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Abstract: This paper provides a formal pragmatic analysis of the St’át’ímcets 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.
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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 methodologies 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’ímcets 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
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1 St’át’ímcets (šƛ̓áyəməxʷ), also known as Lilooet, 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) 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
IPFVthen 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.

footnote
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) îïhen=kalh=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’îmcets 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’ink’net=ti7 séna7, t’u7 cw7aocz 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
going.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=mélyíh-s-tal’i
pretty=EXCLCNTR 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’-mi’n=lhkan séna7 kw=n=nas exéxts 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 icwlh=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 ay lh
  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.’
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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.SIV 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=lhkán 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) **pixem’=wit **séna7 áku7 sqwém=á, t’u7 áy=t’u7
    hunt=3PL CNTR DEIC mountain=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

    kw=s=7ats ’x-en-ítas ku=ts ’i7
    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 (**pixem’**) 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). Sëna7 appears to be felicitous with pixem’ 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 séna7 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
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) it’-em=t’u7 séna7 k=Henry
sing-MID=EXCL CNTR DET=Henry
‘Henry tried to sing.’

(26) it’-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'].”
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 Skwxwú7mesh, 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):

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.
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’iq=k’a séna7, t’u7 cw7aoz kwas wa7 lhkúnsa arrive=EPIS CNT R 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 cw7it=t’u7 i=wá7 get.eaten=EXCLCNTR 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 qvl-wíí’c get.fixed=EXCL CNT R 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 CNT R but quick-too DET=NMLZ=finish=3POSS nilh=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 CNT R 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=nn’kuñústen=a, t’u7 áy=t’u7
closed=EXCL CNTR DET=window=EXISbut 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 qṽl̃-wíi’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.
Crucially, achievements cannot fail to culminate with séna7. (41) is rejected and the predicate is corrected to the accomplishment verb máysen.

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.
Table 1: Interpretations with séna7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unexpected outcome/co-occurring event</th>
<th>unsuccessful event</th>
<th>failure of result state</th>
<th>failure of culmination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>not tested</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) \[ [\text{séna7} (p)]^c \] 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, \[ [\text{séna7} (p)]^c = [p]^c \].

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 \( \text{séna7} \). With respect to the first point, we observe that \( \text{séna7} \) 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 monoclusal sentence, and consultants sometimes give revealing comments suggesting that some additional \( q \) must be invoked:

\[
\text{(43) } \text{ama} = \text{ká} = \text{t’u7 séna7 lh=nu=hás ku=7úts’qa7} \\
\text{good=IRR=EXCL CNTR COMP=you=3SIV DET=go.out} \\
\text{‘It would be good if you went out.’} \\
\text{Consultant’s comment: ‘I guess that would work ... that séna7 just adds a sentence.’}
\]

On the other hand, it is clear that \( \text{séna7} \) does not require two syntactic arguments, since monoclusal sentences containing \( \text{séna7} \) 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’.

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

Another case showing that \( q \) does not have to correspond to an overtly expressed proposition is given in (45). Here, \( \text{séna7} \) 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.

\[
\text{(45) A: cúz’=lhkacw=ha úqwa7 ku=pála7 múta7?} \\
\text{PROSP=2SG.SBJ=Q drink DET=one more} \\
\text{‘Are you going to have another drink?’}
\]
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=7ats’x-en-as láti séna7 s-law
get.there nmlz=see-dir-3erg deic cntr stat-hang

l=t=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:

\[
\text{szum séna7 ti=n-káoh=a}
\]

big CNTR DET=1SG.POSS-car=EXIS

‘My car is big.’

*Consultant’s comment:* “Means they can’t all fit in.”

\[
p: \text{My car is big.} \quad q: \text{They can’t all fit in.}
\]

Finally, as observed earlier, \( q \) can be provided by conversational implicature. A further example of this is given in (48). Here, \( \text{séna7} \) 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) \( \text{saotatih-am=lhkán=tu7 séna7 inátcwas, t’u7 icwa7=lhkan} \)

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.”

\[
p: \text{I went out.} \quad q: \text{I didn’t have much fun.}
\]

As we predict, a \( \text{séna7} \) sentence is rejected if no \( q \) can be recovered by any of these methods. This is supported by the frequent rejection of mono-clausal \( \text{séna7} \)-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) \( \text{zwát-en=lhkán séna7 kw=s=cuz’ kwis … mes=kán=t’u7} \)

know-dir=1sg.sbj CNTR det=nmlz=prosp rain but=1sg.sbj=excl

\[
tsícw mám’teq
\]

get.there go.for.walk

‘I knew it was going to rain … but I went for a walk anyway.’

(50) \( \text{it’-em=lhkán=t’u7 séna7 l=ti=s-gáw’-p=a …} \)

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, \( \text{séna7} \) 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) pixem’=wit séna7 áku7 sqwém=a, t’u7 áy=t’u7 hunt=3PL CNTR DEIC mountain=EXIS but NEG=EXCL

kw=s=7ats’x-en-itas ku=ts’i7 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), Rullman et al. (2008) and Davis (2012) for discussion.

