Negative generic sentences in Skwxwú7mesh Salish¹

Carrie Gillon University of British Columbia

This paper will investigate two patterns of negation in Skwxwú7mesh Salish, paying close attention to the interpretations found with each. The first pattern involves a generic interpretation, which I claim arises from a generic operator introduced by the particle kalh. The second pattern involves a non-generic interpretation. The first pattern will be shown to be restricted with respect to the aspectual categories with which it may co-occur. This restriction is claimed to be a result of the generic operator. The second pattern is free to co-occur with any of the aspectual categories as it lacks any generic operator. It is shown that the first pattern may not involve pluractionality, although it appears to act as such on the surface.

1 Introduction

This paper will investigate two of the patterns of negation in Skwxwú7mesh (henceforth Sq), a Coast Salish language spoken North of the Burrard Inlet. The first pattern is associated with a generic interpretation. This interpretation is not found in other patterns. This pattern is also associated with aspectual restrictions that do not apply to the other patterns. The second pattern involves a non-generic (usually active) interpretation. The two patterns will be compared in order to show that the generic interpretation is not found in all negative contexts.

1.1 The Data

For the purposes of this paper, I will examine two of the negation patterns found in Sq. The primary pattern involves indicative subject morphology (i.e., that morphology which is found in most matrix clauses) and the mysterious particle <u>kalh</u>. The secondary pattern involves subjunctive subject morphology (i.e., that morphology which is more or less found in subjunctive clauses) and the 'irrealis' marker.

(1)	a.	haw	chen <u>k</u> all	n ts'its	'ap'
		neg	lindic par	t work ²	2
		'I dor	n't work' 'I a	m not wo	rking'
	b.	haw	<u>k</u> =an	i	ts'its'ap'
		neg	ir=1sbj	aux	work
		'I did	n't work'		

There are a number of puzzles that are raised by these data: i) why each of the patterns are associated with the different subject morphology, ii) why the patterns involve the 'irrealis'

¹ I would like to thank each of my consultants EL, LB, TC and YJ for their time and their insights into their language. I would also like to thank Martina Wiltschko, Henry Davis, Rose-Marie Déchaine and the audience at the 2001 CLA at Laval for discussion of this data and analysis.

² I use the following abbreviations for morpheme glosses: 1 = first person, 2 = second person 3 = thirdperson, aux = auxiliary, caus = causativizer, det = determiner, f = feminine, indic = indicative morphology, ir = irrealis, m = masculine, neg = negative, nom = nominalizer, pa = pluractional marker, pl = plural, poss = possessive morphology, red = reduplicant, rl = realis, sbj = subjunctive morphology, trans = transitivizer.

marker (\underline{k}) or the so far unnamed particle ($\underline{k}alh$), and iii) why the pattern involving the particle is associated with a generic interpretation *and* a progressive interpretation.³ For the purposes of this paper, I will investigate mainly the last issue.

The main problem that I will investigate involves the aspectual categories that may or may not co-occur with each of the patterns. The first pattern is more restricted than the second pattern. Both patterns may co-occur with verbs (transitive or intransitive).

Verb

(2)	a.	haw <u>k</u> alh <u>x</u> witem
		neg lindic jump
		'S/he doesn't jump' 'S/he isn't jumping'
	b.	haw <u>k</u> =as i <u>x</u> witem
		neg ir=3sbj aux jump
		'S/he didn't jump'

They may also co-occur with (stage-level) adjectives.

(3)	a.	haw <u>k</u> alh wa	kw'ay'	Stage-level Adjective
		neg part pa	hungry	
		'S/he isn't hungry'		
	b .`	haw <u>k</u> =as wa	kw'ay'	
		neg ir=3sbj 'S/he's not hungry'	pa hungry	

However, only the second pattern may be used to negate a Nominal Predicate.

(4)	a. *	haw	<u>k</u> alh	laplait	Nominal Predicate
		neg	part	priest	
	b.	haw	<u>k</u>	laplait=as ⁴	
		neg	ir	priest=3sbj	
		'S/he	's not a	priest'	

This is not the only restriction: the first pattern may not occur with *any* individual-level predicates.⁵ This is in contrast to the second pattern.

