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1. Introduction

In English, non-progressive sentences containing accomplishment VPs give rise to culmination entailments. For example, (1) entails that the fixing was completed.

(1) I fixed the fence (# but I didn’t finish fixing it).

In this paper we examine the corresponding class of VPs in two Salish languages: St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh. We first provide evidence that the closest equivalents to accomplishment VPs in St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh - ‘control transitives’ - do not give rise to culmination entailments. Instead, they have culmination implicatures, which can be cancelled without contradiction.

We then provide an analysis of the Salish data. In both languages, control transitive verbs are derived by suffixation of a transitivizer to a root verb with a single internal argument (Davis 1997, Davis and Demirdache 2000). Unlike control transitives, these underlying root verbs have a culmination entailment which cannot be cancelled. Control transitivizers therefore appear to remove the requirement that culmination happens in the actual world. Our analysis of control transitivizers treats them as introducing inertia worlds in the sense of Dowty’s (1977, 1979) analysis of the English progressive.

We close the paper with discussion of the consequences of our analysis for cross-

\[1\] We are very grateful to St’át’imcets consultants Beverley Frank, Gertrude Ned, Laura Thevarge and Rose Whitley, and to Skwxwú7mesh consultants Lena Jacobs, Margaret Locke, the late Chief Lawrence Baker, the late Tina Cole, the late Yvonne Joseph, the late Eva Lewis and the late Doris White. Many thanks for helpful feedback to Dorit Abusch, Bridget Copley, Rose-Marie Déchaine, Carrie Gillon, Irene Heim, Angelika Kratzer, Mats Rooth, Martina Wiltschko, and to audiences at Cornell University, UBC, WSCLA 9 and NELS 35. Errors are our own. Fieldwork is supported by SSHRC grants #410-2002-1715 and #410-2003-1138.

\[2\] St’át’imcets (a.k.a. Lillooet) is a Northern Interior Salish language spoken in the southwest interior of British Columbia, Canada. Skwxwú7mesh (a.k.a. Squamish) is a Central (Coast) Salish language traditionally spoken in the Squamish Valley, Howe Sound and Vancouver area of BC. Both languages are extremely endangered.
linguistic variation, and for the relationship between culmination properties and temporal duration. We conclude that the Salish data argue against a unified analysis of both ‘accomplishments’ and ‘achievements’ as primitive aspectual classes in natural language.

In the remainder of this introduction we outline some relevant background assumptions about English accomplishments and about (im)perfectivity in Salish.

1.1. **English accomplishments**

In English, accomplishment VPs are telic (‘have a natural endpoint’) as opposed to activity VPs, which are atelic. A standard test for telicity shows that accomplishments are, but activities are not, compatible with the phrase *in an hour*:

(2) a. I fixed the fence.  
    b. I fixed the fence *in an hour.*

(3) a. I pushed the cart.  
    b. *I pushed the cart *in an hour.*

Culmination is entailed when an accomplishment is non-progressive. We can tell that this culmination is an entailment (rather than an implicature) because of the imperfective paradox. The progressive/imperfective proposition in (4a) does not entail the non-progressive/perfective proposition in (4b); yet if (4b) did not itself entail culmination, then (4a) could not fail to entail (4b). A common solution to the paradox is to claim that (4a) does not entail culmination in the actual world, whereas (4b) does.

(4) a. I was fixing the fence.  
    b. I fixed the fence.

1.2. **(Im)perfectivity in Salish**

Turning to Salish, we make the following background assumptions: (i) predicates are in the perfective aspect if they are not overtly marked as imperfective (Mattina 1993, Mattina 1996, Bar-el in prep.); (ii) Salish perfectives are of the standard type, placing the event time inside the reference time (Matthewson 2004, Bar-el in prep.), as opposed to semi-perfectives (Koenig and Muansuwan 2000) or neutral perfectives (Singh 1998).

Finally, a terminological note: since the class of accomplishment VPs in English systematically corresponds to a certain class of VPs in St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh, we will also refer to the latter as ‘accomplishments’. However, since our claim is precisely that the semantics of this class varies cross-linguistically, the very notion of ‘accomplishment’ will ultimately need to be deconstructed.

