one. The failure of the result state to hold is shown in (37), and an 'unsuccessful' case is given in (38).

(37) mays-en=lhkán=t'u7   **séna7** inátcwas, t'u7 plan   múta7 qvl-wíl'c
     fix-DIR=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR** yesterday but already again bad-become
     'I fixed it yesterday, but it already broke again.'

(38) may-en-ítas=t'u7   **séna7** ti=q'láxan=a   … t'u7 áoz=t'u7
     fix-DIR-3PL.ERG=EXCL **CNTR** DET=fence=EXIS   but NEG=EXCL

      kwas   áma kw=s=xilh-twítas
      DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS good DET=NMLZ=do(CAUS)-3PL.ERG
      'They must have fixed the fence … but they didn't fix it good enough.'

The additional interpretation available for accomplishments with *séna7* is that the culmination didn't take place. This is illustrated in (39)–(40).[6]

---

[6] In (40), we infer non-culmination from the English translation using 'tried'. Since this example is predicted to also be able to mean that I *did* eat the fish, but didn't enjoy it, this requires further testing.

(39) mays-en=lhkán=t'u7 **séna7** ti=q'láxan=a … t'u7 áoy=t'u7
fix-DIR=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR** DET=fence=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

    kw=s=tsúkw-s-an
    DET=NMLZ=finish-CAUS-1SG.ERG
'I fixed the fence … but I didn't finish.'

(40) ts'aqw-an'=lhkán=t'u7 **séna7** ti=sts'úqwaz'=a … t'u7 áoy=t'u7
eat-DIR=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR** DET=fish=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

    kwas áma
    DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS good
'I tried to eat the fish … but it wasn't very good.'

Crucially, achievements cannot fail to culminate with *séna7*. (41) is rejected and the predicate is corrected to the accomplishment verb *máysen*.

(41) # máys=t'u7 **séna7** ti=q'láxan=a, t'u7 áoy=t'u7
fix=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR** DET=fence=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

    kw=s=tsúkw-s-an
    DET=NMLZ=finish-CAUS-1SG.ERG
'The fence got fixed, but I didn't finish it.'

We have seen that achievements with *séna7* give rise either to an interpretation where the result state fails to hold, or where there is something wrong with the way in which the event devolves. Accomplishments similarly allow both these interpretations, but in addition allow a 'failure to culminate' interpretation. Achievements can never fail to culminate in the perfective aspect with *séna7*.[7] This shows that while *séna7* encodes an unexpected outcome or occurrence, it cannot take away entailments. *Séna7* does not alter the truth conditions of the proposition to which it attaches.

2.4   Summary of interpretations

Table 1 summarizes the interpretations we have discovered with *séna7* for each Aktionsart. The result state and culmination tests are not applicable to states or activities, since these do not involve changes into result states and are fully atelic.

---

[7] Transitive achievements, marked with the causative/non-control transitivizer *-s*, do entail culmination, and are therefore predicted to behave like intransitive achievements when *séna7* is added. This prediction remains to be tested.

Table 1: Interpretations with *séna7*

	unexpected outcome/ co-occurring event	unsuccessful event	failure of result state	failure of culmination
States	√	not tested	N/A	N/A
Activities	√	√	N/A	N/A
Achievements	√	√	√	*
Accomplishments	√	√	√	√

We have already accounted for the absence of the 'failure of culmination' interpretation with achievements: this interpretation is unavailable because *séna7* does not have the power to defeat entailments of the proposition to which it applies. We argue that all the attested semantic effects can be unified as sub-cases of a single interpretation: *séna7* marks the unexpected co-occurrence of two true propositions. To put it slightly more precisely, the unified meaning of *séna7* (p) is that the speaker did not expect p to be true as well as another contextually salient proposition q. We expand further in the next section.

3   Analysis

Our proposed analysis is given informally in (42). The parameter c represents the context of utterance.

(42) $[\![$ *séna7* (p) $]\!]^c$ is felicitous if c contains a salient true proposition q and the speaker does not expect p and q to both be true.
If felicitous, $[\![$ *séna7* (p) $]\!]^c = [\![\ p\ ]\!]^c$.

As noted earlier, *séna7* does not affect truth conditions; instead, it imposes a felicity condition on the relation of a proposition to another salient proposition (explicit or implicit) within a discourse context.

Although our analysis is presented informally at this stage, we can nevertheless more or less see how it captures the data presented so far. For each aspectual class, p is *séna7*'s prejacent clause, and q is some other true proposition which the speaker does not expect to be true at the same time as p. For example, q might be a proposition which entails that the result state of the event described in p fails to hold. With accomplishments, q could be a proposition which entails that the event described in p failed to culminate. And with any aspectual class, q could be a proposition that entails that the event described in p did not take place well, or successfully.

We can also identify various further predictions and consequences of our proposal. The first thing to note is that the denotation in (42) requires the second proposition, $q,$ to be present in the context at the time of utterance. This predicts that if the addressee cannot recover q, *séna7* will be infelicitous. On the other hand, the unexpectedness requirement (of p and q both being true) is placed only

on the speaker. This predicts that the addressee need not share the speaker's assumptions about what counts as unexpected. These two predictions match our impression of the data collected so far, but they have not been explicitly tested and further research is required.