(5)	a. *	haw	<u>k</u> alh	tl'a <u>k</u> ta	y' <u>k</u> wem	Individual-level Adjective
		neg	part	tall		
	b.	haw	<u>k</u> =as		tl'a <u>k</u> tay' <u>k</u> wem	
		neg	ir=3sb	j –	tall	
		'S/he's	s not tal	1'		

There are at least two possible analyses for these data: i) the particle kalh is a

⁴ The subject morphology follows the predicate here, unlike in the above examples. This order may also be found with verbal predicates when a different negative particle is used:

i) $xwu7axw \underline{k}$ ts'its'ap'=as *not.yet ir work=3sbj* 'S/he hasn't worked yet'

I ignore the implications of the order of the morphology.

⁵ See Mattina (1996) for another example of a Salish language (Okanagan) treating individual-level and nominal predicates differently from the rest of the predicate types.

³ A further distinction involves the use of i, which I am glossing here as 'aux' for simplicity's sake. i can be used in both pattern; however, for reasons that I have yet to determine, it is most common in the second (irrealis) pattern. I will ignore this fact here. I will also ignore the function of i entirely.

pluractional marker, ii) the particle <u>kalh</u> is a marker of genericity (and is perhaps the generic operator itself). I will show that the first analysis is untenable.

1.2 Some properties of *kalh*

The particle <u>kalh</u> looks like a Negative Polarity Item (NPI) as it is only found in negative constructions.

(6)	a.	haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	ts'its'ap'
		neg	lindic	part	work
		'I don'	't work'	ʻl'm n	ot working'
	b. *	chen	<u>k</u> alh	ts'its'a	ıp'
		<i>l indic</i>	part	work	

However, it does not behave like an English NPI as it may not be used in questions.

(7)	a.	chewx u	ts'its'	ap'
		2indic Q	work	
		'Are you wo	orking?'	
	b. *	chexw u	<u>k</u> alh	ts'its'ap'
		2indic Q	part	work

These facts may be relevant to the analysis, but I will not discuss them further here. This particle is quite high. It precedes auxiliaries (but follows the subject morphology).

(8)	a.	haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	i	na	wa	ts'its'ap'		
		neg	<i>l indic</i>	part	aux	rl	ра	work		
		'I dor	'I don't work'							
	b. *	haw	chen	i	<u>k</u> alh	na	wa	ts'its'ap'		
		neg	I indic	aux	part	rl	pa	work		

It also precedes quantifiers (which are usually first in a clause).

(9)	a.	lhi <u>k</u> '	chen	wa	ts'its'ap'	
		always	s Iindic	ра	work	
		'I alwa	ays worl	k'		
	b.	haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	lhi <u>k</u> '	ts'its'ap'
		neg	lindic	part	always	work
		'I'm n	ot alway	ys work	ing'	
	c. *	haw	chen	lhi <u>k</u> '	<u>k</u> alh	ts'its'ap'
		neg	lindic	always	a part	work

This suggests that the particle may be an operator-like element, since it is higher than other operators.

1.3 Structure of the paper

The structure of this paper is as follows: $2 \text{ will discuss the first possibility of } \underline{kalh}$ as a pluractional marker, $3 \text{ will demonstrate that this analysis is untenable, } will discuss the second possibility of <math>\underline{kalh}$ as a marker of genericity, 5 will examine some of the apparent problems with this analysis and 6 will conclude the paper.

2 Pluractionality and kalh

The first possibility I raised for the interpretation of <u>kalh</u> was as a pluractional marker. This at first seems like a possibility as it is subject to the same restrictions as another particle (*wa*) which has been argued to be a pluractional marker (Bar-el 1998).

2.1 Pluractional markers cross-linguistically

Pluractional markers are morphemes which "attach to the verb to indicate a multiplicity of actions, whether involving multiple participants, times or locations" (Lasersohn 1995: 240). "Pluractional markers do not reflect the plurality of a verb's arguments so much as plurality of the verb itself: the verb is understood to represent the occurrence of multiple events" (Lasersohn 1995: 241). They may be associated with many different kinds of 'plurality' of the verb (durativity, augmentativity, iterativity, diminutivity, etc. - Lasersohn 1995).

2.2 The pluractional marker wa

The clitic wa is often used as a continuative marker (Kuipers 1967, Bar-el 1998).

(10)	a.	chen <u>x</u> witem
		lindic jump
		'I jumped (once)'
	b.	chen wa <u>x</u> witem
		lindic pa jump
		'I am jumping' 'I jumped more than once'

"[*wa*] refers to a process as occupying a stretch of time, as having a duration. This duration may concern either a single act or the regular (iterated) performance of it" (Kuipers 1967: 159). Following Bar-el (1998) I assume that *wa* is a pluractional marker. Pluractionality in Sq then is either interpreted as habituality or iteration (depending on context and verb type).