(53) cúz’=lhkalh ncwíl-cal ku=košoh-álhts’a7. ncwíl-in’-ém=kellh 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. 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’it’q’et. His (deceased) mother was called Julianne.*

 zwá̱t-en-as s=Julianne kwas kúkwpi7=kelh
ta=skúza7-s=a i=kwís=as
t=child-3POSS=EXIS when.PST=fall=3SJ

‘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
go=1PL.SBJ DEIC fish-MID COP DET=NMLZ-stretch-net=EXIS PROSP

qwez=en-ém
t=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) īlhen=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) úqwá7=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.
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 \( \text{séna7} \). The future modal \( =kelh \) places the reference time after the evaluation time, which in these examples is the utterance time. \( \text{Séna7} \)’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, \( \text{séna7} \) 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 \( \text{cuz'} \) are given in (60)–(62). Here we get a quite different interpretation.

(60) \( \text{cuz'}=k’a \) \( \text{zam’} \) \( \text{séna7} \) \( \text{tsut wa7} \) “qwa<7>ez’-áłhmec”,
\( \text{PROSP}=\text{EPISwell} \) \( \text{CNTR} \) say IPFV blue<INCH>belly

\( \text{nilh s}=\text{ka-tsút}=s-a \) “qwa<7>y-án’ak”=\( \text{ku7} \).
\( \text{COP NMLZ}=\text{CIRC-say}=3\text{POSS-CIRC} \) blue<INCH>belly=REP

‘So he was apparently going to say he was \( \text{qwa7ez’álhmec} \), but he accidentally said \( \text{qwa7yán’ak} \) instead.’

(Carl Alexander, in Callahan et al. in press:149)

p: He was going to say \( \text{qwa7ez’álhmec} \). q: He said \( \text{qwa7yán’ak} \).

(61) \( \text{nilh} \) \( \text{séna7} \) \( \text{n}=\text{cuz’} \)
\( \text{COP} \) \( \text{CNTR} \) 1SG.POSS=NMLZ=\( \text{PROSP} \) return-CAUS but

\( \text{ka-law-a}=t’ú7=a \) múta7
\( \text{CIRC-hang-CIRC}=\text{EXCL}=A \) 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.
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination reached</th>
<th>Destination not reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion towards speaker</td>
<td>t’iq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion away from speaker</td>
<td>Tsícw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Tsícw 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’iq=wit e=ts7á Sát’=a lhí-[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 lhí-[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 Tsícw 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’iq=k’a séna7, t’u7 cw7aoz kwas wa7 lhkúnsa
**arrive=EPIS CNT R 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) \( t’iq=ti7 \text{ séna7} \), \( t’u7 \text{ cw7aoz kwa wa7} \)
\text{arrive=DEM CNTR but NEG DET+NMLZ+IPFV be}
‘He arrived but there was nobody home.’

p: He arrived.
q: Nobody was home.

(69) \( t’sícw=kan=t’u7 \text{ séna7} \), \( t’u7 \text{ cw7it} \)
\text{get.there=1SG.SBJ=EXCL CNTR but much}

\text{i=n-száyten=a}
\text{PL.DET=1SG.POSS-business=EXIS}
‘I went, but I had too many things to do.’

\text{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) \( t’sícw=kan=t’u7 \text{ séna7} \ldots t’u7 \text{ xwem-7úl} \)
\text{get.there=1SG.SBJ=EXCL CNTR but fast-too}

\text{kw=s=tsem’p=s, nilh=t’u7 múta7}
\text{DET=NMLZ=finish=3POSS COP=EXCL again}

\text{n=s=7úxwal’}
\text{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) \( t’sícw=kan=t’u7 \text{ séna7} \ldots t’u7 \text{ kan páqu7-min} \)
\text{get.there=1SG.SBJ=DIST CNTR but 1SG.SBJ afraid-RLT}

\text{kwenswá s-lheqw}
\text{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) \# \( t’iq=t’u7 \text{ séna7} \), \( t’u7 \text{ qacw-cw-áw’lh nilh s=p’àn’t=s} \)
\text{arrive=EXCL CNTR but break+FRE-vehicle COP NMLZ=return=3POSS}

\text{úxwal’}
\text{go.home}
‘She arrived, but her car broke down so she went home.’