One thing we are fairly certain of is that the second proposition q is correctly characterized in (42): it must be contextually available, but it is not a syntactic argument of *séna7*. With respect to the first point, we observe that *séna7* strongly prefers to appear in a bi-clausal environment, overtly contrasting the two propositions p and q. Out of the blue, it is usually judged as infelicitous in a mono-clausal sentence, and consultants sometimes give revealing comments suggesting that some additional q must be invoked:

(43) ama=ká=t'u7   **séna7**   lh=nu=hás   ku=7úts'qa7
     good=IRR=EXCL **CNTR**   COMP=you=3SJV DET=go.out
     'It would be good if you went out.'
     *Consultant's comment: "I guess that would work ... **that séna7 just adds a sentence**."*

On the other hand, it is clear that *séna7* does not require two *syntactic* arguments, since mono-clausal sentences containing *séna7* are possible, and in many of these cases it is implausible that ellipsis has taken place. Moreover, even when there are two clauses, the contrasting proposition q is not always represented overtly by either of them. In (44), for example, it is not unexpected that a place to stay would be both good and expensive. Therefore, the contrast is not between the two overt clauses 'it looks good' and 'it is very expensive'. Rather, the fact that the place looks good (p) contrasts with the *implicitly* conveyed proposition q 'we won't stay here'.

(44) *Context: A asks B 'Shall we stay here?' B replies:*
     áma=t'u7   lákw7a **séna7**,   t'u7 kéla7=t'u7   cw7it-usa7-[7]úl
     good=EXCL DEIC   **CNTR**   but very=EXCL   much-money-too
     'It looks good, but it is very expensive.'
     p: It looks good.   *q:* We won't stay here.

Another case showing that q does not have to correspond to an overtly expressed proposition is given in (45). Here, *séna7* encodes the unexpectedness of my not having another drink, even though I have money. Crucially, q is not 'I've already had enough to drink', the second overt clause. Instead, q is 'I'm not having another drink', an unexpressed implicature of the second overt clause.

(45) A: cúz'=lhkacw=ha   úqwa7 ku=pála7   múta7?
      PROSP=2SG.SBJ=Q   drink   DET=one   more
      'Are you going to have another drink?'

B: cw7ao
   NEG
   'No.'

A: icwa7=lhkácw=ha   es=qláw'?
   without=2SG.SBJ=Q   have=money
   'Don't you have any money?'

B: wá7=lhkan   **séna7**   es=qláw',   t'u7 plan   í7ez'
   IPFV=1SG.SBJ   **CNTR**   have=money but already   enough

    n-s-7úqwa7
    1SG.POSS-NMLZ-drink
   'I have money, but I've already had enough to drink.'
   p: I have money.   *q:* I'm not having another drink.

    We have found that *q* can be provided in a number of different ways. The first is from generalized implicatures that derive from the lexical semantics of the predicate. These include – as shown above – the implicatures that accomplishments will culminate, that achievements have persistent result states, and that activities will be performed successfully. Second, *q* can be derived from prior discourse. Consider the example in (46).

(46)   *Context: I'll tell you guys what happened when my face got burned. I got burned when I was a child. My mother was working out there in the back. She was fixing some fish we must have been going to eat. My brother Dicky was around. He was helping my mother there. So my mother told him, "Go look at the baby, and see if she's okay." So he went inside.*
   tsicw,   s=7áts'x-en-as   láti7 **séna7** s-law
   get.there   nmlz=see-dir-3erg   deic **cntr** stat-hang

    l=ti=tsepalín=a
    in=DET=baby.basket=EXIS
   'He got there and saw that the baby basket was hanging there, sure
   enough.'   (Laura Thevarge, in Matthewson 2005:272–273)
   p: The baby basket was hanging there. *q:* The baby wasn't all right.

    In this discourse context, the addressee knows that the unexpected *q* must relate to the speaker having been burnt. This is unexpected given that the baby basket was hanging there, apparently unharmed.
    The proposition *q* can also be provided by unspoken discourse context, as illustrated in (47). Here, the physical context is such that the seven people cannot fit in; this does not need to be explicitly stated.

(47) *Context: Seven people are trying to get into a car. The driver says:*
xzum   **séna7**   ti=n-káoh=a
big   **CNTR**   DET=1SG.POSS-car=EXIS
'My car is big.'
Consultant's comment: "Means they can't all fit in."
p: My car is big.   *q:* They can't all fit in.

Finally, as observed earlier, *q* can be provided by conversational implicature. A further example of this is given in (48). Here, *séna7* is not contrasting going out with not having money: it is contrasting going out with not having fun, which is conversationally implicated by not having any money.

(48) ṣaotatih-am=lhkán=tu7   **séna7**   inátcwas,   t'u7 ícwa7=lhkan
     Saturday-MID=1SG.SBJ=DIST   **CNTR**   yesterday   but without=1SG.SBJ

        es=qláw'
        have=money
     'I went out yesterday, but I didn't have any money.'
     Consultant's comment: "He went, but he didn't have any money so he didn't have much fun."
     p: I went out.   *q:* I didn't have much fun.

As we predict, a *séna7* sentence is rejected if no *q* can be recovered by any of these methods. This is supported by the frequent rejection of mono-clausal *séna7*-sentences out of the blue. In (49) and (50) and (repeated from (6) and (20) above), the first clause was originally offered to the consultant and rejected. It becomes fine when an appropriate *q* is added as follow-up.

(49) zwát-en=lhkan   **séna7** kw=s=cuz'   kwis … mes=kán=t'u7
     know-dir=1sg.sbj   **cntr** det=nmlz=prosp   rain but=1sg.sbj=excl

        tsicw   mám'teq
        get.there   go.for.walk
     'I knew it was going to rain … but I went for a walk anyway.'

(50) it'-em=lhkán=t'u7   **séna7**   l=ti=s-gáw'-p=a …
     sing-MID=1SG.SBJ=EXCL   **CNTR**   at=DET=NMLZ-meet-INCH=EXIS

        t'u7 áoy=t'u7   swat   ku=k'alán'-min'-ts-as
        but NEG=EXCL   who   DET=listen-RLT-1SG.OBJ-3ERG
     'I sang at the gathering … but nobody listened.'