2.3 kalh as a pluractional marker?

The restrictions that apply to the first pattern of negation (i.e., the pattern involving <u>kalh</u>) also apply to wa. Nominal predicates and individual-level predicates may not co-occur with $wa.^{6}$

(11)	a.	na	wa	<u>x</u> witem	Verb			
		rl	ра	jump				
		'S/ho	e jumpe	d (more than once)' '	S/he is jumping'			
	b.	na	wa	kw'ay'	Stage-level Adjective			
		rl	ра	get.hungry				
		'S/ho	'S/he is hungry'					
	c. *	na	wa	laplait	Nominal Predicate			
		rl	pa	priest				
	d. *	na	wa	tl'a <u>k</u> tay' <u>k</u> wem	Individual-level Predicate			
		rl	pa	tall				
6 171			1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 for a for a for a for a second a for the			

⁶ There are some exceptions to the restriction on individual-level predicates - for example, if the time of being short is finite, for some reason. They are then interpreted as stage-level predicates (Bar-el 1998).

i)	chen=t	wa	etl'imay' <u>k</u> wem.	chen	mi	tl'a <u>k</u> tay' <u>k</u> wem		
	lindic=pst	ра	short	1 indic	come	tall		
	'I was short. I became tall.'							

wa has the same co-occurrence restrictions as the particle <u>kalh</u> does and is also associated with the same kinds of interpretations (habituality and progressivity). It appears on the surface that they have the same function - only in different contexts. <u>kalh</u> would then be a pluractional marker found only in negative contexts and *wa* would be found elsewhere.

3 The problems with a pluractional analysis

There are a few problems with calling <u>kalh</u> a pluractional marker. The first one involves co-occurence. Both <u>kalh</u> and wa may occur in the same clause. This is not expected if they have the same function in the sentence.

(12)	a.	haw <u>k</u> alh wa <u>x</u> witem
		neg part pa jump
		'S/he doesn't jump' 'S/he is not jumping'
	Ь.	haw <u>k</u> =as wa <u>x</u> witem
		neg ir=3sbj pa jump
		'S/he didn't jump (more than once)' 'S/he's not jumping'

Stage-level predicates *must* occur with *wa*; if they do not, they are associated with a change-of-state interpretation (Bar-el 1998).

(13)	a.	chen wa kw'ay'
		lindic pa hungry
		'I'm hungry'
	b.	chen kw'ay'
		lindic hungry
		'I'm getting hungry'

This is true, even when the first pattern of negation is used.

(14)	a.	haw	<u>k</u> alh	wa	kw'ay'
		neg	part	ра	hungry
		'S/he	's not h	ungry'	
	b.	haw	<u>k</u> alh	kw'a	ıy'
		neg	part	hung	ry
		'S/he	doesn't	get hu	ingry'

This is unexpected if they have the same interpretation.

The second problem involves adjacency (or lack thereof) to the verb. Lasersohn (1995) states that a pluractional marker is attached to the verb. This is obviously the case for wa as it is the closest auxiliary to the verbal complex (Gillon 2000), and is obviously *not* the case for <u>kalh</u>. It may be separated from the verb by other auxiliaries (such as *na*, the realis marker).

(15)	haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	na	wa	ts'its'ap'
	neg	lindic	part	rl	ра	work
	'I dor	n't work	, -		•	

The third problem involves the progressive interpretation. This interpretation should be found in the past tense as well if <u>kalh</u> is truly a pluractional marker. However, this is not the case. Instead, the particle is associated with a 'used to' interpretation. This is not the case for the second pattern, which is only associated with a regular past tense interpretation.

(16)	a.	haw	chen=t	<u>x</u> witem
		neg	lindic=pst	jump
		'I did	n't used to jum	p'
		* 'I w	/asn't jumping'	-
	b.	haw	<u>k</u> =an=t	<u>x</u> witem
		neg	ir=1sbj=pst	jump
		'I did	n't jump'	- •

This 'used to' interpretation is (in English) a marker of genericity (Krifka et al 1995). This raises the possibility of *kalh* as a generic operator.

4 Genericity and <u>kalh</u>

At least one of the interpretations associated with \underline{kalh} (the habitual) looks generic. Is this a sign that \underline{kalh} is itself a generic operator. First I will discuss genericity in English.