2. **Accomplishments in St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh**

Accomplishments are distinguishable from activities in both St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh by differences in out-of-the-blue judgments about tense and culmination. In the absence of overt tense or aspect marking, the default interpretation of
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accomplishments is in the past, and involves culmination:\(^3\)

(5) a. ts’áqw-an’-lhkan ta n-kiks-a
eat-TR-1SG.SU DET 1SG.POSS-cake-DET
‘I ate my cake.’ (St’át’imcets)

Speaker’s comments: “Sounds like you ate all of it.”

b. q’ets’en-lhkán ti ts’áz’cen-a
hook-TR-1SG.SU DET rug-DET
‘I hooked a rug.’ (St’át’imcets)

Speaker’s comments: “That sounds like a finished product.”

(6) a. na xel’-t-as ta sxwexwiy’am’ lha Mary
write-TR-3ERG DET story DET Mary
‘Mary wrote a story.’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

Speaker’s comments: “She wrote it...she finished.”

b. chen p’ayak-an ta tetxwem
fix-TR DET car
‘I fixed the car.’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

Speaker’s comments: “You already fixed it.”

Activities, on the other hand, can easily be interpreted in the present:

(7) a. ít’-em-lhkan
sing-MID-1SG.SU
‘I sang / I am singing.’ (St’át’imcets)

b. k’wzús-em ti syáqts7-a
work-MID DET woman-DET
‘The woman is working.’ (St’át’imcets)

(8) a. chen 7imesh
walk
‘I walked / I’m walking.’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

b. chen xaam
cry
‘I cried / I’m crying.’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

However, the culmination of accomplishments in St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh is only an implicature. Culmination can be explicitly denied without contradiction:\(^4\)

\(^3\) Data are presented in the official orthographies of the languages. Where relevant, the fact that the English translation was volunteered by the consultant is marked with \(VG\) (‘volunteered gloss’).

\(^4\) See also Matthewson to appear, Davis (in prep.), and Bar-el (to appear a,b, in prep.).
Bar-el, Davis and Matthewson

(9) máys-en-lhkan ti q’laxan-a, t’u7 cw7ay t’u7 kw-s tsúkw-s-an
fix-TR-1SG.SU DET fence-DET but NEG just DET-NOM finish-CAU-1SG.ERG
‘I fixed a fence, but I didn’t finish.’ (St’át’imcets)

(10) ts’áqw-an’-lhkan ti n-kíks-a lhkúnsa ku sq’it,
eat-TR-1SG.SU DET 1SG.POSS-cake-DET now DET day
 t’u7 qelh-cál-lhkan ku k’wik’wena7 t’u natcw
but save-ACT-1SG.SU DET few until tomorrow
‘I ate my cake today, but I saved a little for tomorrow.’ (St’át’imcets)

(11) k’ul’-ún’-lhkan ti ts’lá7-a, t’u7 aoy t’u7 kw tsukw-s
make-TR-1SG.SU DET basket-DET but NEG just DET finish-3POSS
‘I made the basket, but it didn’t get finished.’ (St’át’imcets)

(12) na p’ayak-ant-as ta John ta snexwilh-s
RL heal-TR-3ERG DET John DET canoe-3POSS
welh haw k-as 7i huy-nexw-as
CONJ NEG IRR-3CNJ PART finish-LC-3ERG
‘He fixed his canoe but he didn’t finish (fixing) it.’ VG (Skwxwú7mesh)

(13) chen p’ats’-an ta hem’-ten kwi chel’aklh
1SG.SU sew-TR DET cover-INSTR DET yesterday
welh haw k-an 7i huy-nexw
CONJ NEG IRR-1SG.CNJ PART finish-LC
‘I sewed a/the blanket yesterday but did not finish.’ VG (Skwxwú7mesh)

(14) kw John na kw’el-nt-as ta skawts
DET John RL cook-TR-3ERG DET potato
welh haw k-as 7i huy-nexw-as
CONJ NEG IRR-3CNJ PART finish-LC-3ERG
‘John cooked a potato but never finished.’ VG (Skwxwú7mesh)