One thing which will require formalization in future work is the notion of 'speaker expectation'. We note so far that this covers both failed intentions (thus relating to teleological, or more generally priority, modality) and predictions (relating to epistemic modality). In (51), for example, *séna7* accompanies a report of a failed plan (to kill deer), but in (52), there is no plan for them (riders in a

'suicide race') to get hurt. It is simply that the speaker did not expect them to escape unscathed from this dangerous situation.

(51) píxem'=wit **séna7** áku7 sqwém=a, t'u7 áy=t'u7
hunt=3PL **CNTR** DEIC mountain=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

kw=s=7ats'x-en-ítas ku=ts'í7
DET=NMLZ=see-DIR-3PL.ERG DET=deer
'They went hunting in the mountains, but they didn't see any deer.'
p: They went hunting.   *q:* They didn't see any deer.

(52) k'ínk'net=ti7 **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz kw=s=wá7=wit xan'
dangerous=DEM **CNTR** but NEG DET=NMLZ=IPFV=3PL get.hurt
'It was dangerous, but they didn't get hurt.'
p: It was dangerous.   *q:* They didn't get hurt.
(Beverley Frank, in Matthewson 2005:92)

4   Extensions

In this section we show how *séna7* interacts with markers of future time reference, and with motion verbs. We show that the results are as predicted, and furthermore that *séna7* provides a useful diagnostic for prospective semantics and for telicity.

4.1   *Séna7* and future time reference

Here we discuss the interaction of *séna7* with the two grammatical means of inducing future time reference in St'át'imcets: the future-oriented modal clitic *=kelh,* and the future-oriented aspectual auxiliary *cuz'*. We will show that *séna7* gives rise to different readings with these two elements, and that the attested interpretations are as predicted by the analyses of these two elements proposed by Glougie (2008).
        Examples of *=kelh* and *cuz'* are given in (53). As a rough approximation, *=kelh* corresponds to English *will/would* or future-oriented *might,* while *cuz'* corresponds to English *is/was going to*. See Van Eijk (1997), Matthewson (2006), Rullmann et al. (2008) and Davis (2012) for discussion.

(53) **cúz'**=lhkalh ncwíl-cal ku=kosoh-álhts'a7. ncwil-in'-ém=**kelh**
prosp=1sg.sbj roast-act det=pig-meat roast-dir-1pl.erg=**fut**

ku=cín'
DET=long.time
'We're going to roast some pork. We will roast it for a long time.'
(Alexander et al. in prep)

Glougie (2008) argues that *=kelh* places the reference time after the evaluation time (which often equals the utterance time), while *cuz'* is a pure prospective aspect which places the event time after the reference time. In (53),

then, the *cuz'*-clause states that the reference time, which is the same as the utterance time, is earlier than an event of roasting.[8] The *kelh*-clause says that the roasting will take place inside some reference time which follows the utterance time. In simple cases like this, the results are very similar, but Glougie shows that the two elements diverge in cases where an event is already planned at the utterance time. In such cases only *cuz'* is acceptable, not *=kelh,* as shown in (54).[9]

(54) *Context: You are going to D'Arcy for the weekend. You have already purchased your bus ticket, and you leave tomorrow morning at 8:00am. I ask you what your plans are for the weekend. How do you respond?*

   a. **cúz'**=lhkan   nas   áku7   nk'wwátqwa7   natcw
      PROSP=1SG.SBJ   go.to DEIC   D'Arcy   tomorrow
      'I am going to D'Arcy tomorrow.'

   b.#nás=kan=**kelh**   áku7   nk'wwátqwa7   natcw
      go.to=1SG.SBJ=**FUT** DEIC   D'Arcy   tomorrow
      'I might go to D'Arcy tomorrow.'   (Glougie 2008)

Glougie notes that:

> (b) is perfectly grammatical, and would be an appropriate answer to the question "What are you doing this weekend?" if the speaker was only considering going away for the weekend and had not yet purchased a bus ticket. However, once the bus ticket is purchased, only *cuz'* is permissible. (Glougie 2008)

    With both *=kelh* and *cuz',* the evaluation time need not be the utterance time, but can be a past time as well. This is parallel to the situation in English, where *will* has a past-shifted form *would,* and *is going to* has a past-shifted form *was going to.* Past-shifted examples of *=kelh* and *cuz'* are given in (55) and 0 respectively.

---

[8] Glougie argues that *cuz'* does not introduce modality; we do not necessarily subscribe to this proposal. The modality question is independent of what crucially distinguishes *=kelh* and *cuz'* in the context of *séna7,* which is the respective configurations of utterance time, reference time, and event time.

[9] Relatedly, they also diverge when it comes to offering contexts as discussed by Copley (2002, 2009): only *=kelh* can be used to make a felicitous offer, not *cuz'*.

(55) *Context: Mike Leech is currently chief of T'ít'q'et. His (deceased) mother was called Julianne.*

zwát-en-as	s=Julianne	kwas	kúkwpi7=**kelh**
know-DIR-3ERG	NMLZ=Julianne	DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS	chief=**FUT**

ta=skúza7-s=a	i=kwís=as
DET=child-3POSS=EXIS	when.PST=fall=3SJV

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

(Matthewson 2006:689)

(56)

nás=kalh	áku7 ts'úqwaz'-am,	nilh	ti=s-tlh-áyen=a	**cuz'**
go=1PL.SBJ	DEIC fish-MID	COP	DET=NMLZ-stretch-net=EXIS	**PROSP**

qwez-en-ém
use-DIR-1PL.ERG

'We went fishing, we were going to use a gillnet.'

(Beverley Frank, in Matthewson 2005:54)

Let us turn now to the interaction of *séna7* with markers of future time reference. It turns out that with =*kelh*, *séna7* (*p*) imparts that the event described by *p* will happen, in spite of some other proposition *q*, while with *cuz'*, *séna7* (*p*) imparts that the prejacent event was going to happen, but the event described by *q* happened instead.

