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This thesis investigates several previously undescribed properties of the syntax of Shuswap, a Northern Interior Salish language. The data are based on original fieldwork undertaken from 1981-1993. After a brief introduction to Shuswap morphology and syntax, I turn to the central questions of the thesis—what word orders exist in Shuswap and how they can be accommodated in current syntactic theory.

Shuswap has unusually free word order of nominals relative to the verb. I propose that the possible word orders result from three distinct and co-occurring processes placing nominals in preverbal position—clefting, left dislocation, and focusing. An examination of preverbal nominals with respect to focus particles, second position clitics, island conditions, pronominal doubling and verbal morphology leads to the conclusion that clefted nominals are base generated in a position adjoined to CP, left dislocated nominals are adjoined to an external topic position, and focussed nominals are moved to Spec of IP position. These structures also correctly predict word order in sentences with more than one preverbal nominal.

From a descriptive viewpoint, Shuswap seems unique among Salish languages in the word orders that it allows. Coast Salish languages allow only one of these processes—clefting. Other Interior Salish languages utilize a range of preverbal positions but in a much more limited fashion. From a theoretical viewpoint, the free word order facts, along with the frequent use of null pronominals, and discontinuous constituents, suggest that Shuswap is a non-configurational language. In such languages, nominals are not organized in a hierarchical or asymmetrical fashion (as, for example, in English), but rather
are given a flat structure. This thesis provides Shuswap data relevant to the standard tests for asymmetrical structures involving coreference restrictions. I propose a rule for the antecedence of pronominals in Shuswap that crucially relies on the fundamental asymmetry of preverbal and postverbal nominals and clauses. Therefore, I conclude that Shuswap structure, contrary to first impressions, is best analysed as configurational. This study thus supports the claim that all languages are in fact configurational in their underlying representations regardless of their surface properties.
Acknowledgements

Anyone who has spent the time that I have in the preparation of a dissertation owes great debts. I am greatly indebted to the Secwépemc speakers who shared their knowledge with me, and to the many people who generously welcomed me into their homes. In particular, I wish to thank Chief Ron Ignace and Chief Manny Jules for inviting me into their communities. It is my hope that this work reflects the respect I have for the Secwépemc and their language.

This dissertation also reflects an academic community. I wish to thank my thesis committee, and in particular my senior supervisor, Donna Gerdts for sharing her knowledge of Salish with me, and for leading me through the writing process. Two persons deserve special mention: Ross Saunders first introduced me to Salish and for many years supported my field research, and Aert Kuipers generously welcomed me into the field and shared his great knowledge of Salish with me. I also wish to thank Ewa Czaykowka-Higgins, Henry Davis, M. Dale Kinkade, Lisa Matthewson and other participants in the Salish Working Group for providing me with encouragement. John Knowles was generous in his guidance and friendship in my early studies. I have also been fortunate to study with David Perlmutter, and Wayne Suttles, scholars who greatly inspired me.

I wish to thank M. Dale Kinkade, Paul Kroeber, and Charles Ulrich, who meticulously read this manuscript and provided me with comments. Any remaining errors are my own.
The Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Fund and the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society have provided funding for some of the field research in this dissertation.

Finally I wish to thank my family—my wife, Bev, my daughters, Akemi, and Jennifer, and my son, Mark, for their support and for enduring my frequent disappearances into the sagebrush.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Basic Clause Structure

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Common Types of Clauses

1.1.1 Intransitive Clauses

1.1.2 Transitive Clauses

1.1.3 Middle Constructions

1.1.4 Passives

1.1.5 Ditransitive Constructions

1.1.6 Applicatives

1.2 Nominal Case Marking

1.3 Word Order

1.4 Person Marking

1.4.1 Independent Clitics

1.4.2 Dependent Clitics

1.4.3 Subject Suffixes

1.4.4 Object Suffixes

1.4.5 Possessive Affixes

1.4.6 Emphatic Pronouns

1.5 Split Ergativity

1.5.1 Third Person Marking

1.5.2 Aspect

1.5.3 Clause Type

1.6 Agent Hierarchies

1.7 Complex NP Constructions

1.7.1 Possessive Constructions

1.7.2 Relative Clauses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wh-Position</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Basic Properties of Wh and Contrastive Focus Constructions</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Focus Particles</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Second-position Clitics</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Island Constraints</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The Morphological Properties of Clefts</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Clefts of Direct Arguments</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Cliticization</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>Nominalization</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Peripheral Gaps</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Jacaltec</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>Shuswap</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>Halkomelem</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Topic and Focus</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>External Topic Position</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>The Distribution of External Topic Nominals</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Second-position Clitics</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>Island Constraints</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>Doubling</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Focus Position</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>The Distribution of Nominals in the Focus Position</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>The Structure of the Focus Position</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td>Second-position Clitics</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4</td>
<td>Island Constraints</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5</td>
<td>Doubling</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Embedded Contexts</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Shuswap</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Preverbal Positions</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Configurationality</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2</td>
<td>Weak Crossover</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Nominal Arguments</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1</td>
<td>Condition C</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2</td>
<td>Conditions on Extraction</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.3</td>
<td>Weak Crossover</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>absolutive (Jacaltec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asp</td>
<td>aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut</td>
<td>autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux</td>
<td>auxiliary (Halkomelem, Warlpiri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl</td>
<td>classifier (Jacaltec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvc-</td>
<td>plural reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv-</td>
<td>out of control reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+c</td>
<td>diminutive reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dep</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dir</td>
<td>directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dup</td>
<td>duplicative (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ergative (Jacaltec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph</td>
<td>emphatic pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erg</td>
<td>ergative (Warlpiri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evid</td>
<td>evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excl</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp</td>
<td>expectational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact</td>
<td>factual mode (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fc</td>
<td>full control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut</td>
<td>future (Chamorro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut</td>
<td>future mode (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hab</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr</td>
<td>intransitive (Halkomelem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irr</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc</td>
<td>limited control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.c.tr</td>
<td>limited control transitive (Halkomelem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ls</td>
<td>lexical suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Meaning (Language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>nominalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj</td>
<td>object (Halkomelem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qu</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>partitive (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss</td>
<td>possessive (Warlpiri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres</td>
<td>present (Warlpiri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punc</td>
<td>punctual (Mohawk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>redirective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel</td>
<td>relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep</td>
<td>reportative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>res</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
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Introduction

This thesis investigates the syntax of Shuswap, a member of the Salish language family.\(^1\) It arises from field research conducted between 1981 and 1993 with Shuswap speakers. The Shuswap speakers that provided information for this study, with one exception, are all speakers of the Western Shuswap dialect. My primary consultant, Mona Jules, is from Deadmans Creek (Skeetchestn), located west of Savona. The data have been checked with several other speakers from Deadmans Creek, including Basile Deneau and Annie-May Jules. I consulted as well with the late Leslie Jules of Kamloops and

\[^1\] Salish had approximately twenty-three languages (Thompson 1979), although several are no longer spoken. Thompson divides the family into Bella Coola and the main body, which contains the Coast Division, the Tsamosan Division, and the Interior Division. Shuswap is a member of the Interior Salish Division:

(i) Interior Division
   Northern
   Lillooet
   Thompson
   Shuswap
   Southern
   Columbian
   Okanagan
   Kalispel
   Coeur d'Alene

Within Shuswap there are two major dialects, referred to as Western Shuswap and Eastern Shuswap (Kuipers 1990). The dialect boundary is slightly east of Kamloops. The two dialects differ primarily in their phonetic inventory and have some lexical variation. I have observed no significant syntactic differences between the two dialects.
Joe Michel of Adam's Lake (the contemporary village is near Chase). The latter is a speaker of the Eastern Shuswap dialect. My early research was in Dog Creek, on the Fraser River, where I conducted research with Lilly Harry, as well as with her niece Mary Palmantier. I had an opportunity to check several points with Mary Palmantier recently, and her judgements were consistent with those of the speakers with whom I am currently working.

Previous research on Shuswap includes a doctoral dissertation by Gibson (1973), and a grammar by Kuipers (1974), with a subsequent update (Kuipers 1990). These are excellent structural studies, focussing primarily on the phonological and morphological properties of the language, and I refer the reader to these works for information on phonology and morphology. Gibson (1973) provides a structural account of the eastern dialect of Shuswap, whereas Kuipers (1974) provides grammatical information, a dictionary, and eight texts, gathered primarily from speakers of the western dialect of Shuswap. Kuipers (1990) updates the previous grammar, gives new texts, and includes data gathered on the eastern dialect. The syntax of Shuswap, however, has never been systematically described, and this is the first theoretical discussion on that topic. 2

The phenomena investigated in this dissertation arise from two early observations in my fieldwork. One of the observations had previously been

2 There are also several ethnographic studies that include linguistic information (Boas 1890a, 1890b, Bouchard and Kennedy 1975, Dawson 1891, Palmer 1975a, 1975b, Teit 1909), and a short sketch by an oblate missionary (LeJeune 1925).
noted in Kuipers (1974). In wh-questions, agents and patients are treated differently:³

(1) swētē k-wîk-t-Ø-s
    who irr-see-tr-3sØ-3sS

'Who did he see?'

³A broad phonetic transcription is used in this study. The Shuswap consonant set has the properties typical of Salish in general (Thompson 1979). These include an opposition between plain and ejective stops (and affricates), an opposition between prevelar and postvelar places of articulation, and an opposition between labialized and nonlabialized consonants in the prevelar and postvelar regions. The obstruents are voiceless, whereas resonants are voiced. There is an opposition between plain and glottalized resonants. Postvelar resonants are produced as pharyngeals. The consonants are shown in the following chart:

**Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Alv</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Pal</th>
<th>Prevelar</th>
<th>Postvelar</th>
<th>Glot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kʷ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>qʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ejective</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td></td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k'ʷ</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'ʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affr</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>Č</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ejective</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>x'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fric</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x'</td>
<td>x'</td>
<td>x'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glott</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ɬ</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>ɭ</td>
<td>ɭ'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inventory of the vowels is /i e a o u a/. Non-syllabic /i u/ are orthographically represented as /y w/ respectively.
Comparing the wh-questions above to transitive constructions such as (3), it can be observed that the verbal morphology is the same in wh-questions where the patient is questioned (1), but different when the agent is questioned (2):

(2) swétí k-wik-t-ø-m-ís
    who  irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

    'Who saw him?'

(3) wik-t-ø-s
    see-tr-3sO-3sS

    'He saw him.'

The contrast between agent and patient wh-questions suggests a potential structural asymmetry. Moreover, the clitic involved in the extraction of agents has several other uses—including the marking of incompletive aspect, the marking of dependent clauses, and the marking of agent, instrument, locative, temporal, and quantifier extractions. This clitic strategy is one of the notable features of Shuswap syntax.

A second observation is the unexpected frequency of SVO word order. While SVO order was noted in Kuipers (1974), it was claimed to be rare. However, in direct elicitation, SVO is as frequent as the allegedly basic VSO word order. This observation foreshadowed subsequent discoveries of several distinct preverbal positions. This thesis shows that there are three preverbal positions available in the syntax of Shuswap, each with distinct syntactic and morphological properties. The availability of these positions, as well as the freedom of word order in postverbal position, raise the question of the configurational status of Shuswap. At first, the surface properties of word order,
discontinuous constituency, and the use of null pronominals make Shuswap appear to be a non-configurational language. However, evidence from binding theory and weak crossover shows that Shuswap has several structural asymmetries. On the basis of these data, I claim that Shuswap is best analysed as a configurational language. Finally, I investigate the argument status of lexical NPs. Evidence from Condition C effects, conditions on extraction, and weak crossover effects leads to the conclusion that lexical NPs in Shuswap are arguments, not adjuncts.

The basic properties of Shuswap clause structure are described in Chapter One, to provide background for the topics discussed later. Several important phenomena in the grammar of Shuswap are described, including word order, the case system, and person marking. It is shown that Shuswap has a split ergative system, based on person. An investigation of aspect and clause type, distinctions which are commonly made in split ergative systems, shows that Shuswap employs a unique strategy of using clitics to mark aspectual and clausal distinctions. It is concluded that this is different from a split ergative system. It is then shown that Shuswap has agent hierarchies. Evidence comes from restrictions on number and animacy, and from restrictions on the interaction of null third person pronominals and lexical NPs. Finally, the properties of complex NPs—possessive NPs and relative clauses—are described.

In Chapters Two and Three, I present evidence that Shuswap has three distinct preverbal positions—the external topic position, the wh-position, and the focus position, and that nominals in all three positions can co-occur. An examination of preverbal nominals with respect to focus particles, second
position clitics, doubling, island effects, and wh-agreement shows that each position has distinct syntactic properties.

Chapter Two investigates the syntactic properties of wh-position. It is claimed that nominals in the wh-position are base-generated, and that this position is adjoined to CP. Nevertheless, there is evidence that nominals in the wh-position obey islands. This leads to the conclusion that there is empty operator movement. I then turn to wh-agreement. It is shown that there are three complementary strategies involved in the extraction of nominals. Direct arguments may extract without wh-agreement, whereas various obliques and adjuncts employ wh-agreement—either cliticization or nominalization. Finally, I show that Shuswap obeys the Peripheral Gap Constraint, but only when there are null pronominal absolutes.

After establishing the properties of the wh-position, in Chapter Three I turn to two other preverbal positions—the external topic position and the focus position. Neither position has previously been systematically described for Shuswap. The external topic position is represented as base-generated prefixed to CP, and the focus position is represented as Spec of IP. The syntactic properties of these two positions are investigated. There is evidence that the focus position may be multiply filled.

In Chapter Four I address the issue of configurationality. I investigate the properties of binding, weak crossover, and proper government, and show that there are several structural asymmetries in the grammar of Shuswap. I compare the Shuswap binding facts to predictions made by Speas (1990) for configurational and non-configurational languages. Shuswap has a binding pattern that resembles both a configurational and a non-configurational language. It does, however, have a construction that is argued by Speas to
constitute evidence for non-configurationality. I show that this construction is predicted by other principles in the grammar of Shuswap—restrictions on the distribution of null pronominal absolutes that I initially call the *NP pro Condition. In addition, I show that Shuswap has a condition on antecedence that relies on structural asymmetries. In order to be an antecedent, an r-expression must c-command the pronominal. Therefore, an r-expression in subject position can be an antecedent for a pronominal contained in the object NP, but an r-expression in object position cannot be an antecedent for a pronominal in the subject position. In addition to the standard binding conditions, I show that there is also a parallelism constraint operating in the grammar of Shuswap. I propose the Generalized Condition on the Identification of Empty Categories, which unifies the Peripheral Gap Constraint and the *NP pro Condition, and show that this condition follows from an independently motivated Agent Condition. Finally, I show that there are weak crossover effects in Shuswap. While the crossover facts follow from the condition on antecedence, they are nevertheless consistent with the view of configurationality argued for in this thesis.

In Chapter Five, I investigate whether lexical NPs are arguments in Shuswap. First, I investigate Condition C effects. It is shown that lexical NPs, in Shuswap, show Condition C effects. Further support comes from Condition C effects in possessive constructions, relative clauses, and phrasal coordinations. Next, I investigate conditions on the extraction of NPs. There is evidence that possessors of subject NPs in intransitive clauses can extract in Shuswap. Finally, I look at weak crossover which provides evidence for structural asymmetries. The Shuswap properties of Condition C effects, extraction of
possessors, and weak crossover effects are unexpected if all lexical NPs are adjuncts. I conclude that lexical NPs are syntactic arguments in Shuswap.

This study adopts the assumptions of Government and Binding theory (Chomsky 1981, 1982, 1986, 1992). I shall assume that all syntactic arguments are generated within the VP at D-structure, as proposed by the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis (Diesing 1990, Fukui and Speas 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Koopman and Sportiche 1991, Kuroda 1988):

(4) a. m-wik-t-Ø-s r-Mary l-sak'lép
    perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary det-coyote

    'Mary saw the coyote.'

b. 

Shuswap is represented as having underlying SVO word order (4). I shall also assume that the verb raises to the head of functional projections for person-marking purposes. Following Chomsky (1991), I assume that there are
agreement projections for subject and object marking, and an aspect projection for the dependent clitics. Verb raising is shown in (5):

(5)

In (5) the verb has raised to Infl and is in a position to head-govern both lexical NPs. Finally, I assume that Spec of IP is a non-thematic position. In principle, any nominal may move to Spec of IP to receive mild emphasis as shown in (6):

4 I adopt Rizzi's (1990) definition of government:

(i) Head Government: X head-governs Y iff

a. X={A, N, P, V, Agr, T}

b. X m-commands Y

c. no barrier intervenes

d. Relativized Minimality is respected.

(ii) Antecedent Government: X antecedent-governs Y iff
I assume that adjunction to IP is possible. Therefore, after an NP has moved into Spec of IP, additional adjunction of nominals to IP is allowed. In Chapters Two and Three, I motivate two additional syntactic positions. Both of these are base-generated positions.

\[(\text{iii})\quad \text{Relativized Minimality: } X \alpha\text{-governs } Y \text{ only if there is no } Z \text{ such that}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & Z \text{ is a typical potential } \alpha\text{-governor for } Y, \\
\text{b. } & Z \text{ c-commands } Y \text{ and does not c-command } X.
\end{align*}\]
This thesis is a descriptive contribution to the literature on verb-initial languages and to the understanding of Shuswap syntax. It is argued that Shuswap is best analysed as a configurational language and that lexical NPs can be arguments. The thesis supports the hypothesis that all languages are configurational in their underlying representations.
Chapter 1

Basic Clause Structure

1.0 Introduction

This chapter examines Shuswap basic clause structure. I exemplify the range of simple and complex clauses that are used in this study and summarize the grammatical properties associated with each. Common types of clauses are discussed in §1.1. Constructions can be distinguished on the basis of nominal case marking (§1.2), word order (§1.3), and person marking (§1.4). In §1.5 it is shown that Shuswap has a split ergative system for third person marking. Agent hierarchies in Shuswap are discussed in §1.6. Finally, the properties of complex NPs—possessive constructions and relative clauses are discussed in §1.7.

1.1 Common Types of Clauses

This section exemplifies a variety of basic constructions including intransitive, transitive, middle, passive, ditransitive, and applicative
constructions. I relate the properties of verbal morphology to various types of nominals.\(^1\)

1.1.1 **Intransitive Clauses**

Intransitive constructions are shown in (1-3):

1. (1) \(m\)-qʷəččə-Ø
   
   perf-leave-3sS
   
   'She left.'

2. (2) \(x\)-úm-Ø  \(r\)-čixʷ
   
   big-3sS  det-house
   
   'The house is big.'

3. (3) \(m\)-χʔek-Ø  \(r\)-χpəʔə  \(t\)-skʷałkʷʔél\(t\)
   
   perf-go-3sS  det-grandfather  obl-snowmountains
   
   'Grandfather went to the snowmountains.'

Intransitive constructions consist minimally of a predicate (1), though they optionally take lexical arguments (2-3). Evidence for the intransitivity of these constructions comes from nominal case marking (§1.2), and person marking (§1.4).

---

\(^1\)Aspectual distinctions are often indicated by complex constructions in Shuswap. I give all examples in this section in the completive aspect, optionally indicated by the prefix /m-/, since it is not complex.
1.1.2 Transitive Clauses

Transitive clauses are given in (4-6):

(4) k’úl-n-∅-s  r-núxʷənuxʷ  r-mímx
make-fc-3sO-3sS  det-woman  det-basket

'The woman made the basket.'

(5) nik’-n-∅-s  r-spécn  r-tuwíwt
cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-rope  det-child

'The child cut the rope.'