(15) chen yetl’k-an ta lam’ 7i na7-xw chen wa yetl’k-an
1SG.SU paint-TR DET house PART RL-still 1SG.SU IMPF paint-TR
‘I painted the house and I’m still painting it.’ VG (Skwxwú7mesh)

(16) chen kw’el-t ta smits ti natlh
1SG.SU cook-TR DET meat DET morning
7iw’ayti wa7-xw wa kw’el ta smits
maybe IMPF-still IMPF cook DET meat
‘I cooked the meat this morning and it’s still cooking.’ VG (Skwxwú7mesh)

5 We do not give St’át’imcets data here, due to language-internal complications with the test.
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In both languages, culmination can be questioned without inducing an infelicitous sequence:

(17) A: q’ets’-en-ás ta tsákwecetn-a kw-s Mary weave-TR-3ERG DET rug-DET DET-NOM Mary
‘Mary was weaving a rug.’

B: wa7 ha t’u7 q’ets’-en-ás IMPF YNQ still weave-TR-3ERG ‘Is she still doing it?’ (St’át’imcets)

(18) A: na ch’a7-st-as kwi kw’axwa7 lha Mary RL make-CAU-3ERG DET box DET Mary
‘Mary made a box.’

B: na 7u huy-nexw-as RL YNQ finish-LC-3ERG ‘Did she finish it?’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

(19) A: na 7ilhen-t-as ta skawts kwa John RL eat-TR-3ERG DET potato DET John
‘John ate a potato.’

B: na 7u huy-nexw-as ta skawts RL YNQ finish-LC-3ERG DET potato ‘Did he finish (the potato?)’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

Finally, note that the past tense effect is also cancelable, as shown in (20-23). (Recall that all these sentences are in the perfective aspect. The progressive translations here are an artifact of the English restriction on present-tense eventive predicates.)

(20) q’wel-en-lhkán ta ts’i7-a, t’u7 cw7aoy t’u7 kw-s q’wel-s cook-TR-1SG.SU DET deer-DET but NEG still DET-NOM cook-3POSS ‘I am cooking deer meat, but it isn’t done yet.’ VG (St’át’imcets)

(21) máys-en-as ta káoh-a kw-s Bill fix-TR-3ERG DET car-DET DET-NOM Bill ‘Bill is fixing the car.’ VG (St’át’imcets)

(22) na mikw’-int-as ta lhxsenptn lha Mary 7i na7-xw wa mikw’-int-as PART RL-still IMPF wash-TR-3ERG ‘Mary is washing the floor and she’s still washing it.’ VG (Skwxwú7mesh)
It is important to emphasize that these data differ qualitatively from data in English. For comparison, two separate surveys of naïve English speakers were undertaken. Both resulted in judgments of marginality or ungrammaticality for an overwhelming majority of test sentences involving perfective (non-progressive) accomplishments with denial of culmination. In other words, the culmination of an English perfective accomplishment is not cancelable – culmination is an entailment, not an implicature. The comments in (24-25) are from different speakers:

(24) a. # Mary wove a blanket and is still weaving it.
   Speaker’s comments: “Saying that she wove a blanket means she completed it so how could she still be weaving it?”

b. # Mary read a book but didn’t finish it.
   Speaker’s comments: “Should say ‘Mary started reading a book…but didn’t finish it’.”

c. # Mary ate an apple and she is still eating it.
   Speaker’s comments: “If she ate it, she can’t still be eating it – ate implies she’s done!”

(25) A: Mary wove a blanket.
    B1: Did she finish it?
    B2: Is she still weaving it?
   Speaker’s comments: “Sounds strange…because when you say wove a blanket it means she finished, so why would you have to ask whether she finished it?”

3. Analysis
3.1 Accomplishments are derived from telic roots

The accomplishment VPs we are investigating in St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh are formed by the addition of a control transitivizer to bare roots. These roots are unaccusative (have a single internal argument; Davis 1997), and have culmination entailments (Davis in prep). (26-31) show that bare roots are systematically interpreted in the past:

---

6 Bare roots have not yet been widely elicited in Skwxwú7mesh, but the available Skwxwú7mesh data systematically support the claims made here.
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(26) q’ets’ ti swíta-s-a
get.knitted DET sweater-3POSS-DET
‘Her sweater got knitted.’ \(\text{VG}\) (St’át’imcets)

Can it mean it’s being knitted right now? “No. It just means her sweater got knitted.”