Data with =*kelh* are given in (57)–(59). In each case, the speaker makes a prediction about a future event. In addition, there is some contextually recoverable true proposition *q*, and the speaker finds it unexpected that *q* is true as well as *p*.

(57)

ilhen=**kélh**=ti7	**séna7**
eat=**FUT**=DEM	**CNTR**

'He will eat.'

Consultant's volunteered context: When there's a big line up, and running low on food, but they'll serve him anyway.

p: He will eat.　　　　　*q:* They're running low on food.

(58)

úqwa7=**kelh**	**séna7**	ku=qú7
drink=**FUT**	**CNTR**	DET=water

'He will drink water.'

Consultant's volunteered context: If he was on a mountain, and he doesn't know whether the water is good, but he'll drink it anyway.

p: He will drink water.　　　　*q:* He doesn't know if the water is good.

(59) lh=wá7=as lákw7a ku=wá7 mám'teq láku7 álts'qa7=sw=a,
    if=be=3SJV DEIC DET=IPFVwalk.around DEIC outside=2SG.POSS=EXIS

    ama=**kélh**=t'u7 **séna7** kwásu ts7as e=ts7á
    good=**FUT**=EXCL **CNTR** DET+NMLZ+IPFV+2SG.POSS come to=here

    n-tsítcw=a.
    1sg.poss-house=exis

    'If it sounds like someone is walking around there, it would be good if you come to my place.'
    p: It will be good if you come to my place. *q:* You don't live with me.

These data are as predicted given Glougie's analysis of $=kelh$ and our analysis of *séna7*. The future modal $=kelh$ places the reference time after the evaluation time, which in these examples is the utterance time. *Séna7*'s prejacent proposition, which contains $=kelh,$ therefore asserts that an eventuality will take place at that future reference time. (Like any modal claim, $=kelh$ (p) makes an assertion only about possible worlds, but nevertheless, a future modal proposition is truth-conditionally asserted.) Finally, *séna7* contributes that the speaker doesn't expect that $=kelh$ (p) and some contextually available q are both true: in other words, the speaker asserts that an eventuality will happen in the future, and in addition conveys that something unexpected will also happen. This gives rise to an 'in spite of' or 'anyway' reading.

Data with *cuz'* are given in (60)–(62). Here we get a quite different interpretation.

(60) **cúz'**=k'a zam' **séna7** tsut wa7 "qwa<7>ez'-álhmec",
    PROSP=EPISwell **CNTR** say IPFV blue<INCH>belly

    nilh s=ka-tsút=s-a "qwa<7>y-án'ak"=ku7.
    COP NMLZ=CIRC-say-3POSS-CIRC blue<INCH>belly=REP

    'So he was apparently going to say he was *qwa7ez'álhmec*, but he accidentally said *qwa7yán'ak* instead.'
                        (Carl Alexander, in Callahan et al. in press:149)
    p: He was going to say *qwa7ez'álhmec*. *q:* He said *qwa7yán'ak*.

(61) nilh **séna7** n=s=**cuz'** p'án't-s, t'u7
    COP **CNTR** 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=**PROSP** return-CAUS but

    ka-law-a=t'ú7=a múta7
    CIRC-hang-CIRC=EXCL=*A* again

    'I tried to put it back, but it was just hanging there.'
                        (Carl Alexander, in Callahan et al. in press:244)
    p: I was going to put it back. *q:* It hung there.

(62) nílh=tu7 **séna7** ku=s=Father Paterson   ku=**cúz'**
     COP=DIST **CNTR**   DET=NMLZ=Father.Paterson   DET=**PROSP**

    melyih-s-tumúlh-as,   t'u7 láni7=tu7   i=qwatsáts=as
    marry-CAUS-1PL.OBJ-3ERG but DEIC=DIST when.PST=leave=3SJV

    kn=ká7=as   s=Father Paterson
    around=where=3SJV   NMLZ=Father.Paterson
  'It was supposed to have been Father Paterson who was going to marry us,
  but Father Paterson had left and gone somewhere.'

                         (Gertrude Ned, in Matthewson 2005:213)

  p: Father Paterson was going to marry us. *q:* He didn't marry us.

Again, the results fall out from the analysis. *Cuz'* places the event time after the reference time, which in these examples is a past time. *Séna7'*s prejacent proposition thus makes a claim about a pre-state of an event (for example, the state of having a plan to do something). The addition of *séna7* conveys that there is some other proposition *q* that is unexpected given *cuz'* (*p*) (the claim that there was a pre-state of an eventuality). The most natural case is that *q* entails that the expected plan was not fulfilled. The *cuz'* data are very similar to cases where *séna7'*s prejacent is a lexical stative, as discussed in Section 2.1. For example, just as *séna7* when applied to a proposition about wanting something frequently conveys that the expected outcome of that desire (getting the thing) remains unfulfilled, *séna7* on a *cuz'*-proposition conveys that the expected outcome of the pre-state of an eventuality happening (the eventuality actually happening) remains unfulfilled.[10]

Summarizing this section, we have shown that *séna7* gives rise to different interpretations with the two markers of futurity, *=kelh* vs. *cuz'*. With *=kelh,* the truth conditions assert that the prejacent event will happen, and *séna7* conveys that something else will happen which is not expected to simultaneously be true. With *cuz',* the truth conditions assert that the prejacent event was planned to happen, and *séna7* conveys that counter to expectations, it didn't happen after all. We have argued that these are exactly the readings predicted by Glougie's (2008) analysis of *=kelh* and *cuz'* as a future-oriented modal and a prospective aspect, respectively.