4.1 Genericity

Genericity is a property associated with either NPs or sentences. This paper is concerned with sentence level genericity. A generic sentence is one that "expresses regularities which transcend particular facts" (Krifka et al 1995). They have the feel of universally quantified sentences, but they are *not* universally quantified as they allow for exceptions (Krifka et al 1995).

A sentence may be associated with a generic interpretation and a non-generic (or particular, eventive) interpretation, at least for some tenses. The simple present tense, the past and the future can all have both interpretations.

(17) John smokes/smoked/will smoke a pipe (Krifka et al 1995: 6)

The progressive and perfect are not associated with a generic interpretation, instead being associated with a particular interpretation.

(18) John is smoking/has smoked a pipe (Krifka et al 1995: 6)

Some auxiliary constructions (e.g., 'used to') are a marker of genericity.

(19) I used to smoke

Krifka et al (1995) list two tests for generic sentences: i) when generic sentences cooccur with adverbs like *usually* or *typically*, the interpretation does not change much; however, when non-generic sentences co-occur with these, the interpretation changes drastically, ii) if a linguistic form excludes statives, it will also exclude generic interpretations. The first test is shown in (20), and the second in (21).

(20)	a.	i.	A lion has a bushy tail.
		ii.	A lion usually has a bushy tail.
	b.	i.	A lion stood in front of my tent.
		ii.	A lion usually stood in front of my tent.
			(Krifka et al 1995: 9)

The generic sentence in (20ai) has more or less the same interpretation as (20aii). However, the non-generic sentence in (20bi) is significantly different from that in (20bii).

- (21) a. * John is weighing 175 pounds
 - b. Luigi is drinking wine with his dinner
 - c. Luigi drinks wine with his dinner

(non-generic) (generic) (Krifka et al 1995: 12)

Here, the linguistic form (progressive) can neither be used for a stative form, nor may be used for generic interpretations. These tests will be applied to Sq in the next section.

Krifka et al (1995) suggest that generic sentences involve generic operators. An example is given in (22).

(22) John smokes. Gen(smoke)(John) (Krifka et al 1995: 20)

In English this operator is not phonologically realized. It is possible that the generic operator may be phonological in some other language. This possibility will be explored below.

4.2 kalh as generic operator

We have seen that <u>kalh</u> is associated with a habitual interpretation. This interpretation possibly arises because the particle <u>kalh</u> is itself a generic operator. The generic interpretation is shown below.

(22)	haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	tehim'	ta	lam'
	neg	lindic	part	make	det.m	house
	'I dor	i't build	houses	s'		

It is also associated with a universally quantified interpretation "never". This is consistent with this pattern involving a generic operator as generic sentences often feel like universally quantified sentences.

(23)	haw	<u>k</u> alh	<u>x</u> aym
	neg	part	laugh
	'S/he	never la	ughs'

When a past tense marker is added to the <u>kalh</u> pattern, the interpretation given is one that is a marker of genericity in English (i.e., 'used to'), as we saw above.

(24)	haw	chen=t	<u>k</u> alh	wa	t'aya <u>k</u> '
	neg	lindic=pst	part	ра	angry
	'I nev	er used to get i	mad'	-	

The two tests given by Krifka et al (1995) may also be applied to <u>kalh</u>. I will only look at the first test here. The second one will be discussed in the next section. The first test of genericity is the co-occurence with adverbs like *usually* or *typically*. Here, the adverb is *lhik*' 'always'. When <u>kalh</u> and *lhik*' co-occur, the interpretation is similar to the interpretation of <u>kalh</u> on its own.

(25)	a.	haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	lulem	
		neg	lindic	part	sing	
		'I don	't sing'	('I am	not singing')	
	b.	haw	chen	kalh	lhi <u>k</u> '	lulem
		neg	lindic	part	always	sing
		'I don	i't alway	s sing	' 'I rarely sing'	Ũ

The *kalh* pattern passes the first test. It appears so far to act like a marker of genericity.

5 Problems with the generic analysis?

There are some problems with this second analysis - at least on the surface. The first problem involves the second test for generic sentences given by Krifka et al (1995). This test suggests that those forms which do not occur with statives are those which are *not* associated with a generic interpretation. (They are associated instead with a particular interpretation.) However, the pattern which is associated with a generic interpretation (i.e., the <u>kalh</u> pattern) may *not* occur with statives either.

(26)	* haw	chen	<u>k</u> alh	i7im
	neg	1 indic	part	strong

Krifka et al would thus predict it to be a non-generic marker. This is clearly *not* the case. However, this "problem" is not really a problem.