(27) ts’aqw ti ts’úqwaz’-a
get.eaten DET fish-DET
‘The fish got eaten.’ \(\text{VG}\) (St’át’imcets)

Can it mean the fish is getting eaten? “No. It just means it got eaten.”

(28) q’wel ti ts’úqwaz’-a
get.cooked DET fish-DET
‘The fish is cooked.’ \(\text{VG}\) (St’át’imcets)

Rejected gloss: ‘The fish is being cooked.’

(29) na kw’el ta smits
RL get.cooked DET meat
‘The meat is cooked / got cooked.’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

(30) na yetl’k ta lam’
RL get.painted DET house
‘The house got painted.’ \(\text{VG}\) (Skwxwú7mesh)

(31) na payak ta snexwilh
RL get.fixed DET canoe
‘The canoe got fixed.’ (Skwxwú7mesh)

Furthermore, canceling the culmination of bare roots results in a contradiction:

(32) * mays ti q’láxan-a, t’u7 aoy t’u7 kw-s ka-máys-ts-a
get.fixed DET fence-DET but NEG just DET-NOM OOC-fix-3POSS-OOC
‘The fence got fixed, but it couldn’t get fixed.’ (St’át’imcets)

Speaker’s comments: “Contradiction.”

(33) * mets ta púkw-a, t’u7 aoy t’u7 kw-s tsukw-s
get.written DET book-DET but NEG just DET-NOM finish-3POSS
‘The book got written, but it isn’t finished.’ (St’át’imcets)

Speaker’s comments: “Contradiction.”

(34) * na kw’el ta smits 7i na7-xw wa kw’el-t-as
RL get.cooked DET meat PART RL-still IMPF cook-TR-3ERG
‘You’re saying its cooked but they’re still cooking it!...Why would you keep on cooking it? It’s cooked!...Unless she thought it wasn’t quite cooked, then she might put it back in the oven.” (Skwxwú7mesh)
The denotation of an unaccusative root verb is provided in (36), and the denotation of a sentence containing this root is given in (38). (For the analysis of the St’át’imcets tense system assumed here, see Matthewson 2003, 2004.)

(36)  [[ mays ]]\textsuperscript{w} = \lambda e \lambda x [x gets fixed in \textit{w} (e)]

(37)  mays ti q’láxan-a
     get.fixed DET fence-DET
     ‘The fence got fixed.’
     (St’át’imcets)

(38)  [[ \textsc{TENSE}_\textsc{perf} \ mays \ ti \ q’láxana ]]\textsuperscript{w,g} = \exists e [\text{the fence gets fixed in} \text{ \textit{w} (e)} \ & \ \tau(e) \subseteq g(i)] \text{ (where} \ g(i) \text{< Utterance Time or} \ g(i) \text{overlaps Utterance Time)}

     ‘There is an event \textit{e} of the fence getting fixed, and the running time of \textit{e} is included within the contextually salient (past or present) reference time.’

3.2.  \textbf{Control Transitivizers}

The control transitivizers in both St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh seem to perform two functions. They introduce an agent in control over the event (which is missing in the bare root), and they remove the requirement of the bare root that the event culminate in the actual world. A denotation which captures these two effects is given in (39).\textsuperscript{7,8}

(39)  [[ \textsc{CONTROL}_\textsc{TRANS} ]]\textsuperscript{w} = \lambda f \in D_{<l,st>} [\lambda e [e is controlled by its agent in \textit{w} \ & \ \forall w’ [w’ is an inertia world \text{w.r.t.} \textit{w} \text{ at the beginning of} \textit{e} \rightarrow [\exists e’ [f (e’)(w’) \ & \ e \text{ causes} e’ \text{ in} \textit{w’}]]]] \text{ (l = events; Intensional Functional Application is used)}

According to (39), \textsc{CONTROL}_\textsc{TRANS} takes a telic verbal root, and ensures that (i) the event is controlled by its agent and (ii) in all inertia worlds, the event leads to the culmination expressed by the root. When applied to the St’át’imcets root \textit{mays} ‘get fixed’, \textsc{CONTROL}_\textsc{TRANS} says that an agent performs an action which in the normal course of events would lead to the fence getting fixed. This is illustrated in (40-41).