---

[10] The reader may have noticed that the *=kelh* + *séna7* data involve present evaluation times ('will', not 'would'-readings), while the *cuz'* + *séna7* data involve past evaluation times ('was going to', not 'is going to' readings). Our analysis predicts in addition that *=kelh* cases could allow past evaluation times, with readings such as 'the event described in *p* was predicted to happen, in spite of *q*.' We hope to confirm this in future elicitation.

Our analysis also technically predicts the existence of *cuz'* + *séna7* cases with present evaluation times, but these would be pragmatically very odd. They would simultaneously assert that some event is going to happen, and that some other unexpected thing will prevent that event from happening.

4.2   *Séna7* and motion verbs

St'át'imcets possesses four motion verbs which can be used as auxiliaries as well as main predicates, and which form a paradigm based on two dimensions, as shown in Table 2 (from Davis 2012, Chapter 16).

Table 2: Motion verbs

	Destination reached	Destination not reached
Motion towards speaker	*t'iq*	*ts7as*
Motion away from speaker	*Tsicw*	*nas*

Simple examples of each verb are given in (63)–(66), from Davis (2012, Chapter 16). As discussed by Davis, the different tenses used to translate *t'iq* and *tsicw* on the one hand (past) vs. *ts7as* and *nas* on the other (present) do not reflect a real tense effect. They are the result of combining telic vs. atelic predicates with the null non-future tense (Matthewson 2006).

(63) **t'íq**=wit   e=ts7á Sát'=a   lhl-[l]áku7   Lh7ús=a
     arrive=3PL to=DEIC Lillooet=EXIS from=DEIC Lh7us=EXIS
     'They came here to Sat' from over there at Lh7us.'

(64) **tsícw**=wit   áku7   Lh7ús=a   lhel-ts7á   Sát'=a
     get.there=3PL DEIC   Lh7us=EXIS from=DEIC Lillooet=EXIS
     'They went over there to Lh7us from here at Sat'.'

(65) **ts7ás**=wit   e=ts7á Sát'=a   lhl-[l]áku7   Lh7ús=a
     come=3PL to=here Lillooet=EXIS from=DEIC Lh7us=EXIS
     'They are coming here to Sat' from over there at Lh7us.'

(66) **nás**=wit   áku7   Lh7ús=a   lhel-ts7á   Sát'=a
     go=3PL   DEIC   Lh7us=EXIS from=DEIC Lillooet=EXIS
     'They are going over there to Lh7us from here at Sat'."

When we add *séna7* to sentences containing motion verbs, nothing unexpected happens with the telic ones. Like the other achievement verbs discussed in Section 2.3, *t'iq* and *tsicw* retain their culmination with *séna7*. *Séna7* indicates some unexpected outcome of the event, such as the failure of the result state to hold or the failure to meet the person one was intending to visit.

(67) **t'íq**=k'a   **séna7**, t'u7 cw7aoz kwas   wa7 lhkúnsa
     arrive=EPIS **CNTR** but NEG DET+NMLZ+IPFV+3POSS be now
     'He must have arrived, but he's not there now.'
     p: He must have arrived.   q: He's not there now.

(68) **t'íq**=ti7   **séna7**,   t'u7 cw7aoz kwa   wa7
    arrive=DEM **CNTR**   but NEG   DET+NMLZ+IPFV be
    'He arrived but there was nobody home.'
    p: He arrived.   q: Nobody was home.

(69) **tsícw**=kan=t'u7   **séna7**,   t'u7 cw7it
    get.there=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR**   but much

    i=n-száyten=a
    PL.DET=1SG.POSS-business=EXIS
    'I went, but I had too many things to do.'
    Consultant's comment: "He went, but didn't stay, because there was too
    much things to do."
    p: I got there.   q: I didn't stay.

(70) **tsícw**=kan=t'u7   **séna7** … t'u7 xwem-7úl
    get.there=1SG.SBJ=EXCL **CNTR**   but   fast-too

    kw=s=tsem'p=s,   nilh=t'u7   múta7
    DET=NMLZ=finish=3POSS   COP=EXCL   again

    n=s=7úxwal'
    1SG.POSS=NMLZ=go.home
    'I got there … but it was over already, so I came home.'
    p: I got there.   q: I came home.

(71) **tsicw**=kan=tu7   **séna7**,   t'u7   kan   páqu7-min
    get.there=1SG.SBJ=DIST **CNTR**   but   1SG.SBJ   afraid-RLT

    kwenswá   s-lheqw
    DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+IPFV   STAT-ride
    'I went, but I'm scared to ride horses.'
    p: I got there.   q: I didn't ride.

    The non-cancelability of the culmination with *t'iq/tsicw* and *séna7* is illustrated in (72)–(73).

(72) #**t'íq**=t'u7   **séna7**, t'u7 qacw•cw-áw'lh   nilh s=p'án't=s
    arrive=EXCL **CNTR** but break•FRE-vehicle COP NMLZ=return=3POSS

    úxwal'
    go.home
    'She arrived, but her car broke down so she went home.'
    Consultant's comment: "Change t'iq *to* ts7as*: then okay."*

(73) #**tsícw**=ti7   **séna7**   áta7   Lil'wat7úl=a,   t'u7 cw7áoy=t'u7
     get.there=DEM   **CNTR**   DEIC   Lil'wat7úl=EXIS   but   NEG=EXCL

         kw=s=tsícw•ecw=s
         DET=NMLZ=get.there•FRE=3POSS
     'She got to Lil'wat7úl, but she didn't get there.'
     *Consultant's comment: "These two [*tsicw *and* séna7] *are against each other."*

Nas and *ts7as* show a different pattern. As they are atelic, they allow an interpretation whereby the agent fails to reach her destination, as in (74). However, they also allow an interpretation which is not available for ordinary activity predicates: that no motion took place. This is illustrated in (75)–(77). Notice that the acceptable (74) forms a minimal pair with the unacceptable (73), and that (69) and (75) form a minimal pair with different interpretations.