(6) wik-t-∅-s  r-Məry  r-qéʔčə-∅
like-tr-3sO-3sS  det-Mary  det-father-3sP

'Mary saw her father.'

Transitive constructions can be distinguished on the basis of person marking, nominal case marking, and transitive marking. Transitive constructions have two agreement slots for the marking of pronominals. In the examples above these are filled with third person object suffixes followed by the third person subject suffixes. The subject suffixes and the object suffixes are discussed in (§1.4.3) and (§1.4.4) respectively.

---

2 Regular phonological rules result in the deletion of the transitive marker /-t-/ in certain consonantal clusters. The /-n-/, glossed here as 'full control', merges with the unstressed first person subject marker /-n/.
1.1.3 Middle Constructions

Middle constructions are shown in (7-9):

(7) k'ú1-m-Ø  r-núxʷənχʷ  ta-míχ
    make-unsp-3sS  det-woman  obl-basket

'The woman made a basket.'

(8) qʷlēw-m-Ø  r-kyéʔə  ta-spəqpéq
    pick berries-unsp-3sS  det-grandmother  obl-berries

'Grandmother picked berries.'

(9) píχ-m-Ø  r-χpéʔə  ta-c'iʔ
    hunt-unsp-3sS  det-grandfather  obl-deer

'Grandfather is hunting deer.'

In middle constructions the predicate stem is suffixed with /-(é)m/ rather than a transitive marker. The patient of the middle occurs with an oblique marker. Evidence for the surface intransitivity of this construction comes from pronominal marking (§1.4) and from nominal case (§1.2).

The patient in middle constructions is often generic (see 7-9 above) or unspecified:

(10) sačín-m-Ø
    sing-unsp-3sS

'He's singing.'
1.1.4 Passives

Example of what have been called passives (Kuipers 1974) are shown in (11-13):

(11) m-mələx-n-t- Wolfe r-núxʷənənxʷ ta-nč’aʔsqéxəʔ
    perf-kick-fc-tr-3sO-unsp det-woman obi-horse
    ‘The woman was kicked by the horse.’

(12) nik’-n-t- Wolfe r-spéc’n ta-tuwíwt
    cut-fc-tr-3sO-unsp det-rope obl-child
    ‘The rope was cut by the child.’

(13) c’úrm-qs-n-t- Wolfe r-John ta-John r-Mary
    kiss-Is-fc-tr-3sO-unsp obl-John det-Mary
    ‘Mary was kissed by John.’

Passive stems are suffixed with the transitive marker followed by a member of the set of object agreement markers (§1.4.4).

There is some evidence that suggests this construction may be formally transitive.  The evidence comes from the behaviour of this construction in nominalizations. In negatives, the notional predicate is nominalized with a determiner, is prefixed with /s/, and takes possessive person markers in intransitives and subject and object suffixes in transitives. Intransitive and transitive affirmative constructions are shown in (14-15):

---

3I am grateful to Stephen Egesdal (p.c). for pointing this out.
(14) $\chi ? \epsilon k - \varnothing$
   go-3sS
   'He went.'

(15) $\check{c}(u)n-t-\varnothing-\acute{e}s$
   punch-fc-tr-3sO-3sS
   'He punched him.'

Negatives corresponding to the affirmatives given in (14-15) are shown in (16-17):

(16) ta? k-s-$\chi ? \epsilon k - s$
    neg irr-nom-go-3sP
    'He didn't go.'

(17) ta? k-s-$\check{c}(u)n-t-\varnothing-\acute{e}s$
    neg irr-nom-punch-fc-tr-3sO-3sS
    'He didn't punch him.'

We see then that both active transitives and passives take finite clause morphology under nominalization while intransitives do not. Thus, passives follow the active transitive pattern, suggesting that they are not intransitives. In (16) the embedded intransitive predicate takes the possessive marker /-$s/$ whereas in (17) the predicate takes subject marker /-$(\acute{e})s/$ and the object marker /-$\varnothing-$/. The passive construction shown in (13) above tests to be transitive, as can be seen in (18):
If (18) were intransitive, the possessive marker /-s/ would be expected. This is not possible, as shown by (17):

(19) *taʔ k-s-č(u)-n-t-Ø-ém-s
    neg  irr-nom-punch-fc-tr-3sO-unsp-3sP
    'Somebody didn't punch him.'

Since the nominalization facts are somewhat inconclusive in determining the transitivity of this construction, I shall continue to refer to it as passive (Kuipers 1974).

1.1.5 Ditransitive Constructions

I give a ditransitive construction in (20):

(20) kəx-t-Ø-éʔs ʔ-John ʔ-Mary taʔ-s=t=t=swε=wl
    give-tr-3sO-3sS det-John det-Mary obl-fish
    'John gave Mary a fish.'

Ditransitives behave exactly like 'plain' transitives. There is a transitive marker and following it are two agreement positions. Only two lexical nominals may occur with direct case (§1.2), showing that they are linked to the agreement marking on the predicate. In (20) the animate arguments are marked for
agreement on the predicate and these nominals bear direct case. The inanimate patient is marked with an oblique. Notice that (21) is ungrammatical:

\[(21) \text{*kax-t-Ø-és } \gamma-\text{John } \gamma-\text{-swěwľ tə-Mary} \]
\[\text{give-tr-3sO-3sS det-John det-fish obl-Mary} \]
\[\text{‘John gave the fish to Mary.’} \]

1.1.6 Applicatives

A set of suffixes, referred to here as applicative markers, occur in constructions in which nominals bearing a variety of semantic roles appear as the grammatical object. Intransitive constructions that lack an applicative marker are illustrated in (22-24):

\[(22) \text{pe-péń-Ø} \]
\[\text{cv-find-3sS} \]
\[\text{‘He’s finding (something).’} \]

\[(23) \text{nɛs-Ø} \]
\[\text{go along-3sS} \]
\[\text{‘He goes along.’} \]

---

4These markers are also called redirectives (Kinkade 1980). Kuipers (1974, 1992) refers to the set of /-x(i)t-/, /-m(i)nt-/ and /-nweňt-/ as 'complex transitivizers. In this study, the first two are called applicatives, while the last is called a limited control marker.
The grammatically transitive counterparts of (22-24) are shown in (25-27). They are marked with the applicative marker /-m(i)-/, referred to here as 'relational'.

(25) penet-n-Ø-s
    find-rel-fc-3sO-3sS

'The children want a drum.'

(26) nes-m-n-Ø-s
    go along-rel-fc-3sO-3sS

'The children want a drum.'

The transitive marker /t-/ is not overt in (25-27), due to regular phonological processes. There are two agreement positions on the predicate, and the nominals that are linked to these positions bear a member of the set of direct determiners, either /Ø-, /1-/ or the irreals marker /k-/. Any additional nominals are marked with oblique determiners:

5This suffix is referred to as relational in Thompson and Thompson (1992). Kuipers (1974:51) does not segment /-m(i)nt-/ whereas in this study I analyse /-m(i)-n-t-/ as the relational suffix, the full control suffix, and the transitive marker.
(28) m-twka-mí-n-Ø-s  l-sk'wimémlat  r-swéwł n-sqélmxu
perf-sell-rel-fc-3sO-3sS det-child det-fish loc-man

‘The child sold the fish to the man.’

In (28) the goal is marked with the oblique locative determiner /n-/.

There is a second type of applicative. Clauses (29-30) are transitive, with no applicative morphology:

(29) k'úl-n-Ø-s  r-stúkčn
make-tr-3sO-3sS det-dipnet

‘He made the dipnet.’

(30) m-sté?-t-Ø-s  r-xwəxwú?ú?ś
perf-drink-tr-3sO-3sS det-beer

‘She drank the beer.’

The applicative counterparts of (29-30) with are shown in (31-32):

(31) k'úl-x-t-Ø-s  ta-stúkčn
make-red-tr-3sO-3sS obl-dipnet

‘He made a dipnet for him.’

(32) m-sté(t)x-a-x-t-sm-s  ta-xwəxwú?ú?ś
perf-drink-red-tr-1sgo-3sS det-beer

‘She drank the beer for/on me.’

In clauses (32-33), the 'directive' suffix /-x(í)-/ registers that a benefactive or malefactive nominal is the grammatical object of the clause. The patient of
the clause is marked with the oblique determiner /ta-/ . The applicative in clause (32) could have either a benefactive or a malefactive interpretation.

A second use of the applicative /x(ī)-/ is in possessive constructions where the possessor is the grammatical object of the clause:

(33) ṣ-Mary wîk-x-t-sm-s ta-n-qēʔčə
det-Mary see-red-tr-1sgo-3S obl-1sP-father

'Mary saw my father.'

(34) ṣ-Mary wîk-x-t-s-s ta-ʔqēʔčə
det-Mary see-red-tr-2sGo-3S obl-2sP-father

'Mary saw your father.'

The constructions shown in (33-34) with applicative morphology get interpretations where the possessor is disjoint in reference from the grammatical subject. There is agreement with the possessor as can be observed with first and second person object agreement in (33-34) and the head of the possessive construction takes an oblique determiner. Case marking within the possessive construction can be seen in (35):

(35) ṣ-Mary wîk-x-t-ə-s ṣ-John ta-qēʔčə-s
det-Mary see-red-tr-3sO-3s det-John obl-father-3sP

'Mary saw John’s father.'

The head of the possessive construction takes the oblique determiner /ta-/ whereas the possessor takes the direct determiner /ṣ-/.

There is a contrast with third person possessors:
Construction (36) has applicative morphology and the possessor is interpreted as being disjoint in reference with the subject. It constrasts with (37), which lacks applicative morphology, and in which the subject the possessor in the object may or may not co-refer.

Finally it can be observed that the relational and benefactive applicative markers can co-occur:

(38) tɔkɛ-mí-x-t-Ø-s
sell-rel-red-tr-3sO-3sS

‘He sells it to somebody.’

When the two applicatives co-occur, the relational applicative precedes the benefactive.6

6Kuipers (1992:52) discusses the combinations of the transitivizers.
1.2 Nominal Case Marking

As seen in the data in the previous section, Shuswap nominals are preceded by a set of proclitic determiners that distinguish direct from oblique case. The proclitics mark spatial or temporal deixis. They serve to foreground or background nominals in discourse. The nominal case markers are given in (39):

(39) Determiners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Distal</th>
<th>Irrealis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Case</strong></td>
<td>$\gamma-$</td>
<td>$l-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oblique Case</strong></td>
<td>$t\varepsilon-/x-$</td>
<td>$tk-/xk-$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be observed in the chart, proximal/distal deixis is only distinguished for direct case. The proximal direct case marker $/\gamma-$ is used in reference to nominals that are in view of the speaker or in discourse focus.

---

7Gibson (1973) calls this set complement particles, which 'mark phrases that expand notions of the predicate', whereas Kuipers (1974:57) calls them articles that function as case markers, claiming, as in this study, that their behaviour is syntactic. He calls the direct case markers 'absolutive' and the oblique case markers 'relative'. The 'proximal/distal' distinction is referred to as 'present/absent'. The present/absent categories form a class called 'actual-determinate' which opposes the 'hypothetical-indeterminate.'
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(40) mc? k'úñ-n-Ø-s r-말éxya?
   exp make-fc-3sO-3sS det-basket
   'She's going to make the basket.'

The distal direct case marker /l-/ is used with nominals that are not in view of the speaker, or in reference to deceased relatives and mythological beings. It also indicates temporal as well as spatial deixis. It is used in reference to events in the completive aspect (41):

(41) m-píq"-(n)-Ø-n l-말éxya?
    perf-look-(fc)-3sO-1sS det-basket
    'I looked at the basket.'

The direct case irrealis determiner /k-/ is illustrated in (42-43):

(42) qwän-mí-n-Ø-s k-šœmœmœl t k-puméka?
    want-rel-fc-3sO-3sS det-children irr-drump
    'The children want a drum.'

(43) swétŷ k-kwéym-Ø k-sqœxœ-s
    who irr-bark-3sS irr-dog-3sP
    'Whose dog barked?'

The irrealis determiner is used to mark non-specific nominals (42) and is used in wh-question constructions (43).
The oblique case markers /tə-/ and /tək-/ mark realis and irrealis aspect respectively. They have a wide range of syntactic functions. Several functions are illustrated in (44-47). In (44-45) the oblique determiner marks the patient of a middle construction:

(44) k’úl-m-Ø ta-ðeɔxya?
make-unsp-3sS obl-basket
'She made a basket.'

(45) mɛ? k’úl-m-Ø akʷa tək-ðeɔxya?
exp make-unsp-3S rep obl-basket
'She's going to make a basket.'

There are further uses of the oblique marker. It marks locatives (46) and instrumentals (47):

(46) mɛ? xəy-ɛyp kn tə-tikʷ
exp hot-res+c 1sind obl-fire
'I'm going to get hot by the fire.'

---

The distinction between /tə-, x/- and /tək-, xk/- is largely dialectal. The eastern dialect of Shuswap uses the lateral affricate where /tə-/ is used in the western Shuswap. There are instances of /x/- in western Shuswap however. Gibson (1973) segments /tək-, xk/- as being composed of the oblique marker and the irrealis marker /k-/. This is a reasonable assumption.
The oblique determiners shown in (39) are part of a much wider set that mark the thematic status of oblique nominals. For example, locatives are marked with /n-/:

(48) č-1x-m-st-Ø-étŋ  ʔ-kúkpiʔ  nuʔ  nʔ-ʔask’éʔ  
    hab-know-m-caus-3sO-1sS+c  det-chief  there  loc-Alkali Lake

'I know the chief there at Alkali Lake.'

(49) meʔ  ʔay-éyp  kn  n-sq’ílye  
    exp  hot-res+c  1sSind  loc-sweathouse

'I'm going to get hot in the sweathouse.'

(50) č-1x-m-st-Ø-ės  ʔ-kúkpiʔ  nəʔélyə  n-χ̣ɛχ̣təm  
    hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-3sS  det-chief  here  loc-Dog Creek

'He knows the chief here at Dog Creek.'

The distinction between direct and oblique case marking is syntactically determined. There is a correlation between the direct case marker and person marking. In intransitive clauses where one argument is marked for person on the predicate, there can be at most one nominal with direct case. This is confirmed in the intransitive construction in (51) and the middle in (52):
(51) m-χʔɛk-Ø ʁ-χpɛʔa  
    perf-go-3sS det-grandfather  
    obl-snowmountains  

   'Grandfather went to the snowmountains.'

(52) m-qʷlēw-Ø ʁ-kyέʔa  
    perf-pick berries-unsp-3sS det-grandmother  
    obl-berries  

   'Grandmother picked berries.'

In (51) and (52) the nominal linked to person marking on the predicate takes the
direct case marker /ʁ-/. Any additional nominals not linked to person marking
necessarily take oblique determiners.

In possessive constructions, the possessor may precede the head (53a)
or follow it (53b):

(53) a. m-qʷlēw-Ø ʁ-Mary  
    perf-pick berries-unsp-3sS det-Mary  
    ʁ-kyέʔa-s  
    det-grandmother-3sP  

   'Mary's grandmother picked berries.'

---

9It should be pointed out that the case markers have a wider distribution
than suggested by the present discussion. All of the case markers can be used
to introduce clauses.
b.  m-qʷléw-m-Ø   ɣ-kyeʔa-s
    perf-pick berries-nsp-3sS   det-grandmother-3sP

    ɣ-Mary
    det-Mary

'Mary's grandmother picked berries.'

The possessor determines agreement on the head. The direct determiner marks the second element—either the head or the possessor in possessive constructions, depending on the word order. In an intransitive clause such as (53) two nominals are marked for direct case. The case marker on the first nominal in possessive constructions indicates the syntactic status of the entire construction. In (53) the direct determiner indicates that the possessive construction is linked to the person marking on the predicate. The second nominal, the head of the possessive construction, also takes the direct marker. The interaction of the oblique and direct case markers is more clearly shown by the contrast shown in (54-55):

(54)  m-xʔek-Ø  n-čitxʷ-s   ɣ-Mary
      perf-go-3sS  loc-house-3sP   det-Mary

  'He went to Mary's house.'

(55)  m-xʔek-Ø  n-Mary   ɣ-čitxʷ-s
      perf-go-3sS  loc-Mary   det-house-3sP

  'He went to Mary's house.'
The first nominal takes the syntactic case marker of the entire construction and the second member takes the direct case marker. Thus the case marking is independent of the thematic status of the nominals.\(^{10}\)

Similarly, passive constructions only permit a single direct argument, the patient; the passive agent is an oblique:

\[(56)\quad m-k'u1-n-t-ø-m\quad \gamma-m\text{im}x\quad t\text{a-núx}'\text{ønx}'\quad \text{perf-make-fc-tr-3sO-unsp det-basket obl-woman}\]

‘The basket was made by the woman.’

Transitive clauses, however, permit two arguments to be marked for person on the predicate. Thus, it is predicted that there can be two nominal arguments with direct determiners linked to the person marking on the predicate. This is confirmed in the transitive in (57) and the ditransitive in (58):

\[(57)\quad m-k'u1-n-ø-s\quad \gamma-núx'\text{ønx}'\quad \gamma-m\text{im}x\quad \text{perf-make-fc-3sO-3sS det-woman det-basket}\]

‘The woman made the basket.’

\[(58)\quad m-kax-t-ø-ës\quad \gamma-John\quad \gamma-Mary\quad t\text{a-s wëv}'\quad \text{perf-give-tr-3sO-3sS det-John det-Mary obl-fish}\]

‘John gave Mary a fish.’

\(^{10}\)The temporal adjunct /l-pëxýëw täs/ ‘yesterday’ is a counterexample to the observation regarding the correlation of direct case marking and agreement on the predicate. It is likely that the direct determiner has been lexicalized. Other temporal adjuncts take different determiner/complementizers, e.g. /e pëxýëw täs/ ‘tomorrow’ or take nothing at all, e.g. /pëyin/ ‘today, now’.  
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In the transitive construction (57), both the agent and the patient are marked on the predicate, and consequently the lexical nominals can take direct determiners. There are only two pronominal positions on the predicate, so in the ditransitive constructions only two of the three lexical nominals can take direct marking. This correlates with direct case marking. The remaining argument, the patient, is not marked on the predicate and is an oblique.

Applicative constructions also take two direct determiners:

(59) m-k’úl-x-t-Ø-s  ḡ-núxw’ánxw  t’a-mí̊x
    perf-make-red-tr-3sO-3sS  det-woman  obl-basket

‘She made a basket for the woman.’

In constructions with non-human patients, the thematic goal and the agent are marked on the predicate. Thus it is the lexical argument linked to the person marking that takes the direct determiner. The non-human patient is marked with the oblique determiner.

Finally, all of the case markers shown in (39) not only mark the syntactic status of nominals, but also mark clauses. Direct determiners mark the dependent clause in incompletive constructions:

(60) wʔεx  ḡ-píx-m əs
    exist  det-hunt-unsp 3sdep

‘He is hunting.’

The distal determiner is common in factive constructions:
'I know that he kissed the woman.'

The oblique determiner /ta-/ marks the predicate of a relative clause:

\[ (62) \text{č-1x-m-st-∅-ētn} \quad \text{γ-νύχw&anχw} \]
\[ \text{hab-know-unsp-caus-3S-1sS} \quad \text{det-woman} \]
\[ \text{te-čúm-qs-n-∅-s} \quad \text{obl-kiss-ls-fc-3S-3sS} \]

'I know the woman that he kissed.'