\textsuperscript{7} We confine ourselves here to the prototypical control transitivizers –\textit{Vn’} (St’át’imcets) and \textit{Vn/-Vt/-Vnt} (Skwxwú7mesh), glossed \textsc{tr} here. Both languages have a number of other transitivizers which could be classified as ‘control’, as well as ‘limited control’ (LC: Skwxwú7mesh only) and ‘non-control/causative’ (CAU) transitivizers. We leave analysis of these for future research. See Thompson (1979), Davis and Demirdache (2000), among others, for discussion of control in Salish.

\textsuperscript{8} For the connection between control and modalization, cf. English \textit{Bob is silly} (non-control) vs. \textit{Bob is being silly} (control). The cross-linguistic parallel here is surely non-accidental, and invites further investigation.
4. The Source of the Implicature

Recall that St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh accomplishment VPs give rise to an implicature of culmination when used out of the blue.

(42) ts’áqw-an’-lhkan ta n-kíks-a
eat-TR-1SG.SUBJ DET my-cake-DET
‘I ate my cake.’

Speaker’s comments: “Sounds like you ate all of it.”

(43) na xel’-t-as ta sxwexwiy’am’ lha Mary
write-TR-3 DET story DET Mary
‘Mary wrote a story.’

Speaker’s comments: “She wrote it...she finished.”

We argue that the implicature of culmination arises because in all inertia worlds, the event culminates. In the absence of other information, the hearer assumes that the ‘normal’ course of events (culmination) takes place.

The fact that the English progressive, which also involves inertia worlds, does not implicate culmination is explained by the presence in English (unlike in St’át’imcets or Skwxwú7mesh) of a contrasting perfective form which entails culmination. Thus, (44a) is a better way to express culmination than (44b), so (44b) lacks a culmination implicature: 9

9 There are actually perfective transitive accomplishments which entail culmination in St’át’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh; these take a non-control transitivizer. Further research is required here, but it still holds that for any agent in control of an event, there is no contrasting culminating form.
(44)  
  a.  John built a house.  \(\text{ENTAILS CULMINATION}\)
  b.  John was building a house.  \(\text{DOES NOT IMPLICATES CULMINATION}\)\(^\text{10}\)

What about the tense effect? That is, why are St’àt’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh accomplishments usually translated in the past? We adopt a similar idea here: in St’àt’imcets and Skwxwú7mesh, there is a contrasting form (using the imperfective morpheme) which is a better way to express the present imperfective interpretation (since it explicitly makes sure the event is not completed within the reference time). Therefore, the preferred interpretation of a perfective accomplishment sentence is in the past. The perfective / imperfective contrast with respect to tense is illustrated in (45-46).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(45)} \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{máys-en-lhkan ta káoh-a} \\
& \quad \text{fix-TR-1SG.SU DET car-DET} \\
& \quad \text{‘I fixed the car.’} \\
& \quad \text{(St’àt’imcets)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{wá7-lhkan máys-en ta káoh-a} \\
& \quad \text{IMPF-1SG.SU fix-TR DET car-DET} \\
& \quad \text{‘I’m fixing the car.’} \\
& \quad \text{(St’àt’imcets)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(46)} \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{chen lhen-t ta hem’-ten} \\
& \quad \text{1SG.SU weave-TR DET cover-INSTR} \\
& \quad \text{‘I made a blanket.’} \\
& \quad \text{(Skwxwú7mesh)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{chen wa lhen-t ta hem’-ten} \\
& \quad \text{1SG.SU IMPF weave-TR DET cover-INSTR} \\
& \quad \text{‘I’m making the blanket.’} \\
& \quad \text{(Skwxwú7mesh)}
\end{align*}
\]