(74) **nás**=ti7   **séna7**   áta7   Lil'wat7úl=a,   t'u7 cw7áoy=t'u7
     go=DEM   **CNTR**   DEIC   Lil'wat7úl=EXIS   but   NEG=EXCL

         kw=s=tsícw•ecw=s
         DET=NMLZ=get.there•FRE=3POSS
     'She went to Lil'wat7úl, but she didn't get there.'
     p: She went.   q: She didn't get there.

(75) **nás**=kan=t'u7   **séna7**,   t'u7 cw7it
     go=1SG.SBJ=EXCL   **CNTR**   but   much

         i=n-száyten=a
         PL.DET=1SG.POSS-business=EXIS
     'I was gonna go, but I had lots of things to do, so I didn't go.'
     p: I was going to go.   q: I didn't go.

(76) **ts7ás**=kan   **séna7**,   t'u7   cw7aoz-wíl'c
     come=1SG.SBJ   **CNTR**   but   NEG-become
     'I was going to come, but I decided not to.'
                                    (Alexander et al. in prep.)
     p: I was going to come.   q: I'm not coming.

(77) **ts7ás**=ti7   **séna7**,   t'u7 cw7aoz kwa   wa7
     come=DEM **CNTR**   but   NEG   DET+NMLZ+IPFV be
     'He was coming, but there was nobody home.'
     p: He was going to come.   q: He didn't come.

Two final, spontaneously offered examples illustrate *nas* being used as an auxiliary rather than a main predicate, with the same ability to have the prejacent event canceled.

(78) *Context: "Oh," he said, "Richard went hunting."*
nás=t'u7=tu7 **séna7** n-zán-em,   t'u7 áoz=t'u7 múta7
go=EXCL=DIST **CNTR** LOC-circle-MID but NEG=EXCL again

   kw=s=t'iq=s,   i=kel7=át=t'u7   t'iq
   DET=NMLZ=arrive=3POSS when.PST=first=1PL.SBJV=EXCL arrive
'He was just going to go around in a circle, but he never came back to
where we first came to.'   (Carl Alexander, in Callahan et al. in press:265)
p: He was just going to go around in a circle.   q: He never came back.

(79) t'akm'íc=kalh aylh láti7 i=**nás**=at   **séna7** nlham'
go.by=1SG.SBJ now DEIC when.PST=**go**=1PL.SVJ **CNTR** get.in

   l=ki=t'láoz'-s=a   ku=kaoh, áw'w'et=kalh aylh múta7!
   at=PL.DET=canoe-3POSS=EXIS DET=car late=1PL.SBJ now again
'We went right past when we were trying to get on the ferry, and then we
were late!'   (Alexander et al. in prep.)

The behaviour of *nas* and *ts7as* matches that of *cuz'* as discussed above:
unlike ordinary predicates, they allow an interpretation with *séna7* where the
prejacent event was planned to take place, but does not. We therefore conclude
that they have a reading as prospective aspects.[11] This in turn shows that *séna7*
functions as a language-internal diagnostic for elements which incorporate
prospective semantics.[12]

---

[11] There is a fifth motion verb, *t'ak* 'to go along', which indicates (continuing) motion
along a path; see Van Eijk (2007, 2013), Davis (2012), Alexander et al. (in prep.). We have
not yet investigated its behaviour with *séna7*, but we predict that it will have one of the two
readings we ascribe to *nas* and *ts7as*: namely, an atelic motion reading, but not a
prospective aspectual one.
[12] Relatedly, the only other cases we have found where a prejacent event can fail to take
place with *séna7* involve the imperfective auxiliary *wa7*, as in (i)–(ii):

(i) **wá7**=lhkalh **séna7** tsicw   ts'úqwaz'-am
     IPFV=1PL.SBJ **CNTR** get.there fish-MID
     'We were going to go fishing.'   (Laura Thevarge, in Matthewson 2005:301)

(ii) **wá7**=lhkalh **séna7** ts'úqwaz'-am, mes=kálh   múta7 wa7 tsláoy-am!
     IPFV=1PL.SBJ **CNTR** fish-MID   but=1PL.SBJ again IPFV July-MID
     'We were supposed to be fishing and yet we were out having a July holiday!'
        (Laura Thevarge, in Matthewson 2005:310)

5 First steps towards a cross-Salishan perspective: *Séna7* versus Bella Coola *su*

In a remarkably prescient and original paper on the Bella Coola particle *su*, Saunders and Davis (1977) produce the first – and hitherto only published – pragmatic analysis of any Salish discourse adverbial.[13] Though the meaning of *su* is clearly distinct from that of *séna7*, we include it here in order to provide a first cross-Salishan comparison of discourse adverbs.

The particle *su* has two sets of apparently contradictory meanings. The first involves an element of ignorance or surprise – either on the behalf of the hearer, as in (80), or the speaker, as in (81):[14]

(80) talaws-nu   **su**
     marry-2SG.SBJ   *SU*
     'You know what? You got married (last night).'[15]

Furthermore, both these examples come from a speaker of the Lower (Lil'wat7úl) dialect, as does a similar textual example from Van Eijk and Williams (1981):

(iii) cw7áoz=qa7 **séna7**   kwenswá   guy't,   meskán=t'u7
      NEG=PRSUP **CNTR** DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+**IPFV** sleep   but=1SG.SBJ=EXCL

        ka-gúy't-a=t'u7
        CIRC-sleep-CIRC=EXCL
      'I didn't mean to sleep, but I just fell asleep all the same.'
                       (Rosie Joseph, in Van Eijk and Williams 1981:12)

Interestingly, Davis (2012) re-elicited the example in (iii) from an Upper St'át'imcets speaker, who inserted prospective *cuz'*:

(iv) cw7áoz=wi7 **séna7**   kwenswá   **cuz'**   guy't,
      NEG=EMPH **CNTR** DET+1SG.POSS+NMLZ+**IPFV** **PROSP** sleep

        zamas=kán=t'u7   ka-gúy't-a=t'u7
        but=1SG.SBJ=EXCL CIRC-sleep-CIRC=EXCL
      'I didn't mean to sleep, but I just fell asleep all the same.' (Davis 2012, Chapter 38)

Thus, rather than being counter-examples to our claim that *séna7* does not affect truth-conditions, these data likely indicate that in Lower St'át'imcets, *wa7* allows prospective interpretations. Further research is required.