Irrealis case markers occur in negatives (63), yes-no questions (64), and wh-questions (65-66):

\[ (63) \text{ta?} \quad \text{k-s-č-1x-m-st-∅-ēs} \quad \text{neg} \quad \text{irr-nom-hab-know-unsp-caus-3S-3sS} \]

'He doesn't know.'

\[ (64) \text{kɛn} \quad \text{k-s-k"wɛn-(n)-∅-x} \quad \text{γ-ʔék'wən} \quad \text{did} \quad \text{irr-nom-taste-(fc)-3S-2sS} \quad \text{det-salmon eggs} \]

'Have you ever tasted salmon eggs?'

\[ (65) \text{swëty} \quad \text{χk-s-čun-(n)-∅-x} \quad \text{mɛ?} \quad \text{ʔay-ęp-∅} \quad \text{who} \quad \text{obl-nom-say-(fc)-3S-2sS} \quad \text{exp} \quad \text{angry-res-3sS} \]

'Who do you say is going to get angry?'
1.3 Word Order

Word order is relatively free in Shuswap (Kuipers 1974). In fact, as the data below show, post-verbal word order is entirely free. I treat preverbal word order in chapters two and three, where I provide evidence for three distinct preverbal positions.

Intransitive constructions are shown in (67-68):

(67) m-χʔεk-Ø Ʉ-χpēʔa  tə-skʷelkʷél t
perf-go-3sS det-grandfather obl-snowmountains
"Grandfather went to the snowmountains."

Note that the subject and locative can appear in either order. There is no adjacency restriction between the patient of the intransitive and the predicate, as can be seen in (68). The subject and oblique patient in middle constructions may appear in either order as well:

(68) m-χʔεk-Ø  tə-skʷelkʷél t Ʉ-χpēʔa
perf-go-3sS obl-snowmountains det-grandfather
"Grandfather went to the snowmountains."

(69) m-qʷ1éw-m-Ø Ʉ-kyeʔa  tə-spaqpeq
perf-pick berries-unsp-3sS det-grandmother obl-berries
"Grandmother picked berries."
In addition, the oblique agent of passives and the patient can appear in either order:

(71) m-k’úl-n-t-Ø-m r-mi’mx tə-núxʷənxʷ
perf-make-fc-tr-3sO-unsp det-basket obi-woman

‘The basket was made by the woman.’

We might suppose that the freedom of word order exhibited above is due to the fact that one nominal is oblique. However, as seen in the transitive clauses in (73-75), the same freedom of word order is possible, even when the nominals are case marked alike:

(73) m-kúl-n-Ø-s r-núxʷənxʷ r-mi’mx
perf-make-fc-3sO-3sS det-woman det-basket

‘The woman made the basket.’

(74) m-kúl-n-Ø-s r-mi’mx r-núxʷənxʷ
perf-make-fc-3sO-3sS det-basket det-woman

‘The woman made the basket.’
We can conclude from this that contextual information, rather than grammatical marking, serves to disambiguate subject from object in Shuswap.

1.4 Person Marking

There are several sets of pronominal markers in Shuswap. In intransitive clauses the person markers are clitics. Different clitics are used in independent and dependent clauses. On the other hand, in transitive clauses, the person markers are suffixes. Shuswap also has a split system for person marking, with first and second person nominals behaving according to a nominative/accusative system, and third person nominals behaving according to an ergative/absolutive system. The behaviour of third person within this split system is discussed in §1.5.1. Several second person pronominal forms are shown in (76-81):

---

11 See Kroeber 1991 for a summary of the distribution of the clitic versus affixal forms in Salish.
(76) m-k’úl-m k ta-maxéxya?
perf-make-unsp 2sind obl-basket
‘You made a basket.’

(77) w?ɛx  x-k’úl-m ux ta-maxéxya?
exist det-make-unsp 2sdep obl-basket
‘You are making a basket.’

(76) illustrates an independent clitic and (77) illustrates a dependent clitic. These are discussed in §1.4.1 and §1.4.2. In transitive clauses, person is marked by a member of the set of subject and object agreement suffixes:

(78) m-k’úl-n-Ø-x  x-mi̥mx
perf-make-fc-3sO-2sS det-basket
‘You made the basket.’

(79) m-k’úl-Ø-t-s-s  x-núx“enx”  ta-mi̥mx
perf-make-red-tr-2sO-3sS det-woman obl-basket
‘The woman made a basket for you.’

The subject suffixes are discussed in §1.4.3 and the object suffixes are discussed in §1.4.4.

Independent pronouns only occur emphatically.

(80) x-ʔ-anwí?  x-m-k’úl-n-Ø-x  x-mi̥mx
det-2sP-emph det-perf-make-fc-3sO-2sS det-basket
‘You are the one who made the basket.’

The emphatic pronouns are discussed in §1.4.6. They are inflected with a member of the set of possessive pronouns—in (80) with the second person
singular possessive prefix /?-/.

Compare (80) above with the following construction that contains a possessive NP:\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{itemize}
\item (81) ye n ye?éna k-?-mimx
deic qu this irr-2sP-basket
\end{itemize}

'Is this your basket?'

Possessive pronouns are discussed in §1.4.6.

1.4.1 Independent Clitics

The subject clitic set in independent clauses is given in (82):\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12}The /ye-/ in (81) is referred to as a deictic verb stem in Kuipers (1974:45).
\item \textsuperscript{13}In Kuipers (1974:44), this is referred to as the 'clitic' paradigm.
\end{itemize}
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(82) Independent Clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>kn</td>
<td>kt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø kux(^{14})</td>
<td>incl excl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>k(^{15})</td>
<td>kp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\)Shuswap is the only member of the Salish language family that has the grammatical category 'exclusive' (Thompson 1974). The exclusive particle attaches to a stem fully inflected for third person. It is the only pronominal that is mobile:

(i) \(\text{ta? k-s-qʷəčč-s kux}\)
\(\text{neg irr-s-leave-3sP excl}\)

'We (exclusive) didn't leave.'

(ii) \(\text{ta? kux k-s-qʷəčč-s}\)
\(\text{neg excl irr-s-leave-3sP}\)

'We (exclusive) didn't leave.'

(iii) \(\text{ta? k-s-č-1x-m-st-Ø-és}\)
\(\text{neg irr-s-hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-3sS excl}\)

'He doesn't know us (excl).' 

(iv) \(\text{ta? kux k-s-č-1x-m-st-Ø-és}\)
\(\text{neg excl irr-s-hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-3sS}\)

'He doesn't know us (excl).'

\(^{15}\)The second person independent clitic /-k/ may be derived from /-k-č/ (Gibson 1973). This would behave like all other dependent and independent clitics, being composed of a base (either /k-/ or /w-) and a person marker.
Evidence that members of this pronominal set are clitics comes from the position of the yes/no question clitic /n/, a second-position clitic discussed in §2.1.2 and §3.1.2:

(83)  개최-에p n k
      angry-res qu 2sind

     'Did you get angry.'

The yes/no question clitic /n/ attaches to the first word of the clause. That a clitic can intervene between the stem and the person markers suggests that the person markers are also clitics. The independent subject clitics are illustrated in (84-85):

(84)  개최-에p kn
      angry-res+c 1sind

     'I got angry.'

(85)  개최-에p k
      angry-res 2sind

     'You got angry.'

16The behaviour of the question clitic with respect to intransitive and transitive constructions is noted in Kuipers (1974:81). The question particle and subject clitic occur in the opposite order in the other Northern Interior Salish languages, Thompson and Lillooet. See Thompson and Thompson (1992) for Thompson, and van Eijk (1985) for Lillooet.
A second set of clitics is used in dependent clauses. The paradigm is given in (86):\(^{17}\)

(86) **Dependent Clitics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>wn</td>
<td>wat</td>
<td>incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was kux</td>
<td>excl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ux</td>
<td>wap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imperfective aspect is biclausal in Shuswap: the existential /\(w?\text{ex}/ is the predicate of the independent clause, and the notional predicate occurs in a dependent clause, as illustrated in (87-88):

(87) \(w?\text{ex} \quad \text{\(\text{x-x?e?k wn}\) exist det-go+c 1sdep}

'I am going.'

(88) \(w?\text{ex} \quad \text{\(\text{x-x?e?k ux}\) exist det-go 2sdep}

'You are going.'

\(^{17}\text{This paradigm is referred to as the 'suffixal' paradigm in Kuipers (1974:44-45). The dependent clitic paradigm is also referred to as the 'conjunctive' in Kroemer (1991) and Thompson and Thompson (1992).}\)
1.4.3 Subject Suffixes

Subject agreement suffixes occur in transitive clauses (89):

(89) Subject Suffixes\(^{18}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-éʔ/-n</td>
<td>incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-éʔ/-x</td>
<td>-éʔ/p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the subject suffixes are given in (90-93):

(90) wiwk-t-∅-n
    see+tr-3sO-1sS

    'I saw her.'

(91) xʷi-st-étʔn
    like-caus-3sO-1sS+c

    'I like her.'

---

\(^{18}\)Shuswap does not permit first person plural subjects in transitive constructions. This is discussed in §1.6.

\(^{19}\)Each subject and object suffix is given with a strong root, which bears stress, and a weak root, which doesn't bear stress.
(92) \texttt{wik-t-Ø-x}  
\texttt{see-tr-3sO-2sS}  
\textquoteleft You saw her.\textquoteright  

(93) \texttt{x\textasciitilde{i}-st-Ø-\acute{e}x}  
\texttt{like-caus-3sO-2sS}  
\textquoteleft You like her.\textquoteright  

In contrast to the intransitive clitics (83), both the subject and object person markers are inside the second-position question clitic.

(94) \texttt{m-k\textacute{u}l-n-Ø-x n \ x-mir\acute{n}x}  
\texttt{perf-make-fc-3sO-2sS qu det-basket}  
\textquoteleft Did you make the basket?\textquoteright  

1.4.4 Object Suffixes

The object suffixes mark the objects of transitives. They are given in table (95):
Object Suffixes

The use of the object suffixes in transitive clauses is shown in (96-99):

(96) \textit{wiwk-t-sm-x}  
\textit{see+c-tr-1sO-2sS}  
'You see me.'

(97) \textit{\textgenephi wi-st-séčm-x}  
\textit{like-caus-1sO+c-2sS}  
'You like me.'

(98) \textit{wik-t-s-n}  
\textit{see-tr-2sO-1sS}  
'I see you.'

(99) \textit{\textgenephi wi-st-sí-n}  
\textit{like-caus-2sO-1sS}  
'I like you.'

The same object set is used to mark the patients of passives:
It can be seen that object person marking in the passive is followed by an affix glossed 'unspecified', the form of which depends upon the person of the object, /-(ε)m/ for first person singular and third person objects, and /-t/ for first person plural or second person objects.  

1.4.5 Possessive Affixes

Possession is indicated on the head of the possessive construction. Possession is indicated on the head of the possessive construction.

The possessive affixes are given in table (103):

---

20Gibson (1973) places the /-(ε)m/ in the transitive subject paradigm, calling it the 'obviative'. Kuipers (1974:47) considers this construction a passive and calls the /-t/ or /-(ε)m/ an 'extension'. He gives the following formula for the passive: base+transitivizer+object suffix+extension.

21Kuipers (1974:43) states that the possessive paradigm occurs on nouns, nominalized intransitive verbs, and verbal derivatives with /?s/.
The syntactic properties of possessive constructions are discussed in §1.7.1.

1.4.6 Emphatic Pronouns

Emphatic pronouns can occur in Shuswap to provide emphasis and to express pronouns in oblique relations. They are preceded by one of the set of determiners, depending on the syntactic status of the nominal, and are marked

22As in the independent clitic paradigm the exclusive particle is also mobile in the possessive paradigm.

(i) yixf? r-čitxʷ-s kux
deic det-house-3sP excl

'That's our (excl) house.'

(ii) yixf? kux r-čitxʷ-s
deic excl det-house-3sP

'That's our (excl) house.'
with possessive affixes (see §1.4.5 above). The emphatic pronouns are given in (104):

(104)  **Emphatic Pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ḋ-n-čéčwa</td>
<td>ḋ-uļ-nwíʔ-kt</td>
<td>incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ḋ-uļ-nwíʔ-s kux</td>
<td>excl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ḋ-nwiʔ</td>
<td>ḋ-uļ-nwíʔ-amp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ḋ-nwiʔ-s</td>
<td>ḋ-uļ-nwíʔ-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emphatic pronouns are illustrated in (105-109):

(105)  mɛʔ k'úl-n-Ø-s ḋ-mæxɛxyąʔ ḋ-nwiʔ-s  
exp make-fc-3sO-3sS det-basket det-emph-3sP  
'She's going to make the basket herself.'

(106)  qweyqʷay-ɛɬxʷ Ø ḋ-n-čitxʷ Ø l c'ílm  
blue-Is 3sS det-2sP-house conj same  
'Your house is blue and so is mine.'

(107)  ta-n-čéčwa ḋ-wik-t-Ø-m as  
obl-1sP-emph+c det-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep  
'I'm the one who saw him.'
1.5 Split Ergativity

In this section I show that third person arguments behave differently from first and second person arguments, which were discussed in §1.4, suggesting that Shuswap has a split ergative system. Split ergative systems commonly make distinctions on the basis of person, aspect, and clause type (Dixon 1979). Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988b) has a split ergative system for person and clause type but not for aspect.

While there is clear evidence of a split on the basis of person in Shuswap, it is difficult to determine whether there is a split along aspectual and clausal lines. Incompletive aspect is biclausal, taking an existential main predicate. The dependent clause is marked differently depending on its transitivity. In intransitive dependent clauses, the predicate is marked with a member of the set of dependent clitics. Transitive dependent clauses, on the other hand, are marked with subject and object suffixes, but in addition are extended with the third person clitic of the dependent paradigm. I conclude that dependent clauses involve a system not related to split ergativity.
Third person marking is discussed in §1.5.1, aspect in §1.5.2, and clause type in §1.5.3.

1.5.1 Third Person Marking

In this section C show that third person arguments behave differently from first and second person arguments, suggesting that Shuswap has a split ergative system. Intransitive clauses indicate person by a member of the independent clitic set discussed in §1.4.1. These are illustrated in (110-112):

(110) m-χʔεʔk kn
    perf-go+c 1sind

‘I left.’

(111) m-χʔεk k
    perf-go 2sind

‘You left.’

(112) m-χʔεk-∅
    perf-go-3sS

‘He/she left.’

On the other hand, person is indicated in transitive clauses by subject (§1.4.3) and object (§1.4.4) suffixes. The singular subject suffixes are illustrated in (113-115):
First and second person singular object suffixes are illustrated in (116-117). Third person objects behave as in (113-115) above.

An inspection of first and second person marking above shows that, while there is a similarity between the intransitive and transitive subject markers, there are three distinct paradigms. This is shown in the following chart:
Intransitive subject markers are clitics that attach to /k/. Transitive subjects and object markers are suffixes. Third person markers, however, cut across the intransitive and transitive paradigms, as can be seen in (112) and (115) above. This is shown in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transitive S</th>
<th>Intransitive S</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>-(é)n</td>
<td>kn</td>
<td>-s(é)m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>-(é)x</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>-s(f)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intransitive subject markers are clitics that attach to /k/. Transitive subjects and object markers are suffixes. Third person markers, however, cut across the intransitive and transitive paradigms, as can be seen in (112) and (115) above. This is shown in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transitive S</th>
<th>Intransitive S</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person</td>
<td>-(é)s</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in chart (119) above, third person is /Ø/ for subjects of transitive clauses and objects of transitive clauses. This is the absolutive. On the other hand, the third person subject of a transitive clause is /-(é)s/, the ergative. Shuswap thus has an ergative/absolutive system for third person.
1.5.2 Aspect

Languages often have split ergative systems according to aspect (Dixon 1979). Third person in completives behaves according to the ergative/absolutive system, whereas third person in incompletives behaves according to the nominative/accusative system. Shuswap, however, does not have a split ergative system for aspect. Rather, incompletive aspect is marked with dependent clitics.

Third person completives are shown in (120-121):

(120) m-χʔɛk-Ø
    perf-go-3sS
    'He/she left.'

(121) m-k'u1-n-Ø-s
    perf-make-fc-3sO-3sS
    'He/she made it.'

These clauses display the standard behaviour of an ergative/absolutive system, with the absolutive /-Ø-/ marking the subject of an intransitive clause and the object of a transitive clause. The ergative /-(ɛ)s/ marks the subject of a transitive clause. Intransitive incompletives are shown in (122-124):

(122) wʔɛx  χ-χʔɛʔk wn
    exist  det-go+c 1sdep
    'I am going.'
Incompletives are biclausal in Shuswap. The main verb /w?ɛx/ 'exist' takes a dependent clause introduced with a member of the determiner set. Person is marked in the dependent clause with a member of the set of dependent clitics discussed in §4.4.2 above.

While there is a partial resemblance between the subject sets of the independent clitic, dependent clitic, and transitive paradigms, they are different systems. This is shown in chart (125):

---

23 In Shuswap the third person dependent clitic is /wəs/. The initial /w/ labializes the preceding element if it is a prevelar or postvelar. Otherwise it deletes.

(i)  w?ɛx  r-píx-m as
      exist    det hunt-unsp 3sdep

      'He/she is hunting.'

The cognate form in Thompson is /us/ in all environments.
Incompletive transitive clauses are expressed as habituals. The predicate is fully inflected for agreement and additionally is marked with the third person clitic of the dependent clitic paradigm. Incompletsives therefore make use of dependent clauses involving the dependent clitic paradigm rather than involving a split ergative system.

As can be seen in (126-128) above, incompletive transitive clauses are expressed as habituals. The predicate is fully inflected for agreement and additionally is marked with the third person clitic of the dependent clitic paradigm. Incompletsives therefore make use of dependent clauses involving the dependent clitic paradigm rather than involving a split ergative system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent S</th>
<th>Transitive S</th>
<th>Dependent S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>kn</td>
<td>-(ē)n</td>
<td>wn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>-(ē)x</td>
<td>wx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person</td>
<td>-Ø-</td>
<td>-(ē)s</td>
<td>wəs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incompletive transitive clauses are shown in (126-128):

(126) wʔɛx  y-č-kuk'1-st-Ø-n  əs
       exist  det-hab-make+c-caus-3sO-1sS 3sdep

'I'm making it.'

(127) wʔɛx  y-č-k'ul-st-Ø-x  was
       exist  det-hab-make-caus-3sO-2sS 3sdep

'You're making it.'

(128) wʔɛx  y-č-k'ul-st-Ø-s  əs
       exist  det-hab-make-caus-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'He's making it.'
1.5.3 Clause Type

A common type of split ergativity involves a distinction between independent and dependent clauses. It is shown above that third person in independent clauses behaves according to the ergative/absolutive system. In this section I discuss the behaviour of third person marking in dependent clauses.

The use of a biclausal construction to express incompleteive aspect was discussed in §1.5.2 above. In intransitive clauses, rather than taking absolutive marking, the predicate takes the third person dependent clitic:

\[(129) \text{wpex } \text{æ-x?ɛk wæs} \]
\[\text{exist det-go-3sdep} \]

‘He/she is going.’

Incompleteive transitives on the other hand take subject and object suffixes and additionally are marked with the third person clitic of the dependent set:

\[(130) \text{wpex } \text{æ-č-k'?ul-st-Ø-s æs} \]
\[\text{exist det-hab-make-caus-3sO-3sS 3sdep} \]

‘He’s making it.’

It should be noted that in Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988b) there is a distinction between subordinate and dependent clause types. Different clause types take different pronominal sets in Shuswap as well. While relative clauses take the same person markers as independent clauses (with the exception of
those headed by an ergative), other types make use of dependent clitics.

Relative clauses are shown in (131-134):

(131) m-wiwk-t-Ø-n  ṭ-sqélmxʷ  ṭa-m-qʷəččə-Ø
    perf-see+c-tr-3s0-1sS  det-man  obl-perf-left-3sS
    ‘I saw the man who left.’