There are two analyses that would predict that statives would not be able to co-occur with a marker of genericity. If Chierchia (1995) is correct, then individual-level predicates are precisely those which could not co-occur with a generic operator. He claims that individual-level predicates are inherent generics; they would already then have a generic operator. Two generic operators would be ungrammatical as they would be redundant.

The second analysis follows Chomsky (1982), Krifka et al (1995) and Kratzer (1995) in assuming that operators must have a variable to bind (Prohibition against Vacuous Quantification). Kratzer (1995) claims that individual-level predicates lack a spacio-temporal variable. Thus, in the English examples given below, the universal operator is ungrammatical when paired with an individual-level predicate, unless there is some other variable introduced.

(27)	a.	When a Moroccan knows French she knows it well (Kratzer 1995: 129)
	b.	Always _x [Moroccan(x) & knows(x, French)] [knows-well(x, French)]

(Kratzer 1995: 130)

Here, there is another variable introduced by Moroccan, so there is no vacuous quantification.

(28)	a.	*	When Mary knows French she knows it well	(Kratzer 1995: 129)
- ,	b.	*	Always [knows(Mary, French)] [knows-well(Mary,	French)]
			• • • • • • • • •	(Kratzer 1995: 130)

In this example, there is no variable introduced at all, so the sentence *does* involve vacuous quantification.

Turning to the Sq, the same argumentation may be applied. The individual-level predicates may not co-occur with a generic operator because this would involve vacuous quantification.

(29) a. haw chen <u>kalh</u> paym neg lindic part rest 'I don't rest' 'I am not resting' b. -Gen_x [rest(x, I)]

This example involves a stage-level predicate, so it introduces a spacio-temporal variable that the generic operator may operate over.

(30) a. * haw chen <u>k</u>alh i7im neg 1indic part strong b. * -Gen [rest(I)]

i7im, on the other hand, does not introduce a variable, once again creating an ungrammatical structure.

The second problem for this analysis is the problem of the progressive interpretation. <u>kalh</u> is associated with both a generic and a progressive interpretation.

(31) haw <u>kalh</u> ilhen *neg part eat* 'S/he doesn't eat' 'S/he isn't eating'

This progressive interpretation is one which Krifka et al (1995) would not predict for a generic sentence. The progressive in English is strongly associated with a non-generic interpretation. However, I believe this is a problem of translation. Bar-el (1998) found a similar problem when examining *wa*. In English, there is no real present tense. There is only a progressive and a generic present.

(32)	a.	I am singing
	b.	I sing

If a speaker of Sq wants to express that something is occurring now, the only way to force that is to use the progressive.

6 Conclusions and remaining issues

The <u>kalh</u> pattern, I claim, is associated with a generic operator. <u>kalh</u> cannot be a pluractional marker, as I have shown, despite its many similarities to *wa*, the pluractional marker. It remains a question, however, whether the particle <u>kalh</u> is itself a generic operator, or only a marker of that operator, as in the 'used to' construction.

There are other issues which are brought up by this data: i) why the two types involve different subject morphology, ii) why only the second pattern occurs with the irrealis marker \underline{k} , and iii) if the particle $\underline{k}alh$ is itself a part of the negation; i.e., does this pattern involve a two-part negation, or is $\underline{k}alh$ a polarity item? I leave these questions for further research.

References

Bar-el, L. 1998. Verbal plurality and adverbial quantification: a case study of <u>Skwx</u>wú7mesh (Squamish Salish), unpublished thesis, University of British Columbia.

Carlson, G. 1977. A unified analysis of the English bare plural, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, 413-456.

Chierchia, G. 1995. Individual-level predicates as inherent generics, in *The generic book*, ed. G. Carlson and F. Pelletier. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 176-223.

Chomsky, N. 1982. Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Gillon, C. 2000. Clitic order in Skwxwú7mesh Salish, ms, University of British Columbia. Kratzer, A. Stage-level and individual-level predicates, in *The generic book*, ed. G. Carlson

and F. Pelletier. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 125-175.

Krifka, M, F. Pelletier, G. Carlson, A. ter Meulen, G. Link and G. Chierchia. 1995.

Genericity: an introduction, in *The generic book*, ed. G. Carlson and F. Pelletier. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1-124.

Kuipers, A. 1967. The Squamish language: grammar, texts, dictionary. The Hague: Mouton.

Lasersohn, P. 1995. *Plurality, conjunction and events.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Mattina, N. 1996. Aspect and category in Okanagan word formation, Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University.

Smith, C. 1997. The parameter of aspect. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.