Note, however, that as predicted by our analysis, present progressive translations of perfective accomplishments are possible, as shown in (47-48).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(47)} \quad \text{máys-en-as ta káoh-a kw-s Bill} \\
& \quad \text{fix-TR-3ERG DET car-DET DET-NOM Bill} \\
& \quad \text{‘Bill is fixing the car.’} \\
& \quad \text{(St’àt’imcets)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(48)} \quad \text{A:} & \quad \text{na 7encha lha Carrie} \\
& \quad \text{RL where DET Carrie} \\
& \quad \text{‘Where is Carrie?’} \\
\text{B:} & \quad \text{na7 ta lam’-s} \\
& \quad \text{LOC DET house-3POSS} \\
& \quad \text{‘At her house.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{10}\) Hotze Rullmann (p.c.) observes that we may in fact predict that the English progressive should implicate non-culmination, rather than merely failing to implicate culmination. Further work is required here (including establishing the facts about the implicatures of the English progressive).
5. **Implications for cross-linguistic variation**

We have proposed in this paper that Stʼátʼimaclert and Skwxwú7mesh have a culmination requirement in the lexical entries of unaccusative roots.\(^{11}\) Control transitics are all derived from such telic unaccusative roots. The control transitivizer introduces modality: culmination is not required in the actual world for perfective control transitives. While it is not yet known whether this exact analysis is applicable across the Salish family, there is preliminary supporting evidence from at least Sliammon (Mainland Comox; J. Davis 1978, Watanabe 2003) and Senchothen (Northern Straits; Kiyota 2004).\(^{12}\)

In this section we briefly address the consequences of our analysis for the claim that in languages such as English, German and Finnish, telicity is introduced not in the verbal root, but by a higher functional head (see e.g., Tenny 1994, Borer 1994, Kratzer 2004). This seems to be the reverse of the Salish situation, where underlyingly telic roots are made atelic by a higher functional head. However, the two types of system may not involve radical cross-linguistic variation after all.\(^{13}\) Suppose we assume a universal hierarchy of functional heads as in (49):

\[
(49) \quad [\text{Im} \text{perfective} \ [\text{Root/inertia modality} \ [\text{Voice} \ [\text{Telic} \ [V]]]]]
\]

Suppose we further assume, following Pylkkanan (2003), that adjacent functional heads may be ‘bundled’ into a single morpheme. We can then propose that in languages like German, the Voice and Telic heads are bundled into a single morpheme (which can also be called Accusative Case; cf. Kratzer 2004). This accounts for the observation that the adding of an accusative object in such languages also induces telicity. In our two Salish languages, on the other hand, bare roots already incorporate Telic, and the control transitivizers represent a bundling of Root/inertia modality and Voice. This accounts for the fact that adding the agent in such languages removes telicity. Finally, the English progressive bundles Imperfective together with Root/inertia modality.

---

\(^{11}\) It might be possible to strengthen this to the claim that all (non-stative) roots culminate, in which case the requirement could be stated over the whole lexicon, rather than root by root.

\(^{12}\) See also Travis (2000) on Malagasy and Tagalog. Travis argues for an Inner Aspect head which can introduce ‘incompleteness’. She shows that Malagasy possesses affixes introducing both telicity and atelicity, and moreover that there is a correlation between volition and telicity. Thus, the morpheme *maha-* enforces telicity and also non-volitionality. This directly parallels the Salish situation, where the control transitivizers allow non-culmination, but non-control transitivizers enforce culmination (see fn. 9 above).

\(^{13}\) Thanks to Angelika Kratzer (p.c.) for discussion of these issues.
6. ‘Culminativity’ versus ‘Durativity’: Defining Aspectual Classes

In this final section we point out that culmination properties must be treated as partially independent of the relative duration of events. This will lead us to claim that neither ‘accomplishments’ nor ‘achievements’ can be treated as primitive aspectual classes.

Consider, for example, the contrast between unaccusative roots and their control transitive alternates in St’át’imcets. As we have seen, unaccusatives have a culmination entailment, but control transitives have a culmination implicature. However, other aspectual tests treat the two classes identically (essentially, as consisting of an initial process followed by a final state), in contrast to activities and (resulting) states.