(132) m-wiwk-t-Ø-n  ṭ-sqélmxʷ  ṭa-m-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
    perf-see+c-tr-3s0-1sS  det-man  obl-perf-kiss-ls-fc-3s0-3sS
    ṭ-núxʷən̓xʷ
    det-woman
    ‘I saw the man that kissed the woman.’

(133) m-wiwk-t-Ø-n  ṭ-sqélmxʷ  ṭa-m-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-x
    perf-see+c-tr-3s0-1sS  det-man  obl-perf-kiss-ls-fc-3s0-2sS
    ‘I saw the man that you kissed.’

(134) m-wiwk-t-Ø-n  ṭ-sqélmxʷ  ṭa-m-c’úm-qs-n-t-(s)-s
    perf-see+c-tr-3s0-1sS  det-man  obl-perf-kiss-ls-fc-tr-2s0-3sS
    ‘I saw the man who kissed you.’

As can be seen in the relative clause constructions, third person marking
behaves according to the ergative/absolutive system and dependent clitics are
not used.24

24The system is actually more complicated than this. When there are
third person pronominal objects in wh-questions, relative clauses, and clefts, the
focus passive is used for the extraction of ergatives. The focus passive
construction involves the use of dependent clitics. Thus, dependent clitics can
show up in relative clauses as well. This is discussed in chapter two.
However, the following clauses are all marked with dependent clitics:

(135) meʔ kəx-t-sí-n ta-spaʔpέq ɬɛ ɬwənən ux
exp give-tr-2sO-1sS obl-berries conj want 2sdep

'I'll give you some berries if you want.'

(136) č-píʔqʷ-st-ʔ-n yəxéy luʔ w̥íx was
hab-watch+c-caus-tr-3sO-1sS that one there exist 3sdep

qʷiyíłx was
dance 3sdep

'I was watching him when he was dancing.'

(137) sq’léʔnm-st-ʔ-n luʔ yəxéy la-səčímn as
listen+c-m-caus-3sO-1sS part that one det-sing 3sdep

'I was listening to him when he was singing.'

Thus relative clauses must be distinguished from other types of dependent clauses in Shuswap, with respect to the use of the dependent clitic.

While suggestive of the nominative/accusative pattern, Shuswap dependent clause marking is different from the pattern reported for Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988b). The extensive use of the third person clitic of the dependent paradigm is one of the notable features of Shuswap syntax. The clitic is also involved in the focus system which is discussed in Chapter Two.

To summarize, while there is clear evidence of an ergative split for third person in independent clauses, dependent clauses involve a different system of person marking. Incompletive aspect is biclausal and the dependent clause of incompletives, like most dependent clauses, takes a member of the dependent clitic paradigm if intransitive. Transitives take regular subject and object
marking and are additionally marked with third person clitics of the dependent paradigm. The system is different from the Halkomelem one, showing variation in dependent marking systems within the Salish language family.

1.6 Agent Hierarchies

While person hierarchies have been reported in the Coast Salish languages, (Gerdts 1988a, Jelinek and Demers 1983), it has been claimed (Thompson 1979) that such hierarchies do not play a part in the grammars of Interior Salish languages. However, I provide evidence here that hierarchies are also relevant in Shuswap. Two types of evidence are considered: first, gaps in the pronominal system, where certain persons are prohibited, and second, the distribution of lexical NPs and null pronouns.

Transitive clauses with first person plural subject are impossible in Shuswap. Rather passive constructions are used. In (138) we see a first

\[ *\text{wik-t-Ø-t} \quad (\text{incl}) \]

'we (incl) saw him.'

It can be observed, however, that no ambiguity arises with respect to other person marking. Similarly, there would be no ambiguity with weak roots:
person inclusive agent (understood in context), and in (139-140) we see a first
person exclusive agent:

(138) m-wik-t-Ø-m
    perf-see-tr-3sO-unsp
    'We (incl) saw him.'/'He was seen (by us (incl)).'

(139) m-wik-t-Ø-m kux
    perf-see-tr-3sO-unsp excl
    'We (excl) saw him.'/'He was seen (by us (excl)).'

(140) m-wik-t-s-t kux
    perf-see-tr-2sO-unsp excl
    'We (excl) saw you.'/'You were seen (by us (excl)).'

(i) *Č(u)-n-t-Ø-é’t
    punch-fc-tr-3sO-1plS (incl)
    'We (incl) punched him.'

Shuswap tolerates ambiguity in the pronominal system, where some speakers
do not phonetically distinguish second and third person objects:

(ii) wik-t-s-s [wikts]/[wikč]
    see-tr-2sO-3sS
    'He saw you.'

(iii) wik-t-Ø-s [wikts]/[wikč]
    see-tr-3sO-3sS
    'He saw her.'
It is possible that there is a hierarchy involved in this restriction, possibly a number hierarchy. Third person plural ergatives are also not allowed in Shuswap. In stems with plural reduplication, it is the absolutive that is interpreted as the plural:26

(141) m-wak-wík-t-Ø-s
    perf-cvc-see-tr-3sO-3sS
    'He saw them.'/*'They saw him.'

To express a plural associated with the agent, a passive is used.

(142) m-wak-wík-t-Ø-m
    perf-cvc-see-tr-3sO-unsp
    'He was seen (by several).'

The behaviour of first and third person plurals suggests that hierarchy may be stated as (143):

(143) Number Hierarchy

    Singular > Plural

The number hierarchy states that singulants outrank plurals. The hierarchy would interact with the following condition:

---

26 It may be objected that the lack of a plural interpretation for the ergative follows from the nature of the reduplicative process. This reduplication picks out plural absolutives but not plural ergatives. Nevertheless, there is no active way of saying 'They saw him' with or without reduplication.
Number Condition

Objects cannot outrank subjects on the Number Hierarchy.

The interaction of the number hierarchy and the number condition makes the correct predictions for first and third person arguments. However, as can be seen in (145), it is grammatical to have second person plural subjects in transitive constructions:

(145) w/ik-t-Ø-p
    see-tr-3sO-2pIS

'You (plur) saw him.'

This suggest that the number hierarchy must be restated to exclude second person:

(146) Number Hierarchy (non 2nd person)

Singular > Plural

Additional evidence in support of the necessity of hierarchies in the grammar of Shuswap comes from the interaction of lexical nominals with non-overt pronominals (i.e. third person objects). The following construction has only one interpretation:
(147) m-čun-(t)-Ø-s  ḳ-John
perf-tell-(tr)-3sO-3sS  det-John

‘He told John.’/‘John told him.’

It is only possible to interpret this construction in one way, where the non-overt pronominal is interpreted as the ergative and the lexical NP is interpreted as the absolutive.27 The behaviour of constructions such as (147) above suggests a nominal hierarchy, informally stated as (148):

(148) Nominal Hierarchy

non-overt pronouns > lexical NPs

The nominal hierarchy stated in (148) above supplements the following condition:

(149) Nominal Condition

Objects cannot outrank subjects on the nominal hierarchy.

The condition (149), given the nominal hierarchy (148), predicts that there is only one interpretation in constructions with third person arguments in which there is a single null pronominal and a single lexical NP. The null pronominal will be interpreted as the subject and the lexical NP will be interpreted as the object. Notice that the nominal condition is relational and predicts that constructions are possible with null pronominals in both argument positions of a transitive. This is confirmed in (150):

27The distribution of null pronominals is discussed in §4.3.1.
(150) m-čun- (n)-Ø-s
   perf-tell-(fc)-3sO-3sS
   ‘He told him.’

(150) is perfectly grammatical with two null pronominals. There is no absolute condition banning null pronominal arguments.

There is also evidence that animacy plays a role in Shuswap. The nominal hierarchy stated in (148) can be overridden when the null pronominal is interpreted as inanimate. This is shown in (151):

(151) m-nik’-n-Ø-s  y-John
   perf-cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John
   ‘John cut it.’/‘It cut John.’/‘He cut John.’/‘John cut him.’

The null pronominal can be interpreted as an inanimate object or an animate subject but not as an animate object. An animacy hierarchy is given in (152):

(152) Animacy Hierarchy
   animates > inanimates

The animacy hierarchy interacts with the following condition:

(153) Animacy Condition
   Objects cannot outrank subjects on the animacy hierarchy.

The animacy condition can also be observed in ditransitives (154) and applicatives (155), where it can be observed that animate arguments are
marked for agreement and take direct case. Inanimate arguments, on the other hand, are obliques.

(154) m-kax-t-sí-s tə-sək’mín
    perf-give-tr-2sO-3sS obl-knife

    'He gave you the knife.'

(155) m-k’úl-x-t-s-s tə-mímx
    perf-make-red-tr-2sO-3sS obl-basket

    'She made the basket for you.'

It is not possible to express either the ditransitive or applicative in Shuswap with the inanimate patient as a direct argument.

The number, nominal and animacy conditions are unified in (156) as the Agent Condition.

(156) a. Agent Condition

    Objects cannot outrank subjects on the agent hierarchy.

b. Agent Hierarchies

    i. animates > inanimates
    ii. singular > plural
    iii. pronominals > nominals

    The agent hierarchies are ranked—i > ii > iii.

Finally, it can be observed that there are apparent gaps in the passive paradigm. While third person passive agents can occur with third person patients, they cannot occur with first or second person patients. This is shown in (157-159):
(157) č(u)-n-t-Ø-émi ta-John
punch-fc-tr-3sO-unsp obl-John

‘He got punched by John.’

(158) *č(u)-n-t-sèčî-m ta-John
punch-fc-tr-1sO+c-unsp obl-John

‘I got punched by John.’

(159) *č(u)-n-t-sí-t ta-John
punch-fc-tr-2sO-unsp obl-John

‘You got punched by John.’

While the passive is grammatical in (157) with a third person patient, it is
ungrammatical in (158-159) with first or second person patients. It is possible to
have pronominal passive agents (160) provided that these are focussed. The
passive agent can also be questioned (161).  

---

28Passives in Shuswap differ from passives in Halkomelem, (Gerdts
1988b) which does not permit first or second person passive agents:

(i) *ni lám-at-am ?a-χ  ?é.n?θa tθ spé?θ
aux look-tr-intr obl-det 1emph det bear

‘The bear was looked at by me.’

Questions formed on third person passives agents are also forbidden in
Halkomelem.

(ii) *iwēt ni q’wàqʷ-n-ám kθ Bob
who aux club-l.c.tr-intr det Bob

‘Who was Bob punched by?’
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In this section it has been claimed that hierarchies are involved in the grammar of Shuswap. Therefore they must be considered in the formulation of explanations for conditions in the grammar of Shuswap. In §4.3.4 I will claim that hierarchies are directly involved in the identification of empty categories.

1.7 Complex NP Constructions

In this section, I very briefly discuss two common types of complex NPs that are relevant to the study. Possessive constructions are discussed in §1.7.1, and relative clauses are discussed in §1.7.2.

1.7.1 Possessive Constructions

Clauses with possessive constructions are given in (162-163):
In (162-163) the possessor precedes the head and the head is marked for third person agreement. It is also common to have the head precede the possessor, as shown in (164-165):

(164) m-xʷéym-Ø [ʐ-John ʐ-sqéxas ʐ-John
perf-bark-3sS det-dog-3sP det-John

'John's dog barked.'

(165) xyum-Ø ʐ-čitxʷ-s ʐ-John
big-3sS det-house-3sP det-John

'John's house is big.'

1.7.2 Relative Clauses

Shuswap has both headed and headless relative clauses. A headed relative clause is illustrated in (166), and a headless relative clause is illustrated in (167):
In headed relative clauses, the head is marked with a member of the set of direct case markers, either /x-/ or /l-/, followed by the relative clause marked with the oblique case marker /ta-/. Headless relative clauses are introduced by the direct case marker /l-/. They may also be interpreted as factuals, as indicated by the second gloss in (167). Order appears to be fixed in headed relative clauses:

(168) *č-1x-m-st-Ø-ëtn
    hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-1sS+c
    ta-wik-t-Ø-x
    obl-see-tr-3sO-2sS

    x-sqélmx[w
    det-man

    'I know the man you saw.'

The binding properties of relative clauses are discussed in Chapter Four.
1.8 Conclusion

This chapter provided a sketch of the clause types that occur later in the study. I discussed several common clauses with respect to word order, nominal case, and pronominal marking. Intransitive clauses, transitive clauses, middles, passives, ditransitives, and applicatives, were exemplified. Several pronominal systems were then discussed. It was shown that there were sets of independent clitics, dependent clitics, subject and object suffixes, as well as possessive pronouns and emphatic pronouns. Shuswap has been shown to be split ergative on the basis of person. Third person pronominals behave according to the ergative/absolutive system:

(169) m-χʔɛk-Ø
     perf-go-3sS
     ‘He/she left.’

(170) m-k’ul-n-Ø-s
     perf-make-fc-3sO-3sS
     ‘He/she made it.’

First and second persons follow a nominative/accusative pattern. I then investigated Shuswap with respect to other common split systems—those of aspect and clause type. It was shown that completive and incompletive aspects differ in their pronominal marking, but this follows from the biclausal status of incompletive constructions. These have a main predicate existential followed by a dependent clause. Intransitive dependent clauses take a dependent pronoun marker:
Incomplete transitive clauses, however, are expressed as habituals. They take the habitual prefix /č-/ and are additionally marked with a third person clitic of the dependent pronominal paradigm:

(171) ə?ex $\times\timesмop\kappa\omega_3$ was
       exist  det-go 3sdep

'He/she is going.'

Shuswap clause types differ in their use of pronominal marking. Independent clauses, as noted earlier, use either independent clitics or subject and object suffixes. Dependent clauses, on the other hand, employ dependent clitics, as noted for the incompletives above. Not all dependent clauses employ dependent clitics, however. Relative clauses take person marking that is the same as in independent clauses, only using the dependent clitic for clauses that have ergative heads with a third person object. I conclude that Shuswap employs a system different from a person split for the marking of aspect and clause type. Rather, the dependent clitic system is a notable feature of Shuswap syntax.

Evidence was presented to support the hypothesis that agent hierarchies are present in Shuswap. Two types of evidence were considered: first, there are gaps in the pronominal system, and second, certain combinations of
nominals and pronominals are prohibited. Shuswap does not allow first or third person plural ergatives; these are expressed instead as passive agents:

(173) m-wik-t-∅-m
perf-see-tr-3sO-unsp

'We (incl) saw him.'/'He was seen (by us (incl)).'

(174) m-wik-wik-t-∅-m
perf-cvc-see-tr-3sO-unsp

'He was seen (by several).'

These constructions provide evidence of a non-second person number hierarchy. The second type of evidence can be seen in the interaction of lexical nominals with non-overt pronominals:

(175) m-čun-(n)-∅-s  γ-John
perf-tell-(fc)-3sO-3sS  det-John

'He told John.'/"John told him.'

In transitive constructions, lexical nominals may only be interpreted as absolutives. It is also shown that animacy also must be included in the hierarchy. Animate nominals outrank inanimate ones:

(176) m-nik'-n-∅-s  γ-John
perf-cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John

'John cut it.'/"It cut John.'/"He cut John.'/"John cut him.'

Furthermore (176) shows that animacy conditions take precedence over the condition on the interaction between lexical nominals and non-overt
pronominals. In this case, we see that it is possible to have a lexical ergative with a non-overt pronominal, but only if the pronominal is inanimate. These data led to the following Agent Condition:

(177) a. Agent Condition

Objects cannot outrank subjects on the agent hierarchy.

b. Agent Hierarchies

i. animates > inanimates
ii. singular > plural
iii. pronominals > nominals

The agent hierarchies are ranked—i > ii > iii.

I then discussed the nature of complex NP constructions—possessive constructions and relative clauses. Possessive constructions can occur in either head initial or head final order. The head is marked for agreement. There are asymmetries in Shuswap with respect to the extraction of possessors. These are discussed in Chapter Five. I next discussed the properties of two types of relative clauses—headed and headless. Headed relative clauses are marked with the oblique determiner /ta-/:
The binding properties of relative clauses are discussed in Chapter Four, and the extraction properties of relative clauses and of nominals out of relative clauses are discussed in Chapter Five.
2.0 Introduction

In this chapter I examine the syntactic properties of wh-questions and contrastive focus constructions. Wh-questions are illustrated in (1-3) and focus constructions are illustrated in (4-6):

1. \textit{swētē} \textit{k-wik-t-Ø-s}
   \textit{who} \textit{irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS}
   
   'Whom did he see?'

2. \textit{swētē} \textit{k-wik-t-Ø-m}
   \textit{who} \textit{irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp}
   
   'Who was seen?'

3. \textit{(ta-)}\textit{swētē} \textit{k-wik-t-Ø-m} as
   \textit{(obl-)}\textit{who} \textit{irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep}
   
   'Who was she seen by?'

4. \textit{ นาย-John} \textit{1u? l-m-wik-t-Ø-s}
   \textit{det-John} \textit{part det-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS}
   
   'It's John that he saw.'

---

1Speakers often translate wh question and focus constructions into English using clefts.
In §2.1 I discuss the basic properties of wh-questions and focus constructions. Based on their clause-initial position and on their resemblance to relative clauses I argue that they are clefts. It is shown that clefted nominals may optionally be accompanied by focus particles and may host second-position clitics. Constructions with clefted nominals are shown to obey Island Constraints. In §2.2 I discuss several strategies associated with the clefting of nominals. In §2.3 I discuss the Peripheral Gap Constraint. The chapter concludes with §2.4.

2.1 Basic Properties of Wh and Contrastive Focus Constructions

The Wh-question and contrastive focus constructions in (1-6) resemble the relative clauses illustrated in (7-9):

(7) č-1x-m-st-Ø-étñ  r-sqélmw  ta-wik-t-Ø-s
    hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-1sS+c  det-man  obl-see-tr-3sO-3sS
    ‘I know the man who he saw.’
'I know the man who was seen.'

'I know the man who saw him.'

Nominals that are questioned or placed in contrastive focus always occur at the beginning of the clause. There is a strong resemblance between wh-questions, focus constructions, and relative clauses. They all have a dependent clause introduced by a determiner. The irrealis determiner /k-/ is used in wh-questions. A member of the set of direct determiners, either /l-/ or /r-/ is used in factives and headless relative clauses. The oblique determiner /ta-/ is used in headed relative clauses. The similarities of wh-questions, focus constructions, and relative clauses suggest that they be assigned the same structure. I adopt for Shuswap, the proposal of Gerdts (1988b) for Halkomelem and Kroeber (1991) for pan-Salish that wh-questions and focus constructions are clefts. The clefted or focussed nominal is a predicate that receives modification by a relative clause, as represented in (10):
The adjoined NP in (10) functions as a predicate in wh-and clefts and a head nominal in relative clauses.²

In §2.1.1-2.1.3 I discuss wh-questions and contrastive focus constructions with respect to the distribution of focus particles, the behaviour of second-position clitics, and island constraints.

2.1.1 Focus Particles

Nominals in the wh-position may optionally be followed by a deictic particle, either /əiʔ/ or /lʊʔ/.³ When a particle follows the clefted element it

²I assume Browning's (1987) analysis of clefts.
³Only a single element can occur in the wh-position. There can only be a single focus particle. Compare the good construction in (i) with a single focus particle and the ungrammatical one in (ii) with two focus particles.