\text{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 [tsícw 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)  náš=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 cw7ít
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.”

\[ \text{nás}=t\'u7=\text{tu7} \quad \text{séna7} \quad \text{n-zán-em}, \quad t\'u7 \quad \text{áoz}=t\'u7 \quad \text{múta7} \]

\[ \text{go}=\text{EXCL}=>\text{DIST} \quad \text{CNTR} \quad \text{LOC-circle-MID} \quad \text{but} \quad \text{NEG}=\text{EXCL} \quad \text{again} \]

\[ \text{kw}=s=t\'iq=s, \quad \text{i}=\text{kel7}=\text{át}=t\'u7 \quad t\'iq \]

\[ \text{DET}=\text{NMLZ}=\text{arrive}=3\text{POSS} \quad \text{when.PST}=\text{first}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{SBJV}=\text{EXCL} \quad \text{arrive} \]

‘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)

\[ \text{p}: \text{He was just going to go around in a circle.} \quad \text{q}: \text{He never came back.} \]

(79) \[ \text{t\'akm\text{\text{ic}}}=\text{kalh} \quad \text{aylh} \quad \text{láti7} \quad \text{i=nás}=\text{at} \quad \text{séna7} \quad \text{nlham'} \]

\[ \text{go.by}=1\text{SG.SBJ} \quad \text{now} \quad \text{DEIC} \quad \text{when.PST}=\text{go}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{SVJ} \quad \text{CNTR} \quad \text{get.in} \]

\[ \text{l}=\text{ki}=t\'láoz'-s=a \quad \text{ku}=\text{kaoh,} \quad \text{áw\text{\text{w}}=et}=\text{kalh} \quad \text{aylh} \quad \text{múta7!} \]

\[ \text{at}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{DET}=\text{canoe}=3\text{POSS} \quad \text{EXIS} \quad \text{DET}=\text{car} \quad \text{late}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{SBJ} \quad \text{now} \quad \text{again} \]

‘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 \text{nas} and \text{ts7as} matches that of \text{cuz’} as discussed above: unlike ordinary predicates, they allow an interpretation with \text{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 \text{séna7} functions as a language-internal diagnostic for elements which incorporate prospective semantics.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{11}\) There is a fifth motion verb, \text{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 \text{séna7}, but we predict that it will have one of the two readings we ascribe to \text{nas} and \text{ts7as}: namely, an atelic motion reading, but not a prospective aspetual one.

\(^{12}\) Relatedly, the only other cases we have found where a prejacent event can fail to take place with \text{séna7} involve the imperfective auxiliary \text{wa7}, as in (i)–(ii):

(i) \[ \text{wá7}=\text{lhkalh} \quad \text{séna7} \quad \text{tsicw} \quad \text{ts’úqwaz’-am} \]

\[ \text{IPFV}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{SBJ} \quad \text{CNTR} \quad \text{get.there} \quad \text{fish-MID} \]

‘We were going to go fishing.’ (Laura Thevarge, in Matthewson 2005:301)

(ii) \[ \text{wá7}=\text{lhkalh} \quad \text{séna7} \quad \text{ts’úqwaz’-am}, \quad \text{mes}=\text{kálh} \quad \text{múta7} \quad \text{wa7} \quad \text{tsláoy-am!} \]

\[ \text{IPFV}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{SBJ} \quad \text{CNTR} \quad \text{fish-MID} \quad \text{but}=1\text{PL} \quad \text{SBJ} \quad \text{again} \quad \text{IPFV} \quad \text{July-MID} \]

‘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).’

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-elicted 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.
Did I punch you (last night, when I was drunk)?'

(Saunders and Davis 1977:211)

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-q̓ux̣umtimut-tx
    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 *sénaʔ*. To start with, *su* appears to be confined to the epistemological dimension – it is specifically sensitive to knowledge – while *sénaʔ* 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 *sénaʔ* 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 *sénaʔ*. We have argued that *sénaʔ* has no effect on truth conditions, but imposes a felicity condition on the discourse context, repeated in (84):
(84) \[ [\text{séna}7 (p)]^c \] 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 \text{séna}7 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, \text{séna}7 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, \text{séna}7 helps to distinguish between two ways of expressing future time reference: with the prospective auxiliary \text{cuz}', \text{séna}7 cancels the expectation that a future event took place, but with the modal enclitic \text{=kelh}, there is a lexical entailment that the reference time follows the utterance time, which \text{séna}7 cannot cancel. Finally, \text{séna}7 distinguishes between two classes of motion verbs: with one class, which acts essentially like achievements, a destination is always reached, with or without \text{séna}7; but with the other, not only is the destination not necessarily reached, but \text{séna}7 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 \text{séna}7 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, \text{séna}7 has a ‘modal flavour’ even without an accompanying overt modal enclitic: these speakers sometimes either translate \text{séna}7 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 \text{séna}7 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 \text{séna}7, St’át’imcets has at least four other elements with contrastive meanings: the conjunctions \text{t’u7}, \text{k’ámálh} and \text{zámas/mes=t’u7}, and the second position enclitic \text{=hem’}, all of which can co-occur with \text{séna}7, and indeed appear in many of the example sentences in this paper.\(^\text{16}\) 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 \text{=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 \text{séna}7, these labels reveal more about the difficulty of finding an adequate translation for \text{=hem’} than about the meaning of the element itself. The

\(^{16}\) The \text{t’u7} in \text{zámas/mes=t’u7} is not the conjunction \text{t’u7} ‘but’, but the ‘exclusive’ enclitic \text{=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