As we have seen, in out-of-the-blue contexts, bare roots and control transitives have a past tense interpretation (50a-b); in contrast, activities have a present or past tense interpretation (50c), and (resulting) states are interpreted in the present (50d).

\[(50)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{mays ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{UNACC. ROOT} \\
& \text{‘The car got fixed.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{máys-en-lhkan ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{CONTROL TRANS.} \\
& \text{‘I fixed the car.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{máys-cal -lhkan ki káoh-a} \\
& \text{ACTIVITY} \\
& \text{‘I am fixing/fixed some cars.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & \text{(e)s-máys ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{STATE} \\
& \text{‘The car is fixed.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

When modified by the imperfective auxiliary *wa7*, unaccusatives, control transitives and activities all yield a process reading, in contrast to resulting states, which yield a (somewhat marginal) temporary state reading:

\[(51)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{wa7 mays ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{UNACC. ROOT} \\
& \text{‘The car is/was being fixed.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{wá7-lhkan máys-en ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{CONTROL TRANS.} \\
& \text{‘I am/was fixing the car.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{wá7-lhkan máys-cal ki káoh-a} \\
& \text{ACTIVITY} \\
& \text{‘I am/was fixing some cars.’} \\
& \text{(St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}

---

14 This discussion is based on St’át’imcets; extension to Skwxwú7mesh requires further research.

15 The imperfective also allows a habitual reading which is not relevant to the discussion here.
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d.  \(\text{wa7 (e)s-máys ta káoh-a}\)
    IMPF STAT- get.fixed DET car-DET
    ‘The car is fixed (temporarily).’  \(\text{STATE}\)  (St’át’imcets)

Finally, when modified by a combination of the perfect aspect marker \(\text{plan}\) (usually translated as ‘already’), plus the imperfective \(\text{wa7}\), unaccusatives and control transitives are both ambiguous between a process and resulting state reading, whereas activities yield only a process reading, and states yield only a resulting state reading:

(52)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{plan wa7 mays ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{already IMPF get.fixed DET car-DET} \\
& \text{(i) ‘The car is/was already being fixed.’} \\
& \text{(ii) ‘The car has/had already been fixed.’} \\
\text{unacc. root} & \text{ (St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{plán-lhkan wa7 máys-en ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{already-1SG.SU IMPF get.fixed -TR DET car-DET} \\
& \text{(i) ‘I am/was already fixing the car.’} \\
& \text{(ii) ‘I have/had already fixed the car.’} \\
& \text{control trans.} & \text{ (St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{plán-lhkan wa7 máys-cal ki káoh-a} \\
& \text{already-1SG.SU IMPF get.fixed -ACT PL.DET car-DET} \\
& \text{‘I am/was already fixing some cars.’} \\
& \text{activity} & \text{ (St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & \text{plan wa7 (e)s-máys ta káoh-a} \\
& \text{already IMPF STAT- get.fixed DET car-DET} \\
& \text{‘The car is/was already fixed.’} \\
& \text{state} & \text{ (St’át’imcets)}
\end{align*}\]

The results of these tests are summarized in (53). The unaccusative roots and the control transitives behave exactly alike, in spite of differing with respect to culmination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unaccusatives</th>
<th>control transitives</th>
<th>activities</th>
<th>resulting states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>out-of-blue</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>process/present</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa7</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>temporary state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan wa7</td>
<td>process/result state</td>
<td>process/result state</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>result state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tests pick out three aspectual classes: states, activities, and ‘accomplishments’, the last class including both unaccusative roots and control transitives. In other words, (non-instantaneous) unaccusative roots and control transitives have identical aspectual properties as far as (53) is concerned, in spite of the culmination difference we have demonstrated.

What about ‘true’ (i.e., instantaneous or near-instantaneous) achievements? Here, the culmination difference is sometimes neutralized (54-55), but sometimes not (56):
The predicate *pun* ‘be found (intr.), find (tr.)’ is a unique case of a verb whose unaccusative root is formally identical to its control transitive alternant. This is because the –Vn transitivizer has fused with the root in the transitive variant.
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