(i) ɾ-Mary ɾʔʔ ɾ-John 1-m-c'úrn-qš-n-ʔ-s
det-Mary part det-John det-perf-kiss-ls-tr-3sO-3sS

'It was Mary that John kissed.'
functions as a focus particle. The distal particle /lu?/ is used either as a locative or a temporal, where the nominal is either not visible or the event is completed (see (4-6) above). (11-16) illustrate the particle /vi?/, which has a proximal spatial reference.4

(11) swétý  vi?  k-wik-t-Ø-s
     who       part  det-see-tr-3sO-3sS

    'Who is it that she saw?'

(12) swétý  vi?  k-wik-t-Ø-m
     who       part  det-see-tr-3sO-unsp

    'Who is it that was seen?'

(13) swétý  vi?  k-wik-t-Ø-m as
     who       part  det-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

    'Who is it that saw her?'

______________________________

(ii)  *vi-Mary  vi?  vi-John  vi?  l-m-c'úm-qs-n-Ø-s
      det-Mary  part  det-John  part  det-perf-kiss-ls-tr-3sO-3sS

    'It was Mary that John kissed.'

Support for a single wh-position comes from wh-questions. It is not possible to form multiple questions in Shuswap. Notice that although there are two apparent wh-words in (iii), the second one is interpreted as an indefinite.

(iii) swétý  k-wik-t-Ø-s  k-stèm
     who       irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS  irr-anything

    'Who saw anything?'

4The focus particles also function to indicate topicality in discourse, nominals currently in the foreground taking proximal particles, and backgrounded nominals taking distal particles.
(14) ṝ-sqélmxʷ ḫiʔ ṝ-wik-i-Ø-s
    det-man part det-see-tr-3sO-3sS

    'It's the man that she saw.'

(15) ṝ-sqélmxʷ ḫiʔ ṝ-wik-t-Ø-m
    det-man part det-see-tr-3sO-unsp

    'It's the man that was seen.'

(16) (ta)-sqélmxʷ ḫiʔ ṝ-wik-t-Ø-m as
    det-man part det-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

    'It's the man that saw her.'

A full demonstrative particle may also precede the clefted element:

(17) yəʕʕíʔ ṝ-sqélmxʷ ṝ-wik-t-Ø-s
    deic det-man det-see-tr-3sO-3sS

    'That's the man that she saw.'

(18) yəʕʕíʔ ṝ-sqélmxʷ ṝ-wik-t-Ø-m
    deic det-man det-see-tr-3sO-unsp

    'That's the man that was seen.'

(19) yəʕʕíʔ ṝ-sqélmxʷ ṝ-wik-t-Ø-m as
    deic det-man det-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

    'That's the man that saw her.'
2.1.2 Second-Position Clitics

Clefted elements can host second-position clitics.\(^5\) The set of clitics includes the evidential clitic /nka/ (20), the reportative /akw’a/ (21) and the confirmative question clitic /n/ (22).

\[(20)\] `I-spéc’n nka \(\chi\)? \(l\)-nik’-n-\(\emptyset\)-s \(\chi\)-John\n\text{det-rope evid part det-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John}\n
'It must be the rope that John cut.'

\[(21)\] `I-spéc’n akw’a \(\chi\)? \(l\)-nik’-n-\(\emptyset\)-s \(\chi\)-John\n\text{det-rope rep part det-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John}\n
'They say it's the rope that John cut.'

\[(22)\] `I-spéc’n \(\chi\)? \(l\)-nik’-n-\(\emptyset\)-s \(\chi\)-John\n\text{det-rope qu part det-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John}\n
'Is it the rope that John cut?'

Wh-questions may also be followed by second-position clitics. This is illustrated with the evidential clitic in (23) and the reportative clitic in (24):

\[(23)\] `swét nka \(\chi\)? \(k\)-nik’-n-\(\emptyset\)-s \(\chi\)-John\n\text{who evid part irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John}\n
'Who was it that John apparently cut?'

---

\(^5\)In chapter three I show that that other preverbal nominals cannot host second-position clitics.
(24) swét akʷa ʁi?  k-nikʷ-n-Ø-s  ʁ-John
who rep part  irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John

'Who did they say that John cut.'

2.1.3 Island Constraints

A question is raised whether the wh-or the focussed nominal undergoes
movement to the wh-position. (25-26) illustrate complex constructions, where
the predicate takes a clausal complement:

(25) ʁ-John m-wik-t-Ø-s ʁ-Mary
det-John perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary

m-cʼúr-h-qs-n-Ø-s ʁ-sqélmwxʷ
det-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-man

'John saw Mary kiss the man.'

(26) č-1x̂m-st-Ø-ēs ʁ-Sam  m-kʼúl-n-Ø-s
hab-know-caus-3sO-3sS det-Sam perf-make-tr-3sO-3sS

ʁ-stúkčn
det-dipnet

'He knows that Sam made the dipnet.'

It is possible to extract a focussed nominal out of a clausal complement as
shown in (27-29):
(27) ṣ-sqélmxw ṣi? ṣ-John m-wík-t-∅-s ṣ-Mary
det-man part det-John perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary
m-c'úm-qs-n-∅-s
det-kiss-Iṣ-fc-3sO-3sS

‘That’s the man that John saw Mary kiss.’

(28) ṣ-stúkčn ṣi? č-lxm-st-∅-és ṣ-Sam
det-dipnet part hab-know-caus-3sO-3sS det-Sam
m-k'úl-n-∅-s
perf-make-tr-3sO-3sS

‘It’s the dipnet that he knows that Sam made.’

Similarly wh-nominals can be extracted from clausal complements as shown in (32-33):

(29) swétỳ ṣi? ṣ-John k-m-wík-t-∅-s ṣ-Mary
who part det-John irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary
m-c'úm-qs-n-∅-s
det-kiss-Iṣ-fc-3sO-3sS

‘Who is it that John saw Mary kiss?’

(30) swétỳ ṣi? č-lxm-st-∅-és ṣ-Sam
who part irr-hab-know-caus-3sO-3sS det-Sam
k-m-k'úl-n-∅-s
perf-make-tr-3sO-3sS

‘What is it that he knows that Sam made?’
It is not possible to extract nominals out of relative clauses or adjunct clauses in Shuswap, showing that wh-and focus nominals obey the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint and the Adjunct Island Condition, standardly assumed to be diagnostics of movement.\textsuperscript{6} Constructions that contain relative clauses are given in (31-32):

(31) ṭ-John k-wik-t-Ø-s ṭ-núxʷ'ánxʷ ta-c'úm-qš-n-Ø-s
det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-woman obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

‘John saw the woman who he kissed.’

(32) čn-t-sé(č)m-s ṭ-sqélmxʷ ta-č'wi-st-Ø-és
punch-tr-1sO-3sS det-man obl-like-caus-3sO-3sS

‘The man who she likes punched me.’

It is not possible to extract a nominal from a relative clause:

(33) *swétů ḥu? ṭ-John k-wik-t-Ø-s ta-núxʷ'ánxʷ
who part det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS obl-woman
ta-c'úm-qš-n-Ø-s
obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

*‘Who was it that John saw the woman who kissed?’

\textsuperscript{6}This assumption is somewhat controversial (Cinque 1991, Hegarty 1991).
This shows that wh-nominals obey the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint.

The following constructions contain adjunct clauses.7

(35) *swôtú
ta-xwéist-6-6s
who
irr-punch-fc-1sO-3sS
det-man

*‘Who does the man who likes punched me?’

(36) ċ-1xrm-st-6-6s
1-m-k’úl-n-6-6s as
who
perf-make-tr-3sO-3sS
3sdep
det-dipnet

‘He knows when Sam made the dipnet.’

It is not possible to extract a wh-nominal from an adjunct clause.

7The construction shown in (39) may not be an adjunct clause but an embedded question. If this is so, then it provides evidence the Shuswap obeys a different island condition, the Wh-island Constraint.
This shows that Shuswap wh-nominals also obey the Adjunct Island Constraint.

On the basis of the data relevant to the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint and the Adjunct Island Condition, I conclude that the targets of nominals in the wh-position involve movement in Shuswap.

2.1.4 Summary

In this section the basic properties of the wh-position have been discussed. I argue on the basis of the resemblances to relative clauses, that wh-questions and contrastive focus constructions are clefts that contain relative clauses. It has also been shown that only a single element can be clefted and that the target of the cleft is subject to island constraints.
On the basis of island constraints I propose that there is empty operator movement in Shuswap. Thus, I assume that a wh-construction as in (39a) is represented in (39b):

(39) a. swɛ́t̚ɪ̞ k-wɪ̀k-t-Ø-s
    who  irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

    'Who did he see?'
The representation in (39b) shows that the variable is bound by an empty operator which in turn is co-indexed with the clefted wh-stem.

### 2.2 The Morphological Properties of Clefts

In this section I show that the formation of clefts involves three different morphological strategies depending on the thematic status of the nominal that is clefted.\(^8\) Direct arguments of the predicate can be clefted without any special morphological marking. This is a pan-Salish phenomenon (Kroeber 1991). The clefting of direct arguments is discussed in §2.2.1. However, when oblique arguments or adjuncts appear in the wh-position, special morphological marking must be used—either cliticization or nominalization. I refer to these two processes as wh-agreement, following Chung (1982, 1992).\(^9\) When passive agents, instruments, locatives, temporals and the quantifier /xʷəxʷɛy t/ all are in the wh-position, the predicate is marked with third person from the dependent clitic paradigm (§1.4.2). This strategy is unique to Shuswap and Thompson (Kroeber 1991, Newman 1980, Thompson 1979). The clitic strategy is discussed in §2.2.2. A final type of wh-agreement involves nominalization (see Kroeber 1991). Nominalization occurs when the patients of ditransitives, middles and passives, adverbials and a class of quantifiers, including *many*,

---

\(^{8}\)While Kuipers (1974) identifies the major morphological properties of what he calls the 'suffixal paradigm' and of 'nominalization' and notes common uses of them, the claim that these strategies are essentially instantiations of the same process and the relating of this process to focus is original to this thesis.

\(^{9}\)These processes are called 'relative-agreement' in Kroeber (1991).
some, a few and numerals are in the wh-position. Nominalization is discussed in §2.2.3. In §2.2.4 I summarize the distribution of wh-agreement in Shuswap.

2.2.1 Clefts of Direct Arguments

Direct arguments can be questioned, focussed, or relativized. The dependent clause carries the same agreement suffixes and clitics that are used in independent clauses. Absolutive arguments are illustrated in (40-45):

(40) swéty k-wik-t-Ø-s
         who   irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS
     ‘Whom did he see?’

(41) swéty k-wik-t-Ø-ém
         who   irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp
     ‘Who was seen?’

(42) ḥ-John ḥi? l-m-wik-t-Ø-s
        det-John part det-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS
     ‘John was the one that she saw.’

(43) ḥ-John ḥi? l-m-wik-t-Ø-m
        det-John part det-perf-see-tr-3sO-unsp
     ‘John was the one that was seen.’

(44) ḥ-John k-wik-t-Ø-s ḥ-nuxʷ’anxʷ ta-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
        det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-woman obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS
     ‘John saw the woman who he kissed.’
When the absolutive argument is questioned, focussed, or relativized, the verbal morphology is the same as in independent clauses (46-49).

(46) wìk-t-ø-s
     see-tr-3sO-3sS

     ‘He saw her.’

(47) wìk-t-ø-m
     see-tr-3sO-unsp

     ‘She is seen.’

(48) c’úrn-qs-n-ø-s
     kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

     ‘He kissed her.’

(49) c’úrn-qs-n-ø-m
     kiss-ls-fc-3sO-unsp

     ‘She was kissed.’

Constructions with demonstrative pronouns can also be clefted:

(50) yaayí? ri? yaayéy r-wìk-t-ø-s
     deic part deic det-see-tr-3sO-3sS

     ‘That’s the one that this one saw.’

(51) yaayí? ri? r-wìk-t-ø-m
     deic part det-see-tr-3sO-unsp

     ‘That’s the one that was seen.’
Emphatic pronouns can also be clefted:

(52) γ-n-ćććwa?  xi?  γ-wí[w]k-t-sm-s
    det-1sP-emph+c  part  det-see-tr-1sO-3sS

'I'm the one that she saw.'

(53) γ-nćććwa?  xi?  γ-wí[w]k-t-sl-m
    det-1sP-emph  part  det-see-tr-1sO-unsp

'I'm the one that was seen.'

(54) γ-ʔ-anwí?  xi?  γ-wík-t-s-s
    det-2sP-emph  part  det-see-tr-2sO-3sS

'You're the one that she saw.'

(55) γ-ʔanwí?  xi?  γ-wík-t-s-t
    det-2sP-emph  part  det-see-tr-2sO-unsp

'You're the one that was seen.'

(56) γ-nwí?-s  xi?  γ-wík-t-Ø-s
    det-emph-3sP  part  det-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'She's the one that he saw.'

(57) γ-nwí?s  xi?  γ-wík-t-Ø-m
    det-emph-3sP  part  det-see-tr-3sO-unsp

'She's the one that was seen.'

In addition, it is possible to directly question (58-60) or focus (61-63) overt ergative arguments when there is a first or second person pronominal object or an overt nominal absolutive argument.
First and second person subject emphatic pronouns may also be focused.

(64) r-n-čéčwə? r-i? r-wiwk-t-s-n
det-1sP-emph+c part det-see+c-tr-2sO-1sS

'i'm the one that saw you.'
Possessors can also occur in the wh-position:

(66) **sweťu** k-xwéym-Ø k-sqéxə-s
who irr-bark-3sS irr-dog-3sP

'Whose dog barked?'

(67) **sweťu** k-xyum-Ø k-čitxw-s
who irr-big-3sS irr-house-3sP

'Whose house is big?'

Apparently possessors of subjects or objects in transitive clauses cannot occur in the wh-position:

(68) *sweťu k-wíwk-t-sm-s k-qéʔčə-s
who irr-see+c-tr-1sO-3sS irr-father-3sP

'Whose father saw me?'

(69) *sweťu k-wík-t-Ø-x k-qéʔčə-s
who irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS irr-father-3sP

'Whose father did you see?'

I discuss the extraction properties of possessor extraction in §5.3..

In this section it has been shown that direct arguments can be questioned, focussed, or relativized without employing wh-agreement. In §2.2.2 I discuss one type of wh-agreement—cliticization.
2.2.2 Cliticization

In §2.2.1 it was established that direct arguments, including the ergative argument can occur in the wh-position. There are restrictions on ergatives however. The ergative arguments in §2.2.1 either co-occur with a lexical NP object or with a first or second person pronominal. Ergatives cannot occur in wh-position when there are third person pronominal objects. Instead, a passive is used:\footnote{\textsuperscript{10}}

(70) (ta)-s\text{\`e}t\text{\`y} 
| k-wik-t-\text{\`o}-m as |
| (obl )-who |
| irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep |

'Who was she seen by?'

(71) Mary \text{\`i}? 
| k-wik-t-\text{\`o}-m as |
| Mary part |
| det-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep |

'Mary is the one that saw him.'

(72) \text{\`e}-Mary 
| c\text{"}\text{\`u}mq\text{"}-n-\text{\`o}-s 
| \text{\`e}-sq\text{"}lm\text{"} |
| det-Mary |
| kiss-tr-3sO-3sS det-man |

ta-x\text{"}i-st-\text{\`o}-\text{\`e}m as
| det-like-caus-3sO-unsp 3sdep |

'Mary kissed the man who likes her.'

In addition, there is wh-agreement. The predicate is marked with a third person clitic from the dependent clitic paradigm, discussed in §1.4.2. I would like to

\footnote{\textsuperscript{10} When the passive agent is extracted, the determiner /ta-/ is optional.}
claim that the Shuswap clitic construction is a focus passive. When the passive agent occurs in wh-position it triggers wh-agreement. In (73) I illustrate a personal passive:

(73) wik-t-Ø-m te-Mary r-John
    see-tr-3sO-unsp obl-Mary det-John

    ‘John was seen by Mary.’

When the passive agent is clefted, a clitic is left on the predicate.

(74) te-Mary r-wik-t-Ø-m as r-John
    obl-Mary det-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep det-John

    ‘It’s Mary that John was seen by.’

On the other hand, if the patient is clefted there is no clitic.

(75) r-John rì? r-wik-t-Ø-m te-Mary
    det-John part det-see-tr-3sO-unsp obl-Mary

    ‘It’s John that was seen by Mary.’

The clitic strategy is not restricted to the focussing of passive agents. It is also used in locative (76) and temporal (77) wh-questions.

(76) xhè?n k-ník’-n-t-Ø-m as
    where irr-cut-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

    ‘Where did he cut it?’

(77) pnhè?n k-ník’-n-t-Ø-m as
    when irr-cut-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

    ‘When did he cut it?’
The clitic is also triggered when locatives (78-79), temporals (80), the quantifier /χʷəxʷcʸt/ all (81), and instruments (82) are focussed.

(78) a. \[ mɛ? \ kax-t-sí-n \ tìʔéna \] exp give-tr-2sO-1sS from this

'I'll give you some from this (container).'

b. \[ tìʔéna \ mɛ? \ kax-t-sí-n \ as \] from this exp give-tr-2sO-1sS 3sdep

'I'll give you some from this (container).'

(79) a. \[ m-ník'-n-Ø-s \ ɾ-spéc'n \ n-čkék'æ? \] compl-cut-fc-3sO-3s det-rope loc-shed

'I was in the shed that he cut the rope.'

b. \[ na-čkék'æ? \ ɾi? \ m-ník'-n-Ø-s \ əs \ ɾ-spéc'n \] loc-shed deic compl-cut-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep det-rope

'It was in the shed that he cut the rope.'

(80) a. \[ ník'-n-Ø-s \ ɾ-spéc'n \ le-paxyéwtas \] cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-rope det-yesterday

'It was yesterday that he cut the rope.'

b. \[ le-paxyéwtas \ ɾu? \ ník'-n-Ø-s \ əs \ ɾ-spéc'n \] det-yesterday deic cut-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep det-rope

'It was yesterday that he cut the rope.'

(81) a. \[ mɛ? \ kax-t-sí-n \ χʷəxʷcʸt \ ta-spaqpéq \] exp give-tr-2sO-1sS all obl-berries

'I'm going to give you all the berries.'
b. \( x^w a x^w e y t \) \( m e? \) \( k a x-t-s í-n \) \( a s \) \( t a-s p a q p é q \)
all \( \text{exp} \) \( \text{give-tr-2sO-1sS} \) \( \text{3sdep} \) \( \text{obl-berries} \)

'I'm going to give you all the berries.'

(82) a. \( m-n í k-n-Ø-s \) \( ð-s p é c'n \) \( t a-s a k^w m í n \)
\( \text{perf-cut-fc-3sO-3sS} \) \( \text{det-rope} \) \( \text{obl-knife} \)

'It was the knife that he cut the rope with.'

b. \( t a-s a k^w m í n \) \( l u? \) \( l-1-m-n í k-n-Ø-s \) \( a s \) \( ð-s p é c'n \)
\( \text{obl-knife} \) \( \text{part} \) \( \text{det-perf-cut-fc-3sO-3sS} \) \( \text{3sdep} \) \( \text{det-rope} \)

'It was the knife that he cut the rope with.'

To summarize, cliticization takes place in the clefting of temporal or spatial locatives, passive agents, instrumentals, and the quantifier \( / x^w a x^w e y t / \) \( \text{all} \).

### 2.2.3 Nominalization

A second type of strategy—nominalization—is used when oblique arguments occur in the wh-position. In (83-84) I show a ditransitive and a middle construction:

(83) \( m-k a x-t-Ø-ë s \) \( t a-s q l é l t n \)
\( \text{compl-give-tr-3sO-3sS} \) \( \text{obl-salmon} \)

'He gave her a salmon.'