[13] Though Saunders and Davis refer to *su* as a 'particle', its morphosyntactic distribution suggests it should probably be treated as part of a second-position clitic string.

[14] Saunders and Davis's transcriptions have been slightly adjusted to fit the transcription conventions used here.

[15] Morpheme glosses for the Bella Coola examples have been inserted by the authors.

(81) qup̓-cinu   a   **su**
     punch-1SG.ERG+2SG.OBJ   Q   *SU*
     'Did I punch you (last night, when I was drunk)?'

<div align="right">(Saunders and Davis 1977:211)</div>

The second appears to have an almost opposite semantic value, typically translated by speakers as 'again':

(82) kma-ak-c   **su**
     hurt-hand-1SG.SBJ   *SU*
     'My hand is hurting again.'

(83) cp-ixʷ   a   **su**   ti-q̓ǔumtimut-t x
     wipe-2SG.ERG   Q   *SU*   DET-car-DET
     'Are you wiping the car again?'   (Saunders and Davis 1977:211–212)

Saunders and Davis extract a common pragmatic core of *expectability* from these apparently disparate meanings. Their basic idea is that *su* is sensitive to either speaker or hearer knowledge (or both, but not neither). If the speaker has knowledge of the event denoted by a proposition, but the hearer does not, the pragmatic consequence will be (anticipated) hearer surprise, as in (80); conversely, if the hearer has knowledge of the event but the speaker does not (typically, because s/he does not remember it), the consequence is speaker surprise, as in as in (81). On the other hand, if both speaker and hearer have prior knowledge of the event denoted by the proposition, then nothing is surprising, with the implication that the event is either continuing or repeated: hence the translation in (82) and (83) of 'again'. (The fourth logical possibility is ruled out as pragmatically infelicitous: presumably the event denoted by a proposition cannot be unknown to *both* speaker and hearer.)

Though as analyzed by Saunders and Davis, *su* falls squarely into the domain of discourse-sensitive sentential adverbs, its meaning is clearly distinct from that of *séna7*. To start with, *su* appears to be confined to the epistemological dimension – it is specifically sensitive to knowledge – while *séna7* can equally well apply to the teleological/priority modal dimension, involving plans, intentions, and so on. Second, *su* can apply to either the speaker or the hearer (or also, in fact, to a third party), but *séna7* is always speaker-centred. And third, and most crucially, *su* is non-contrastive: though it invokes a discourse context, its domain is a single proposition, not a pair of opposing propositions.

6   Conclusion

In this paper, we have offered the first formal pragmatic analysis of a Salish discourse adverb, St'át'imcets *séna7*. We have argued that *séna7* has no effect on truth conditions, but imposes a felicity condition on the discourse context, repeated in (84):

(84) $[\![$ *séna7 (p)* $]\!]^c$ is felicitous if *c* contains a salient true proposition *q* and the speaker does not expect *p* and *q* to both be true.

We have also shown how *séna7* can be used as a diagnostic tool for teasing out subtle distinctions between entailments and implicatures, illustrating with test cases from three different semantic domains. In the first, *séna7* acts as a diagnostic for telicity, helping to distinguish achievements, which have a culmination entailment, from control accomplishments, which only have culmination implicatures. In the second, *séna7* helps to distinguish between two ways of expressing future time reference: with the prospective auxiliary *cuz'*, *séna7* cancels the expectation that a future event took place, but with the modal enclitic *=kelh*, there is a lexical entailment that the reference time follows the utterance time, which *séna7* cannot cancel. Finally, *séna7* distinguishes between two classes of motion verbs: with one class, which acts essentially like achievements, a destination is always reached, with or without *séna7*; but with the other, not only is the destination not necessarily reached, but *séna7* has the ability to completely cancel the motion event, demonstrating that the members of this second class have become reanalyzed as prospective aspect markers.

Obviously, much work remains to be done. To start with, we need a more precise characterization of which clause *séna7* can appear in; there appears to be speaker variation with respect to how freely it can occur in the second of two contrasting clauses (with some speakers even allowing it to optionally appear in both), but we have not yet investigated this issue in detail.

Secondly, we have noticed that for some speakers, *séna7* has a 'modal flavour' even without an accompanying overt modal enclitic: these speakers sometimes either translate *séna7* as 'supposed to' or indicate that its use implies a lack of knowledge on the part of the speaker, suggesting that it has deontic and/or epistemic readings. We have not yet explored this thoroughly.

Thirdly, we have not yet systematically investigated the relation of *séna7* to speech act participants and/or perspective holders; though our impression is that it is always speaker-oriented, this needs to be backed up with more thorough elicitation.

Fourthly, aside from *séna7*, St'át'imcets has at least four other elements with contrastive meanings: the conjunctions *t'u7*, *k'ámalh* and *zámas/mes=t'u7*, and the second position enclitic *=hem'*, all of which can co-occur with *séna7*, and indeed appear in many of the example sentences in this paper.[16] The three conjunctions are all translated as 'but' by van Eijk (2013) and Alexander et al. (in prep.), but as noted by these authors, they have partially different contexts of use. The enclitic *=hem'* is glossed as 'antithetical' by Van Eijk (1997), 'for sure' or 'the real thing' by Van Eijk (2013), and 'actually or really' by Alexander et. al (in prep.); as with *séna7*, these labels reveal more about the difficulty of finding an adequate translation for *=hem'* than about the meaning of the element itself. The

---

[16] The *t'u7* in *zámas/mes=t'u7* is not the conjunction *t'u7* 'but', but the 'exclusive' enclitic *=t'u7* 'still, just, yet'.

relation of *séna7* to these other markers of contrast is obviously another important topic for future research.

Finally, aside from a brief excursus on Bella Coola *su*, we have not yet attempted any cross-linguistic comparison between *séna7* and semantically similar elements in other languages, including the well-studied contrastive English conjunctions *even though, but,* and *in spite of,* as well as elements in less well known languages such as the Tohono O'odham 'frustrative' particle *cem* (Hale 1969, Copley 2005, Copley and Harley 2014). The relation between *séna7* and these elements is another important matter for future research.

References

Alexander, C., H. Davis, B. Frank, G. Ned, J. Lyon, D. Peters Sr., L. Redan, C. Shields, C. Scotchman and R. Whitley (in prep.). *Nqwal'uttenlhkálha: An English to Upper St'át'imcets dictionary.* Vancouver, BC and Lillooet, BC: University of British Columbia Occasional Papers in Linguistics and the Upper St'át'imc Language, Culture and Education Society.

Bar-el, L. (2005). *Aspectual distinctions in Skwxwú7mesh* (PhD dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Bar-el, L., H. Davis and L. Matthewson. (2005). On non-culminating accomplishments. In L. Bateman & C. Ussery (Eds.), *NELS 35: Proceedings of the 35th annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society* (Vol. 1, pp. 87–102). Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Bochnak, R. and L. Matthewson (Eds.). (2015). *Methodologies in semantic fieldwork.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Callahan, E., H. Davis, J. Lyon and L. Matthewson (in press). *Sqwéqwel' Múta7 Sptakwlh: St'át'imcets Narratives by Qwa7yan'ak (Carl Alexander).* Vancouver, BC and Lillooet, BC: University of British Columbia Occasional Papers in Linguistics and the Upper St'át'imc Language, Culture and Education Society.

Copley, B. (2002). *The semantics of the future* (PhD dissertation). MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Copley, B. (2005). When the actual world isn't inertial: Tohono O'odham *cem*. In M. Becker and A. McKenzie (Eds.), *Proceedings of SULA 3: Semantics of Underrepresented Languages in the Americas*, University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers: Vol 33. (pp. 1–18). Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Copley, B. (2009). *The semantics of the future.* (Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics). New York: Routledge.

Copley, B. and H. Harley. (2014). Eliminating causative entailments with the force-theoretic framework: The case of the Tohono O'odham frustrative *cem*. In B. Copley and F. Martin (Eds.), *Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics: Vol. 52. Causation in grammatical structures*, (pp. 120–151). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, H. (2012). *A teacher's grammar of Upper St'át'imcets.* Ms., University of British Columbia.

Davis, H., J. Lyon and J. van Eijk (in prep.). *Upper St'át'imcets Stories: Narratives by Bill Edwards, Sam Mitchell and Martina LaRochelle.* Vancouver, BC and Lillooet, BC: University of British Columbia Occasional Papers in Linguistics and the Upper St'át'imc Language, Culture and Education Society.

Davis, J. (1978). Pronominal Paradigms in Sliammon. In *Papers for the 13th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages* (pp. 208–236). Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

Gerdts, D.B. (2008). Halkomelem limited control constructions. Paper presented for Spring 2008 Colloquium Series, Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Glougie, J. (2008). Future expressions in St'át'imcets. Ms., University of British Columbia.

Hale, K. (1969). Papago /čim/. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, *35*(2), 203–212.

Jacobs, P. (2011). *Control in Skwx̱wú7mesh* (PhD dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Kiyota, M. (2008). *Situation aspect and viewpoint aspect: From Salish to Japanese* (PhD Dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Matthewson, L. (2004a). On the absence of telic accomplishments in St'át'imcets. In C. Ravinski & Y. Chung (Eds.), *Proceedings of WSCLA 9*, UBC Working Papers in Linguistics: Vol 15. (pp. 65–78). Vancouver, BC: UBCWPL.

Matthewson, L. (2004b). On the methodology of semantic fieldwork. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, *70*(4), 369–415.

Matthewson, L. (2005). *When I was small—i wan kwikws: A grammatical analysis of St'át'imcets oral narratives.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Matthewson, L. (2006). Temporal semantics in a supposedly tenseless language. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, *29*, 673–713.

Rullmann, H., L. Matthewson and H. Davis. (2008). Modals as distributive indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics*, *16*(4), 317–357.

Saunders, R. and P.W. Davis. (1977). Bella Coola *su*. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, *43*(3), 211–217.

Tonhauser, J. and L. Matthewson. (2015). Empirical evidence in research on meaning. Ms., The Ohio State University and University of British Columbia.

Turner, C. (2011). *Representing events in Saanich (Northern Straits Salish): The interaction of aspect and valence* (PhD dissertation). University of Surrey, Surrey, UK.

Van Eijk, J. (1997). *The Lillooet language: Phonology, morphology, syntax*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Van Eijk, J. (2013). *Lillooet–English dictionary*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Occasional Papers in Linguistics, vol. 2.

Van Eijk, J. and L. Williams. (1981). *Cuystwí malh ucwalmícwts: Lillooet legends and stories*. Mount Currie, BC: Ts'zil Publishing House.

Watanabe, H. (2003). *A morphological description of Sliammon, Mainland Comox Salish*. Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim Publications. Osaka: Osaka Gakuin University.