(84) \( m-k'ú l-m-Ø \) \( t a-s t ú k č n \)
\( \text{compl-make-unsp-3sO} \) \( \text{obl-dipnet} \)

'He made a dipnet.'
When the patient of a ditransitive (85) or middle construction (86) is clefted, the predicate takes an /s-/ prefix.

(85) stēmi k-s-kəx-t-Ø-és
what irr-nom-give-tr-3sO-3sS

‘What did he give her?’

(86) stēmi k-s-k’úl-m-s
what irr-nom-make-unsp-3sP

‘What did he make?’

Notice that this construction shows different behaviour for intransitive and transitive clauses. Intransitives take possessive person marking (87), whereas transitives take subject and object person marking (88-89):

(87) stēmi k-ʔ-s-k’úl-m
what irr-2sP-nom-make-mid

‘What did you make?’

(88) stēmi k-s-kəx-t-Ø-ɛx
what irr-nom-give-tr-3sO-2sS

‘What did you give her?’

(89) stēmi k-s-kəx-t-sí-s
what irr-nom-give-tr-2sO-3sS

‘What did she give you?’

Adverbial wh-questions (90-91) and questions on numeral quantifiers (92-93) also take nominalizations.
Focus constructions behave in the same way as wh-questions. This is shown in (94-95):

(94)  tə-sqlé̌ltn  luʔ  l-s-kax-t-Ø-ēs
obl-salmon  part  det-nom-give-tr-3sO-3sS

‘It’s a salmon that he gave her.’

(95)  tə-stúkčn  luʔ  l-m-s-k’úl-m-s
obl-dipnet  part  det-compl-nom-make-unsp-3sP

‘It’s a dipnet that he made.’

This is also the strategy with adverbial predicates (96-97), negatives (98-99), the quantifiers /xʷ?it/ many and /sʔiʔxʷ/ some, other, (100-101), and numerals (102-103).
(96) m-wi? ṝ-s-yēw-m-s
    perf-finish det-nom-fish-unsp-3sP

    'He's finished dipnetting.'

(97) (ta)-kmtúš ṝ-s-yēw-m-s
    (obl)-always det-nom-fish-unsp-3sP

    'He's always dipnetting.'

(98) ta? k-s-qʷačéč-s
    neg irr-nom-leave-3sP

    'He didn't leave.'

(99) ta? k-s-č-1x-m-st-ʔ-ēs
    not irr-s-hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-3sS

    'He doesn't know.'

(100) xʷʔit mɛ? s-kəx-t-sí-n ta-spaqpáq
    many exp nom-give-tr-2sO-1sS obl-berries

    'I'm going to give you lots of berries.'

(101) sʔiʔl xʷ mɛ? s-kəx-t-sí-n ta-spaqpáq
    some exp nom-give-tr-2sO-1sS obl-berries

    'I'm going to give you some of the berries.'
(102) tčilkst ta-sak’lép ɣ-s-wik-m-s ɣ-John
five obl-coyote det-nom-see-unsp-3sP det-John

'John saw five coyotes.'

(103) sasélə ɣ-s-č(u)-nt-séčm-s
two det-nom-punch-tr-1sO+c-3sS

'He punched me two times.'

2.2.4 Summary

I summarize the distribution of the direct, clitic and nominalization strategies associated with the wh-position in the following chart:
The direct and wh-agreement strategies are in complementary
distribution. Ergative and absolutive arguments can be directly extracted,
whereas obliques and adjuncts select one of the wh-agreement strategies—
either cliticization or nominalization. It would be natural to attempt to tie the
distribution of wh-agreement to structural distinctions. Direct arguments in the
wh-position do not need wh-agreement. Presumably both ergative and
absolutive nominal expressions are structurally governed by the predicate that
has raised to Infl. Perhaps whether wh-agreement involves the cliticization or nominalization strategy can be related to an oblique/adjunct distinction.

The fact that nominalization is associated with the occurrence of middle and ditransitive patients in the wh-position, suggests that it applies to obliques that are thematically required by the predicate. Such obliques could be represented within the verbal projection. Nominals such as locatives and temporals associated with the clitic strategy could be viewed as not being thematically required by the predicate. They could be represented as adjuncts, attached outside of the verbal projection.

However, this account runs into insurmountable problems. First of all, although some locatives may be viewed as adjuncts, there is also a class of predicates that projects a thematic grid for locatives within the verbal projection. It would be predicted that predicates such as /tntës/ put would use nominalization when the locative is in the wh-position. However, these locatives behave just like all locatives and use cliticization.

\[ (104) \text{Mary} - m-tn-t-Ø-Øs - l-mirnx - n-čkęk'\?a \]
\[ \text{det-Mary} - \text{perf-place-tr-3sO-3sS} - \text{det-basket} - \text{loc-shed} \]

'Mary put the basket in the shed.'

\[ (105) \text{Mary} - m-tn-t-Ø-Øs as \]
\[ \text{det-Mary} - \text{perf-place-tr-3sO-3sS} 3sdep \]

1-mirnx
\[ \text{det-basket} \]

'Mary put the basket in the shed.'
Secondly, the behaviour of quantifiers within object arguments causes problems with attributing wh-agreement strategies to structural differences.

(106) m-ʔíłn-(n)-Ø-s  r-skʷimémlat  [τʷəτʷέyt  l-spəqpeq]
     perf-eat-fc-3sO-3sS  det-child  all  det-berries
     'The child ate all the berries.'

(107) τʷəτʷέyt  m-ʔíłn-(n)-Ø-s  s  r-spəqpeq
     all  perf-eat-fc-3sO-3sS  3sdep  det-berries
     l-skʷimémlat
     det-child
     'The child ate all the berries.'

(108) m-ʔíłn-(n)-Ø-n  [τʷʔit  tə-spəqpeq]
     perf-eat-fc-3sO-1sS  many  det-berries
     'I ate many berries.'

(109) τʷʔit  m-s-ʔíłn-(n)-Ø-n  r-spəqpeq
     many  perf-nom-eat-fc-3sO-1sS  det-berries
     'I ate many berries.'

Presumably, in both instances the nominal is in the same thematic position within the verbal projection. The same contrast between cliticization and nominalization can be observed in ditransitives. Recall that the quantifier /τʷəτʷέyt/ all triggers the clitic strategy when it is in the wh-position, whereas the quantifier /τʷʔit/ many triggers nominalization.
(110) a. \(x^w\alpha x^w\epsilon yt\) \(m\varepsilon?\) \(kax-t-sí-n\) \(taspaqpéq\)
all \(exp\) \(give-tr-2sO-1sS\) \(3sdep\) \(obl-berries\)

'I'm going to give you all the berries.'

b. \(x^w\alpha x^w\epsilon yt\) \(m\varepsilon?\) \(kax-t-sí-n\) \(taspaqpéq\)
all \(exp\) \(give-tr-2sO-1sS\) \(obl-berries\)

'I'm going to give you all the berries.'

(111) a. \(x^w?it\) \(m\varepsilon?\) \(s-kax-t-sí-n\) \(taspaqpáq\)
many \(exp\) \(nom-give-tr-2sO-1sS\) \(obl-berries\)

'I'm going to give you lots of berries.'

b. \(x^w?it\) \(m\varepsilon?\) \(kax-t-sí-n\) \(taspaqpáq\)
many \(exp\) \(give-tr-2sO-1sS\) \(obl-berries\)

'I'm going to give you lots of berries.'

In (110-111), the quantifiers were associated with the patient of ditransitives. Again, it is reasonable to assume that the quantifiers originate in the same structural position in each case.

The evidence suggests that the distribution of the strategies of wh-agreement cannot be tied to syntactic structural positions. Rather, the wh-agreement pattern will have to be stipulated.
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2.3 Peripheral Gaps

Shuswap exhibits an asymmetry with respect to wh-extraction. In transitive constructions the absolutive argument can be related to wh, whereas the ergative argument cannot:

$$\text{(112) swétə} \quad k-\text{xʷi-st-ə-és}$$
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS

'Who does she like?'/"Who likes her?"

$$\text{(113) swétə} \quad k-\text{xʷi-st-ə-ém as}$$
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'Who likes her?'/"Who does she like?"

In §2.2.2 I argued that (113) was a focus passive construction. The use of the passive is a disambiguation device.

Languages have a number of strategies to resolve potential ambiguity. These strategies will be invoked in contexts where there are empty categories. This is likely to arise in languages with pro-drop, where the position of the null pronominal cannot be read off of word order.

One strategy is to set a default interpretation in the presence of such categories. In Chapter Three I propose a constraint that states that in the presence of a null pronominal and an overt NP, the pronominal will be interpreted as an ergative and the overt NP interpreted as the absolutive.

Another strategy is to put some restriction on where gaps can occur, such as the Peripheral Gap Principle (Hankamer 1973, Woolford 1991).
(114) Peripheral Gap Principle

If any interpretation is possible for an unacceptable ambiguous structure, it will be that interpretation under which the location of the deletion site is peripheral rather than internal.

The Peripheral Gap Principle can be observed in English double object constructions (Woolford 1991). In (115) the wh-form is related to the patient of the ditransitive.

(115) Who did they show Fred?

If wh-is related to the goal of the ditransitive a passive construction is used.

(116) Who was shown Fred?

In this construction, NP-movement takes the goal out of a position adjacent to the patient. The goal is now able to undergo wh-movement. In §2.3.1 I discuss the Peripheral Gap Principle in Jacaltec. The Shuswap facts are discussed in §2.3.2. In §2.3.3 it is shown that Halkomelem, a Coast Salish language, uses another disambiguation strategy, the suppression of ergative marking.

2.3.1 Jacaltec

The Peripheral Gap Principle has also been shown to occur in Jacaltec (Craig 1977, Woolford 1991). Jacaltec has rich verbal agreement but is not a pro-drop language. There are situations, however, where null pronominals can occur. One source of null pronominals is found in the interpretation of
coreference. This is referred to as Noun Classifier Deletion by Craig, because it is claimed that pronominals have developed from noun classifiers. Coreference is subject to a precedence condition in Jacaltec. In (117), a PP has been preposed.

(117) boj smam ix xiv naj (Craig 1977:181)
    with her father cl saw cl/he/him

    'It is with her father that he saw her/it.'
    'It is with her father that she saw him.'

The PP contains a pronominal antecedent for one of the arguments which will consequently drop. It is in this context that ambiguity may arise. The pronominal that has been dropped can be interpreted either as the subject or the object. The Peripheral Gap Principle predicts that the interpretation with the null pronominal as the object will be strongly preferred. This is the case. The reading where the possessor is an antecedent for the subject is highly secondary. It is also possible to interpret the null pronominal as an inanimate. This is due to the fact that most inanimates lack classifiers and thus occur as null pronouns.

The Peripheral Gap Principle can be seen to resolve ambiguity in wh-question, cleft, and relative clause constructions in Jacaltec (Craig 1977:211-221). (118) is a transitive clause with pronominal arguments.

(118) x-Ø-(y)-il naj ix
    asp-A3-E3-see cl/he cl/her

    'He saw her.'
In (119-121) the absolutive is able to be directly extracted in wh-question, cleft, and relative clause constructions.

(119) mac xil naj
Who saw cl/he

‘Who did he see?’

(120) ha’ ix xil naj
cleft cl/she saw cl/he

‘It’s her that he saw.’

(121) wohtaj ix xil naj
I know cl/her saw cl/he

‘I know the woman that he saw.’

In (122-124), the extraction of the ergative requires that the ergative person marking be suppressed and that the verb take the additional marking /-ni/.

(122) mec x’il-ni ix
Who saw-suffix cl/her

‘Who saw her?’

(123) ha’ naj x’il-ni ix
cleft cl/he saw-suffix cl/her

‘It is he who saw her.’

(124) wohtaj naj x’il-ni ix
I know cl/he saw-suffix cl/her

‘I know the man who saw her.’
Craig claims that this operation is truly a disambiguation device. In constructions where no ambiguity would arise. In (125) it is possible to use either regular verbal morphology or the disambiguation mechanism.

(125) ha' naj smak/xmakni sam
    cleft cl/he hit his father

'It's he who hit his father.'/*'It's him who his father hit.'

The reason that there is no ambiguity is that it is impossible to obtain a coreferential grammatical reading for (126).

(126) smak sam sam naj naj
    hit his father cl cl/him

'His father hit him.'

This is claimed to be an instance of the Constraint on the Recoverability of Deletion as discussed in Hankamer (1973). The sentence is grammatical with a disjoint reference reading. It is not possible to delete the pronominal object and obtain a coreferential reading. in the following construction, the null pronominal is interpreted as an element that lacks a classifier.

(127) xil smam naj
    saw his father cl

'His father saw it.'

Clefting of the possessive object still gives an ungrammatical reading.
The disambiguation device is apparently optional in constructions with possessive objects in Jacaltec.

2.3.2 Shuswap

Like Jacaltec, Shuswap allows the absolutive in wh-question, focus, and relative clause constructions to occur in wh-position without wh-agreement on the predicate:

(129) swétú k-χ̃i-st-Ø-és
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS
‘Who does she like?’/‘Who likes her?’

(130) Mary ρi? χ̃i-st-Ø-és
Mary part like-caus-3sO-3sS
‘Mary's the one he likes.’/‘Mary's the one who likes him.’

(131) ρ-Mary c'úrn-qs-n-Ø-s [τ-σqẹímx\^] t̃e-χ̃i-st-Ø-és]
det-Mary kiss-is-fc-3sO-3sS det-man obl-like-caus-3sO-3sS
‘Mary kissed the man that she likes.’/‘Mary kissed the man who likes her.’

As the second gloss in (128-130) show, the ergative argument cannot occur in wh-position when the other argument is a third person pronominal. Rather a
focus passive construction is used. Passive agents require cliticization when they occur in the wh-position.

(132) \text{swētū} \quad \text{k-wik-t-Ø-m as}
\text{who} \quad \text{irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{3sdep}

‘Who saw her?’/‘Who did she see?’

(133) \text{Mary} \quad \text{ʁi?} \quad \text{wik-t-Ø-m as}
\text{Mary} \quad \text{part} \quad \text{see-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{3sdep}

‘Mary saw her.’

(134) \text{ʁ-Mary} \quad \text{c'úrmqs-n-Ø-s} \quad \text{ʁ-sqélmxw}
\text{det-Mary} \quad \text{kiss-is-fc-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-man}
\text{tə-x"i-st-Ø-ěm as}
\text{det-like-caus-3sO-unsp} \quad \text{3sdep}

‘Mary kissed the man who likes her.’

This asymmetry in the way absolutive and ergative gaps are treated confirms that the Peripheral Gap Principle is present in the grammar of Shuswap.\(^{11}\) It predicts the following configuration, where the absolutive gap is directly related to wh.

(135) \text{Whi} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{pro} \quad \text{e}_i

---

\(^{11}\)The Peripheral Gap Principle is somewhat problematic in relying on word order. In Chapter Four I restate it as a condition on pronominal absolutes in transitive constructions (The Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories).
The Peripheral Gap Principle also predicts that in the following representation, wh-cannot be related to the ergative gap and the construction will be ruled out:

(136)  *Wh_i \lor e_i \text{ pro}

This is confirmed in (137):

(137)  s\(\text{w}\)\(\text{e}\)\(\text{t}_{\text{i}}\)  k-wi\(k\)-t-\(\emptyset\)-s  \\
       who  irr-seen-tr-3sO-3sS  \\

"Who did she see?/*Who saw her?"

The construction shown in (137) only has one interpretation, that in which the wh-stem is related to the absolutive. In order to relate the first of two adjacent pronominals to wh, the focus passive strategy is used.

(138)  s\(\text{w}\)\(\text{e}\)\(\text{t}_{\text{i}}\)  k-wi\(k\)-t-\(\emptyset\)-m\(\text{e}\)  \\
       who  irr-seen-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep  \\

"Who saw her?/*Who did she see?"

That the Peripheral Gap Principle is related to disambiguation can be shown by its failure to apply with first and second person arguments:

(139)  s\(\text{w}\)\(\text{e}\)\(\text{t}\)  k-wi\(k\)-t-s\(\text{s}\)  \\
       who  irr-seen-tr-2sO-3sS  \\

"Who saw you?"
Furthermore, the Peripheral Gap Principle does not apply when the pronominal absolutive is inanimate:

(141) swěťy\textsubscript{i} k-nik’n-o-s who irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS

‘Who cut it?’

This supports the notion that disambiguation is implicated. When there is a single overt nominal argument, the focus passive strategy also does not apply.

(142) swěťy k-wik-t-o-s \textsubscript{\textsc{x-Mary}} who irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary

‘Who saw Mary?’/‘Who did Mary see?’

This establishes four points. First, it is possible to extract ergative arguments in Shuswap. Second, the Peripheral Gap Principle applies only to pronouns. It fails to apply when there is an overt nominal in spite of the resulting ambiguity. The possibility of using (142) ambiguously suggests the following representations:

(143) Wh\textsubscript{i} V e\textsubscript{i} NP

The Peripheral Gap Principle need not be invoked, as it only applies to pronouns. Third, the grammaticality of (142) establishes that at least some
nominals are capable of being syntactic arguments in Shuswap. If all nominals were adjuncts, it is predicted that it would be impossible to extract ergatives and that the focus passive strategy shown in (144) would always be used:

(144) swétý k-wik-t-Ø-ém as ɣ-Mary
    who irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep det-Mary

‘Who saw Mary?’/‘Who did Mary see?’

This construction is possible. Thus, the focus passive strategy is invoked to relate the first of two adjacent empty categories to wh. Finally, it cannot be claimed that the use of the focus passive is optional. The two constructions do not mean the same thing. (142) is an instance of true quantification, whereas (144) is used in a distributive sense, picking out an individual from a group identified in the previous discourse. This appears to be an instance of discourse linking (Pesetsky 1987, Cinque 1991).

There is evidence that a trace counts for the Peripheral Gap Principle. In the following constructions a nominal argument has been moved to Spec of IP:

(145) swétý ɣ-Maryj k-wik-t-Ø-s tj ei
    who det-Mary irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘Who did Mary see?’/‘Who saw Mary?’

12Constructions such as (144) often elicit comments about a plurality reading and get translated ‘which one of you saw Mary?’ This would be appropriate when asking a group of people sitting in the room, which one of them saw Mary. Notice that in chapter one I provided evidence that there is an animacy constraint operating in Shuswap that disallows a plural ergative with a singular absolutive. This would provide an explanation for the use of the focus passive strategy.
Notice that when a nominal is in immediate preverbal position, the operator may only be interpreted as binding the absolutive nominal. This supports the predictions of the Peripheral Gap Principle and provides evidence that the trace of a nominal in preverbal position counts for this principle.

2.3.3 Halkomelem

The Coast Salish language Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988b, Hukari 1977) displays a different device in resolving ambiguity in wh-questions, that of suppressing agreement morphology for third person ergatives. When the absolutive argument is questioned or focussed, the agreement is phonetically null as illustrated in (147):

\[(147) \text{wēt kʷa ni lēm-át-ʔē.n?} \quad \text{who det aux see-tr-1ssub} \]

\['What did I see?’"

Constructions involving non-third person arguments have full agreement morphology on the predicate.
(148) nawa ni lam-th-ama-mi-e.n?
2emph aux look-tr-2obj-1subj

'It's you that I looked at.'

(149) ?én?Tha ni q’wàq”-aTh-ám’s-as
1emph aux club-tr-1obj-3subj

'It's me who he clubbed.'

On the other hand, when there is a third person object in emphatic contexts, the predicate is not marked for subject morphology:

(150) ?én?Tha ni q’wàq”-at-(?mwa)
1emph aux club-tr

'I'm the one who clubbed it.'

The non-third person emphatic pronouns behave like third person emphatic pronouns for the purposes of agreement. Observe that the predicate is not marked for subject agreement morphology when third person arguments are extracted in wh-questions and in cleft constructions:

(151) ëwet k’wsa ni? k’wíc’-at t’Tha smáyaTh
who det aux butcher-tr det deer

'Who (feminine) butchered the deer.'

(152) níl ña sténi? ni q’wáq”-at-(ás)
3emph det woman aux club-tr

'It's the woman who clubbed it.'
The Halkomelem data show a different strategy from the one used by Shuswap, to resolve ambiguity.

2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, evidence has been presented that wh-questions, contrastive focus constructions, and relative clauses all employ a cleft strategy, as has been previously claimed for other Salish languages (Kroeber 1991). A wh-question (153), a contrastive focus construction (154), and a relative clause (155) are given:

(153) swé tô  k-wik-t-Ø-s
    who   irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘Whom did he see?’

(154) ḥ-John  lu?  l-m-wik-t-Ø-s
     det-John part  det-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘It's John that he saw.’

(155) č-lxml-st-Ø-ét n  ḥ-sqélmxʷ  tę-wik-t-Ø-s
     hab-know-caus-3sO-1sS+c  det-man  obl-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘I know the man who he saw.’
The cleft construction is represented as a base-generated position adjoined to CP:

(156)

\[
\text{CP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{CP}
\]

The syntactic properties of the wh-position were then described. Only one nominal can occur in wh-position and this nominal may be associated with a focus particle, such as the particle /luʔ/ in (154). Furthermore, the clause that is associated with the nominal in wh-position has specific properties. It is typically introduced by a determiner, either a direct determiner in wh-questions (153) or contrastive focus (154), or the oblique determiner in relative clauses (155). Nominals in the wh-position can host second-position clitics:

(157) swět nka ʁiʔ k-nik'-n-Ø-s ʁ-John
who evid part irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John

‘Who was it that John apparently cut?’
In addition, nominals in the wh-position can be extracted from clausal complements (158), but not from adjuncts (159) or complex NPs (160):

(158) swētũ yî? r-John k-m-wík-t-Ø-s r-Mary
who part det-John irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary
m-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
det-kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS

'That's the man that John saw Mary kiss.'

(159) *stěr̥i yî? č-1xmn-st-Ø-ės pnhē?n r-Sam
what part hab-know-caus-3sO-3sS when det-Sam
1-m-k’úl-n-Ø-s as
det-perf-make-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'*What did he know when Sam made?'

(160) *swētũ lu? r-John k-wik-t-Ø-s tə-núxʷanxʷ
who part det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS obl-woman
tə-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
obl-kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS

'*Who was it that John saw the woman who kissed?'

Under the assumption that island effects are diagnostic of movement, these constructions provide evidence of empty operator movement.
I then turned to the morphological properties of the wh-position. Direct arguments, including the ergative, may occur in wh-position without wh-agreement:

\[(161) \text{swětý k-wik-t-Ø-s} \]
\[
\text{who irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS}
\]

'Whom did he see?'

However, extracted obliges and adjuncts employ wh-agreement, which is realized as cliticization or nominalization. When passive agents, temporals and locatives, or the quantifier /x'ωx'ěyt/ all that are in the wh-position, the predicate is marked by cliticization. A passive agent in wh-position is shown in (162):

\[(162) \text{swětý k-wik-t-Ø-m as} \]
\[
\text{who irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep}
\]

'Who saw her?'

On the other hand, when the patients of middles and ditransitives, the quantifiers /x'ωit/ many, and /s'iį'^x/ some, and adverbials are in wh-position, the predicate is nominalized. An extracted patient of a ditransitive is shown in (163):

\[(163) \text{stěmi k-s-kax-t-Ø-és} \]
\[
\text{what irr-nom-give-tr-3sO-3sS}
\]

'What did he give her?'
Next I discussed the Peripheral Gap Constraint and showed that it applies in Shuswap. In transitive constructions, the absolutive argument can be related to wh, whereas the ergative argument cannot:

(164) swétý k-χʷi-st-∅-és
     who  irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS

‘Who does she like?’/‘Who likes her?’

In (164) the wh-question can only be associated with the peripheral position, the absolutive, and not the ergative. A focus passive (165) is employed to question the agent:

(165) swétý k-χʷi-st-∅-ēm as
     who  irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS 3sdep

‘Who likes her?’/‘Who does she like?’

In Shuswap, the Peripheral Gap Principle only applies when there are null objects:

(166) swétý k-χʷi-st-∅-ēs ḡ-Mary
     who  irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS  det-Mary

‘Who likes Mary?’/‘Who does Mary like?’

As can be seen by the ambiguity in (166), when there is a lexical NP, the nominal in the wh-position can be associated with either the absolutive or the ergative argument.
Chapter 3

Topic and Focus

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides evidence that there are syntactic positions that precede the predicate in addition to the wh-position discussed in Chapter Two. A wh-question is shown in (1):

(1) swětěy k-wik-t-Ø-s
    who    irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'Who did he see?'

Nominals may occur to the left of this position, as illustrated in (2-3):

(2) r-John swětěy k-wik-t-Ø-s
    det-John who    irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'That John, who did he see?'

(3) r-Basile stěmi r-qé condolences
    det-Basile what    det-father-3sP    irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'Basile, what did his father see?'

I call the position that occurs at the left edge of the clause the external topic position. Nominals in this position are followed by a pause. Functionally, the position behaves like a switch topic position, permitting a previously mentioned
referent in the discourse to be foregrounded. For example, (2) would be appropriate in a discourse where it is established that each member of a group of people saw somebody and the speaker is returning one of the previously established members of the group, John, to the foreground. Similarly (3) would be foregrounding Basile from a previously identified set of participants. A switch topic would contrast with a continuing topic in Shuswap, which would typically use a pronominal form rather than a name.

Nominals may also occur to the right of the cleft but to the left of the predicate, as illustrated in (4-5):

(4) swéty r-John k-wik-t-Ø-s
    who det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS
    ‘Who did John see?’

(5) swéty r-Basile k-wik-x-t-Ø-s ta-ʔúqʷi-s
    who det-Basile irr-see-red-tr-3sO-3sS obl-brother-3sP
    ‘Who is it that Basile saw his brother?’

I refer to the position occupied by the nominal John in (4) and Basile in (5) as the focus position. Functionally, the nominal in focus position behaves as a continuing topic. The focus position is used to foreground nominals already established in the discourse and to provide a mild emphasis. There are no noticable intonational properties associated with this position.

1See Herring (1990) for a discussion of switch topics.
2The nominal John in (2) occurs with direct case, which indicates that John is being talked about. It may also occur without a marker, in which case John is being directly asked who a third person saw.
The data in (2-5) show instances of two preverbal nominals. In fact, sentences like (6) and (7), where nominals occupy all three preverbal positions, are also possible.

(6) ṡ-John swéťy ṡ-qeʔča-s k-wiʔ-t-ʔ-s
det-John who det-father-3sP irr-see-irr-3sO-3sS

'John, who did his father see?'

(7) ṡ-John ṡ-Mary luʔ ta-swéʔkax-t-ʔ-έs
det-John det-Mary part obl-fish give-irr-3sO-3sS

l-paxʔéw'tas
det-yesterday

'John gave the fish to Mary yesterday.'

In (6-7) the leftmost nominal, a possessor in (6) and the thematic agent in (7), are in the external topic position. The wh-question stem /swéťy/ in (6) and the nominal in contrastive focus in (7) are in the wh-position. Finally, the nominals in immediate preverbal position, the thematic agent in (6) and the patient of the ditransitive in (7), are in the focus position.

I show in this chapter that the three positions can be distinguished on the basis of wh-agreement on the predicate, second-position clitics, focus particles, doubling, and island effects. In §3.1 I discuss the distribution and syntactic properties of the nominals that occupy the external topic position. The focus position is discussed in §3.2. Both the external topic position and the focus position are contrasted with the wh-position. The behaviour of preverbal elements in embedded contexts is discussed in §3.3.
3.1 External Topic Position

This section discusses the syntactic properties of nominals in the external topic position. First the distribution of nominals that can occur in this position is discussed in §3.1.1. Then the syntactic behaviour of the nominals that occupy this position are investigated with respect to second-position clitics (§3.1.2), island constraints (§3.1.3), and doubling (§3.1.4).

3.1.1 The Distribution of External Topic Nominals

This section provides data showing that all nominals can appear in the external topic position. Subjects of intransitive clauses can occur in the external topic position:

(8) ʁ-kúkpi? ʃɛ? n-Ø
det-chief well qu-3sS

‘The chief, is he well?’

(9) ʁ-ʃohn pnhɛʔn ʁ-qʷəčč-ʃ as
det-John when irr-leave-3sS 3sdep

‘John, when did he leave?’

Notice in (8) that no determiner occurs on the predicate, in contrast to constructions where there are nominals in the wh-position (9). In (10-11) an ergative is in the external topic position:
The ergative occurs to the left of the temporal in the wh-position in (10), whereas in (11) it is to the left of the wh-stem. It should be observed that there is no wh-agreement with the external topic. All instances of wh-agreement are with the nominal in the wh-position.

In (12-13) objects are in external topics:

(12) ʔ-John pnheʔn k-wik-t-Ø-x was det-John when irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep

‘John, when did you see him?’

(13) ʔ-John pnheʔn k-k’úl-x-t-Ø-x was te-miʔmx det-John when irr-make-red-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep obl-basket

‘John, when did you make him a basket?’

Notice that in the applicative construction (13), a benefactive is the grammatical object and that it may occur as an external topic. Also, patients of passives (14-15), middles (16), and ditransitives (17), can be external topics.

(14) ʔ-spéc’n swéty k-nik’-n-t-Ø-m as det-rope who irr-cut-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

‘The rope, who cut it?’
Nominals in various oblique roles may also be external topics. (18) shows a locative, (19) shows a temporal, and (20) an instrumental:

(15) \( \text{τά-\text{John} \ swētī \ k-wik-t-∅-m \ as} \)
\( \text{det-John who irr-see-tr-3S-O-unsp 3sdep} \)

‘That John, who saw him?’

(16) \( \text{τα-\text{spēc'\text{n} swētī \ k-pel-nik'-m-∅} \)
\( \text{obi-\text{rope who irr-have-cut-unsp-3S-S}} \)

‘The rope, who cut it?’

(17) \( \text{τα-sqīltn \ swētī \ k-kax-t-∅-ēs \ τά-\text{John} \)
\( \text{obi-salmon who irr-give-tr-3S-O-3S-\text{S} det-John} \)

‘The salmon, who gave it to John?’

(18) \( \text{n-čitxw \ stērī \ lu? \ k-ník'-n-∅-s} \)
\( \text{loc-house what part irr-cut-fc-3S-O-3S-S} \)

‘In the house, what did he cut?’

(19) \( \text{l-pəxyēwtas \ stērī \ lu? \ k-ník'-n-∅-s} \)
\( \text{det-yesterday what part irr-cut-fc-3S-O-3S-S} \)

‘Yesterday, what did he cut?’

(20) \( \text{ta-sak"mín \ swētī \ k-nik'-n-t-∅-m \ as} \)
\( \text{obl-knife who irr-cut-fc-3S-O-unsp 3sdep} \)
\( \text{τά-\text{spēc'\text{n}}} \)
\( \text{det-\text{rope}} \)

‘The knife, who cut the rope with it?’
Possessors of subjects of intransitive clauses (21-22) and transitive clauses (23-24) can be external topics:

(21) ɤ-John m-Ɂw̌éym ɤ-sqéxə-s
det-John perf-bark det-dog-3sP

‘That John, his dog barked.’

(22) ɤ-John xyum ɤ-čitxʷ-s
det-John big det-house-3sP

‘That John, his house is big.’

(23) ɤ-Mary swétų ɤ-qéʔčə-s k-wík-t-ʔ-s
det-Mary who det-father-3sP irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘That Mary, who did her father see?’

(24) ɤ-John m-wíwk-t-sm-s ɤ-qéʔčə-s
det-John perf-see+c-tr-3sO-1sS det-father-3sP

‘That John, his father saw me.’

In transitive clauses, Shuswap distinguishes possessors of object NPs that are coreferential with the subject from those that are disjoint in reference. Coreferential possessors of object NPs occur in regular transitive constructions, whereas disjoint possessors of NPs occur in applicative constructions, in which the possessor becomes the grammatical object of the clause. Both types of possessors may be external topics:

(25) ɤ-Mary pneʔn k-wík-t-ʔ-s ɤ-qéʔčə-s
det-Mary when irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

‘That Mary, when did she see her father?’
In (27-28) nominals with quantifiers can be external topics:\(^3\)

(27) \text{xw?it tə-spyu? pnhe?n k-wik-t-Ø-s as}
det-many obl-bird when irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'Many of the birds, when did he see them?'

(28) \text{xwæxwæyt tə-spyu? pnhe?n k-wik-t-Ø-s as}
all obl-bird when irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'All of the birds, when did he see them?'

To summarize, the external topic position is available to all nominals, irrespective of their thematic status.

It should also be observed that the external topic position cannot be multiply filled (29), and cannot take focus particles (30):

\(^3\)Quantifiers cannot be discontinuous from the nominal that they quantify over:

(i) \text{*xw?it pnhe?n k-wik-t-Ø-s as tə-spyu?}
det-many when irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep obl-bird

'Many of the birds, when did he see them?'

(ii) \text{*xwæxwæyt pnhe?n k-wik-t-Ø-s as tə-spyu?}
all when irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep obl-bird

'All of the birds, when did he see them?'
(29) *¼-John l-panyéw tas swétû k-wik-t-Ø-m as
det-John det-yesterday who irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

'That John, who saw him yesterday.'

(30) *¼-John xi? swétû k-wik-t-Ø-m as
det-John part who irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

'That John, who saw him.'

I represent external topic structures in a manner proposed by Aissen (1992): external topics are base-generated in a node prefixed to CP and dominated by E(xpression). This is shown in (31):

(31)

---

4Aissen (1992), following Banfield (1973) and Emonds (1985), represents the projection dominating the external topic as E(xpression).
In §2.1.2 it was shown that clefted nominals in wh-position can host second-position clitics, including the evidential clitic /nke/, the reportative clitic /akwa/ and the confirmative question clitic /n/. The rule for clitic placement is informally given in (32):

(32) Clitic Placement

Attach second-position clitics to the first word of CP.

In (33-36) the predicate, which is in initial position, can host second-position clitics:

(33) m-xwéym n-Ø r-John r-sqέxε-s
     perf-bark qu-3sS det-John det-dog-3sP

‘Did John's dog bark?’

(34) xyum n-Ø r-John r-čitx-w-s
     big qu-3sS det-John det-house-3sP

‘Is John's house big?’

(35) m-xwéym nκε-Ø r-John r-sqέxε-s
     perf-bark evid-3sS det-John det-dog-3sP

‘I guess John's dog barked.’
Nominals can also host second-position clitics:

(37) \( \text{\textit{John}} \text{\textit{akwə}} \quad \text{\textit{qéʔčə-s}} \quad \text{\textit{m-wiwk+c-t-sm-s}} \quad \text{\textit{det-John rep det-father-3sP perf-see-tr-1sO-3sS}} \)

‘(Somebody said) John’s father saw me.’

Constructions with external topics are given in (38-39):

(38) \( \text{\textit{John}} \quad \text{\textit{m-xwéym-Ø}} \quad \text{\textit{sqéχə-s}} \quad \text{\textit{det-John perf-bark-3sS det-dog-3sP}} \)

‘That John, his dog barked.’

(39) \( \text{\textit{John}} \quad \text{\textit{xyum-Ø}} \quad \text{\textit{čitxʷ-s}} \quad \text{\textit{det-John big-3sS det-house-3sP}} \)

‘That John, his house is big.’

The external topic in (31) is represented as outside of CP. This predicts that external topics should not be able to host second-position clitics. The prediction is confirmed in (40-41):

(40) \( \text{\textit{*John n}} \quad \text{\textit{m-xwéym-Ø}} \quad \text{\textit{sqéχə-s}} \quad \text{\textit{det-John qu perf-bark-3sS det-dog-3sP}} \)

‘That John, did his dog bark?’
Instead, the predicate is the host of second-position clitics in spite of a nominal occurring to its left:\(^5\)

(42) ə-John m-xʷéym n-ə ə-sqēxə-s
det-John perf-bark qu-3sS det-dog-3sP

'\(\text{That John, did his dog bark?}\)'

(43) ə-John xyum n-ə ə-čitxʷ-s
det-John big qu-3sS det-house-3sP

'\(\text{That John, is his house big?}\)'

(44) ə-John m-xʷéym nka-ə ə-sqēxə-s
det-John perf-bark evid-3sS det-dog-3sP

'\(\text{That John, I guess his dog barked.}\)'

(45) ə-John xyum nka-ə ə-čitxʷ-s
det-John big evid-3sS det-house-3sP

'\(\text{That John, I guess his house is big.}\)'

---

\(^5\)External topics, such as the following are not frequent in texts. They are much more frequent in direct elicitation.

(i) ...xu... tlíʔsə c'x-n-t-ə-és akʷə ə-kʷósu
part name look-fc-tr-3O-3sS rep det-pig

ə-sxʔíʔn-s...
det-food-3sP

'\(\text{...Oh, tlíʔsə looked at the pig's food...}\)' (Kuipers 1974: T7:79 p113)
This follows from the rule of clitic placement in (32), given the analysis for external topics proposed here.

### 3.1.3 Island Constraints

In §2.1.3, I showed that movement to wh-position obeyed island constraints. In contrast, the external topic position does not exhibit island effects. The following constructions contain temporal adjunct clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(46)} & \quad m-I\alpha\xk\xxy\y\?\-x-t-sm-x & \text{pnhé} & \text{n} & \text{\(\varepsilon\)-John} \\
& \text{perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS} & \text{when} & \text{det-John} \\
& \text{k-m-q"\aččč-Ø-as} \\
& \text{irr-perf-leave-3sO 3sdep}
\end{align*}
\]

“You told me when John left.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(47)} & \quad m-I\alpha\xk\xxy\y\?\-x-t-sm-x & \text{pnhé} & \text{n} & \text{\(\varepsilon\)-John} \\
& \text{perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS} & \text{when} & \text{det-John} \\
& \text{\(\varepsilon\)-kí?\xa-s} & \text{k-m-q"\aččč as} \\
& \text{det-mother-3sP} & \text{irr-perf-leave 3sdep}
\end{align*}
\]

“You told me when John’s mother left.”

As can be observed in (48-49), the leftmost nominal violates the Adjunct Island Constraint:
(48) $\gamma$-John m-1euxxya?-x-t-sm-x n phnê?n
det-John perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS qu when

k-m-q"açêê as
irr-perf-leave 3sdep

'That John, did you tell me when he left.'

(49) $\gamma$-John m-1euxxya?-x-t-sm-x n phnê?n
det-John perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS qu when

$\gamma$-ki?xə-s k-m-q"açêê as
det-mother-3sP irr-perf-leave 3sdep

'That John, did you tell me when his mother left.'

That the leftmost nominal in (48-49) violates the Adjunct Island Constraint is predicted for external topics (Aissen 1992). No movement has taken place. The nominal in the external topic position is able to bind a null pronominal—an absolutive in (48) and a possessor in (49).

The same point can be made for the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint. Relative clauses are illustrated in (50-51):

(50) m-wik-t-∅-x $\gamma$-nuxwənəxə
det-woman perf-see-tr-3sO-2sS

det-woman

'the woman that John kissed.'
'You saw the woman that John's brother kissed.'

As can be observed in (52-53), a nominal may appear in the external topic position in violation of the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint.\(^6\)

(52) ɣ-John  m-wik-t-∅-x  ɣ-núxʷənənʷ  
det-John  perf-see-tr-3sO-2sS  qu  det-woman  
   tə-c’úm-qs-n-∅-s  
obl-kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS

‘That John, did you see the woman that he kissed.’

(53) ɣ-John  m-wik-t-∅-x-n  ɣ-núxʷənənʷ  
det-John  perf-see-tr-3sO-2sS-n  det-woman  
   tə-c’úm-qs-n-∅-s  ɣ-úqʷi-s  
obl-kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS  det-brother-3sP

‘That John, did you see the woman that his brother kissed.’

We see then that nominals in the external topic position may violate the Adjunct Island Condition and the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint. This is predicted if external topics do not undergo movement.

\(^6\)A third type of standard island test is the Sentential Subject Condition. It is not clear that Shuswap has sentential subjects. This is discussed in Chapter Five.
3.1.4 Doubling

The final evidence for the external topic position comes from doubling phenomena. In the following constructions, the nominals in the external topic position—a subject in (54), an object in (55), and a locative in (56)—can be doubled with a strong deictic or a spatial deictic:

(54) ḡ-Mary m-c'úṁ-qs-n-t-s-s (xi?)
det-Mary perf-kiss-Is-fc-tr-2sO-3sS that one

'That Mary, she kissed you.'

(55) ḡ-sp'éc'n m-nínk'-n-Ø-n (xi?)
det-rope perf-cut+c-fc-3sO-1sS that one

'That rope, I cut it.'

(56) n-čitxʷ spec'n akʷə k-ník'-n-Ø-s ḡ-John
loc-house rope rep irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John

(nərīʔ?)
(there)

'Over at the house they say it was a rope that John cut.'

These data are easily accommodated under my analysis since there are two positions—the external topic in CP and a nominal in the clause. In contrast, nominals in the wh-position cannot be doubled by strong deictics:
(57) swéty k-m-qʷəčəč-Ø (*ʔi?)
    who  irr-perf-leave-3sS  that one

    'Who left?'

(58) swéty k-wik-t-Ø-s  r-Mary (*ʔi?)
    who  irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS  det-Mary  that one

    'Who saw Mary?'/"Who did Mary see?''

(59) xhēʔn k-ník'-nt-Ø-m əs (*nəʕí?)
    where  det-cut-fc-3sO-unsp 3sdep  there

    'Where did he cut it?''

In this section I have provided evidence for an external topic position. It has been shown that nominals in this position cannot host second-position clitics, can violate island constraints, and can double, leaving a strong deictic. I have posited a structure where external topics are to the left of CP.

3.2 Focus Position

I previously discussed two preverbal NPs in Shuswap—nominals in wh-position (Chapter Two) and external topics (§3.1). This section provides evidence for a third preverbal position in the grammar of Shuswap. In (60-62) we see that a nominal intervenes between the wh-nominal and the predicate:

(60) xhēʔn r-Mary  k-ʔeč k əs
    where  det-Mary  irr-go 3sdep

    'Where did Mary go?'
I refer to this position as the focus position. Notice that in (60-62) wh-agreement is with the question word in the wh-position—a locative (60), an absolutive (61), and a temporal (62). This provides evidence that the focus position does not trigger wh-agreement.

While the data in this section establishes that nominals may occur to the right of a nominal in the focus position, it should be observed that there is a distinction between the wh-position and the focus position. When nominals are in the wh-position there is a determiner on the predicate. However when there is an nominal in the focus position the predicate does not take a determiner:
Nominals can also occur in the focus position following nominals in wh-position with contrastive focus:

(65) ṭ-Mary /Internal  ṭ-John  c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
   det-Mary  part  det-John  kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS

   *It was Mary that John kissed./*It was Mary that kissed John.'

(66) ṭ-qé?ča-s  Internal  ṭ-Mary  wik-t-Ø-s
   det-father-3sP  part  det-Mary  see-tr-3sO-3sS

   'It's her father that Mary saw.'

(67) ṭ-paxéwtes lu?  ṭ-sk’imémlat  m-ʔín-(n)-Ø-s  æs
   det-yesterday  part  det-child  perf-eat-tr-3sO-3sS  3sdep
   ṭ-speqpeq
   det-berries

   'It was yesterday that the child ate the berries.'

In (63) the nominal in the focus position is an absolutive, whereas it is an ergative in (64-67).
3.2.1 The Distribution of Nominals in the Focus Position

The constructions illustrated in (63-67) above suggest that the focus position may be a subject position. Initial support for the claim that focus position is a subject position is available in the following construction, where the preverbal nominal cannot be interpreted as the absolutive, in spite of the pragmatics forcing a single plausible reading.7

(68) @x-spæqqeq m-ʔíln-(n)-Ø-s l-skʷimémlæt
det-berries perf-eat-tr-3sO-3sS det-child
l-paxyéwtes det-yesterday

@‘The berries ate the child yesterday.’/‘The child ate the berries yesterday.’

However the focus position can be occupied by an object if the wh-position is filled:8

---

7I have no explanation for why the second gloss is unavailable in (68).
8Again, I have no explanation for this fact. Focussed objects may be allowed under other circumstances as well. For example, in the following sentence it is preceded by a negative predicate:

(i) ...k’émæl tæ? x-ʔ-sméʔstm k-s-kʷn-nwé(ʔy)n-Ø-n
but neg det-2sP-sister irr-nom-take-ic-3sO-1sS
‘...but I didn’t get your sister (well)...’ (Kuipers 1974: T8:141 p127)
In (69) the object follows a temporal in wh-position, in (70) it follows an emphatic pronoun in wh-position, and in (71) it follows a temporal.

Clauses (72-74) show that the focus position is also available to locatives, instruments, and the patients of ditransitives:

(69) pnhé’n ṭ-qé’ča-s k-c’úmh-qš-n-Ø-s-as
    when det-father-3sP irr-kiss-Islcfc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

    ṭ-Mary
    det-Mary

    ‘When did Mary kiss her father?’

(70) ṭ-n-čéčwē?’ ṭi? ṭ-sək’lép wiwk-t-Ø-n
    det-1sP-emph+c part det-coyote see+c-tr-3sO-1sS

    ‘Myself I saw the coyote.’

(71) l-pəxyéwtas lu? ṭ-səq̥̏q̥̏q m-ʔín-(n)-Ø-s-as
    det-yesterday part det-berries perf-eat-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

    l-sk’wimékłat
    det-child

    ‘It was yesterday that the child ate the berries.’

In (69) the object follows a temporal in wh-position, in (70) it follows an emphatic pronoun in wh-position, and in (71) it follows a temporal.

Clauses (72-74) show that the focus position is also available to locatives, instruments, and the patients of ditransitives:

(72) stérmí n-čitxʷ k-ník’-n-Ø-s
    what loc-house irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS

    ‘What did he cut in the house?’

(73) stérmí tə-sək’w már k-ník’-n-Ø-s
    what obl-knife irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS

    ‘What did he cut with the knife?’
In summary, as seen in the data above, non-subjects can occur in the focus position.

The focus position can be multiply filled, as illustrated in (75-79):

(74) světý ta-sqléltn k-kax-t-Ø-és
     who obl-salmon irr-give-tr-3sO-3sS

‘Who did he give the salmon?’

(75) pnhé?n ṭ-qéʔča-s ṭ-Mary
     when det-father-3sP det-Mary

k-‘c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s əs
irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

‘When did Mary kiss her father?’

(76) pnhé?n ṭ-Mary ṭ-qéʔča-s
     when det-Mary det-father-3sP

k-‘c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s əs
irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

‘When did Mary kiss her father?’

(77) pnhé?n n-čitxʷ ṭ-John k-nik’-n-Ø-s əs
     when loc-house det-John irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

ṭ-spéc’n
det-rope

‘When did John cut the rope in the house?’

143
'When did John cut the rope in the house?'

'Who was it yesterday in the house that cut the rope?'

While the nominals in the focus position above are to the right of wh-question stems, they may also co-occur with clefted nominals taking contrastive focus:

'It was yesterday when the child ate the berries.'

In (75-78) the wh-questions are in the wh-position and trigger wh-agreement on the predicate. In (79) an absolutive is clefted, therefore no wh-agreement is required. Finally, in (80) a temporal is clefted to indicate contrastive focus. The nominals to the right of the nominals in the wh-position in the above constructions are therefore in the focus position.
Data is now presented to illustrate several common types of simple clauses with respect to the focus position. Intransitive constructions are shown in (81-83):

(81)  m-qʷačćč-Ø  ṛ-John  
      perf-leave-3sS  det-John  
      'John left.'

(82)  m-xʷεym-Ø  ṛ-sqέχa  
      perf-bark-3sS  det-dog  
      'The dog barked.'

(83)  xyum-Ø  ṛ-čıtśʷ  
      big-3sS  det-house  
      'The house is big.'

The subject of the intransitive constructions in (81-83) above is able to occur in the focus position:

(84)  ṛ-John  m-qʷačćč-Ø  
      det-John  perf-leave-3sS  
      'John left.'

(85)  ṛ-sqέχa  m-xʷεym-Ø  
      det-dog  perf-bark-3sS  
      'The dog barked.'

(86)  ṛ-čıtśʷ  xyum-Ø  
      det-house  big-3sS  
      'The house is big.'
Intransitives with possessive NP subjects are shown in (87-88):

(87)  x'hé?n  k-χʔek-Ø was  ρ-John  χ-ʔqéʔčə-s  
where  irr-go-3sS  3sdep  det-John  det-father-3sP  

'Where is John's father going?'

(88)  kɛnm  w1  xʷeym-Ø  ρ-John  χ-sqéčə-s  
why  part  bark-3sS  det-John  det-dog-3P  

'Why did John's dog bark?'

It is unproblematic to have the entire possessive construction in the focus position (89-90):

(89)  x'hé?n  ρ-John  χ-ʔqéʔčə-s  k-χʔek  was  
where  det-John  det-father-3sP  irr-go  3sdep  

'Where is John's father going?'

(90)  kɛnm  ρ-John  χ-sqéčə-s  w1  xʷeym-Ø  
why  det-John  det-dog-3sP  part  bark-3sS  

'Why did John's dog bark?'

The possessor of the NP can also occur in this position:

(91)  x'hé?n  ρ-John  k-χʔek-Ø was  χ-ʔqéʔčə-s  
where  det-John  irr-go-3sS  3sdep  det-father-3sP  

'Where is John's father going?'
(92) kεnm ɣ-John w̃ ɣɛym-Ø ɣ-sqέχε-s
why det-John part bark-3sS det-dog-3P

‘Why did John’s dog bark?’

The following construction is a middle in which no nominal occurs in
focus position:

(93) pnhéʔn  k-m-k’ul-m-Ø as  ta-miʔmx
when irr-perf-make-unsp-3sS 3sdep obl-basket
\(\text{ɣ-núx’ænx’}\)
det-woman

‘When did the woman make a basket?’

In (94-96) the agent of the middle, the patient of the middle and both are tested
in focus position respectively:

(94) pnhéʔn  \(\text{ɣ-núx’ænx’}\) k-m-k’ul-m-Ø as
when det-woman irr-perf-make-unsp-3sS 3sdep
\(\text{ta-miʔmx}\)
obl-basket

‘When did the woman make a basket?’

(95) *pnhéʔn  ta-miʔmx k-m-k’ul-m-Ø as
when obl-basket irr-perf-make-unsp-3sS 3sdep
\(\text{ɣ-núx’ænx’}\)
det-woman

‘When did the woman make a basket?’
The construction with the agent of the middle in the focus position (94) is fully grammatical. On the other hand, the construction with the patient of the middle in the focus position (95) is ungrammatical. When both the patient and the agent of the middle are in the focus position, the sentence is marginally accepted.\(^9\)

> An active construction is shown in (97):

\[
\begin{align*}
(97) & \text{ pnhe}\hat{e}\text{n } k-m-k'ul-n-\emptyset-s \text{ as } \text{ m}\text{i}\text{m}\text{h}\text{x} \text{ r-}\text{n}\text{u}\text{x}'\text{an}\text{x}'w \\
& \text{ when } \text{ irr-perf-make-tr-3sO-3sS } 3s\text{dep } \text{ det-basket } \text{ det-woman}
\end{align*}
\]

> 'When did the woman make the basket?'

In (98-100) the agent, the patient, and both are tested in the focus position, respectively:

---

\(^9\)Speakers typically claim that constructions such as these are awkward but possible. Another typical response is that constructions such as these are 'understandable'.
When did the woman make the basket?

When did the woman make the basket?

When did the woman make the basket?

The actives exhibit the same behaviour as the middle constructions. While it is possible to have the agent of the active in the focus position (98), it is not possible to have the patient of the active in this position (99). Again, the sentence is marginal when both are in the focus position (100).

A passive construction is shown in (101):

When was the basket made by the woman?
In (102-104) the agent, the patient, and both are tested in focus position, respectively:

(102) pnhé?n ta-núxʷənχʷ k-m-k'ul-ń-t-Ø-m as
     when obl-woman   irr-perf-make-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

  ỉ-mǐñx
  det-basket

'When was the basket made by the woman?'

(103) pnhé?n ỉ-mǐñx k-m-k'ul-ń-t-Ø-m as
     when det-basket   irr-perf-make-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

  ta-núxʷənχʷ
  obl-woman

'When was the basket made by the woman?'

(104) pnhé?n ỉ-mǐñx ta-núxʷənχʷ
     when det-basket obl-woman

  k-m-k'ul-ń-t-Ø-m as
  irr-perf-make-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

'When was the basket made by the woman?'

While having the passive agent in the focus position is marginally possible, it is completely grammatical to have the passive patient in the focus position.
Furthermore, when both the passive agent and the patient are in the focus position the sentence is grammatical.\(^ {10} \)

A ditransitive is given in (105):

\[(105) \ \text{pnhḗn} \quad k-m-kəx-t-Ø-ēs \ as \quad ŭ-John \quad ŭ-núxʷənxʷ\]

\[
\text{when} \quad \text{iirr-perf-give-tr-3sO-3sS} \ 3sdep \ \text{det-John} \ \text{det-woman}
\]

\[
\text{ta-sq̓l̓éltn}
\]

obl-salmon

‘When did John give the woman some salmon?’

In (106-110) the agent, goal and patient are placed in the focus position.

\[(106) \ \text{pnhḗn} \quad ŭ-John \quad k-m-kəx-t-Ø-ēs \ as \quad ŭ-núxʷənxʷ\]

\[
\text{when} \quad \text{det-John} \quad \text{iirr-perf-give-tr-3sO-3sS} \ 3sdep \ \text{det-woman}
\]

\[
\text{ta-sq̓l̓éltn}
\]

obl-salmon

‘When did John give the woman some salmon?’

\[(107) \ \text{pnhḗn} \quad ŭ-núxʷənxʷ \quad k-m-kəx-t-Ø-ēs \ as \quad ŭ-John \quad \text{ta-sq̓l̓éltn}\]

\[
\text{when} \quad \text{det-woman} \quad \text{iirr-perf-give-tr-3sO-3sS} \ 3sdep
\]

\[
\text{det-John} \quad \text{obl-salmon}
\]

‘‘When did John give the woman some salmon?’
‘When did the woman give John some salmon?’

\[^{10}\text{My primary consultant, Mona Jules, commented that (102) was a bit awkward, but gave a context where it would be used. It emphasizes the woman, when there are other women present.}\]
In the ditransitive construction, it is possible to put the agent in focus position, but not the goal. Notice that (107) is grammatical, but only with the interpretation in which the woman is the agent and John is the goal. As shown by (108), it is also possible to put the patient of the ditransitive in focus position. On the other hand, the placement of more than one nominal in the focus position in ditransitives is ungrammatical:

(109) *pnhéʔn tə-sqleltən ƛ̓-John k-m-kəx-t-ə-és as
    when obl-salmon det-John irr-perf-give-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep 3sdep
    ƛ̓-núxʷənəxʷ
det-woman

'When did John give the woman some salmon?'

Quantifiers are illustrated in (110-111):

---

11My primary speaker, Mona Jules, accepted this with the comment that it is "ok with emphasis". This gives support for the functional status of this position as providing mild emphasis.
(110) pnhé?n  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s as  ᵇx⁻xʷʔit  ta-spyu?
when  irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep  det-many  obl-bird

'When did he see many birds?'

(111) pnhé?n  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s as  ᵇxʷəxʷéyt  ta-spyu?
when  irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep  all  obl-bird

'When did he see all the birds?'

It is possible to have the entire quantified phrase in the focus position (112-113), but not the quantifier discontinuous from the nominal that it quantifies (114-115):

(112) pnhé?n  ᵇx⁻xʷʔit  ta-spyu?  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s as
when  det-many  obl-bird  irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'When did he see many birds?'

(113) pnhé?n  1-ᵽxʷəxʷéyt  ta-spyu?  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s as
when  det-all  obl-bird  irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep

'When did he see all the birds?'

(114) *pnhé?n  ᵇx⁻xʷʔit  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s as  ta-spyu?
when  det-many  irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep  obl-bird

'When did he see many birds?'

(115) *pnhé?n  1-ᵽxʷəxʷéyt  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s as  ta-spyu?
when  det-all  irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep  obl-bird

'When did he see all the birds?'

There is evidence that only the possessors of subject NPs in intransitive clauses may occur in the focus position.
Possessors of NPs in transitive constructions cannot extract:

(118) *pnhé?n ɣ-John k-wik-t-∅-x was ɣ-qéʔčə-s
when det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep det-father-3sP

‘When did you see John's father?’

(119) *pnhé?n ɣ-John k-wik-t-(s)-s as ɣ-qéʔčə-s
when det-John irr-see-tr-2sO-3sS 3sdep det-father-3sP

‘When did John's father see you?’

Recall that one function of the applicative is to indicate disjoint reference in object possessive constructions:

(120) pnhé?n k-m-wik-x-t-∅-x ɣ-Mary
when irr-perf-see-red-tr-3sO-2sS det-Mary

ta-qéʔčə-s
obl-father-3sP

‘When did you see Mary's father?’
The possessive is the grammatical object of the clause, and the head of the possessive construction is marked with an oblique determiner. The object (121), the head (122), or both (123) may occur in the focus position.

(121) pnhé?n  ṅ-Mary  k-m-wik-x-t-Ø-x was
      when  det-Mary  irr-perf-see-red-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep

    ta-qéʔčə-s
    obl-father-3sP

'When did you see Mary's father?'

(122) pnhé?n  ta-qéʔčə-s  k-m-wik-x-t-Ø-x was
      when  obl-father-3sP  irr-perf-see-red-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep

    ṅ-Mary
    det-Mary

'When did you see Mary's father?'

(123) pnhé?n  ṅ-Mary  ta-qéʔčə-s
      when  det-Mary  obl-father-3sP

    k-m-wik-x-t-Ø-x was
    irr-perf-see-red-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep

'When did you see Mary's father?'

In this section the distribution of nominals in the focus position has been shown. Data have been presented that shows that this position is available to most arguments whether they are direct or oblique. There is a tendency in active transitive constructions to interpret nominals in the focus position as
agents, in preference to patients. However, both agents and patients can co-occur in this position, as can be seen by instances of multiple focus.

3.2.2 The Structure of the Focus Position

In this section I discuss the basic syntactic properties of the focus position. I propose that the focus position is Spec of IP. Subsequent to this position being filled, additional nominals may adjoin to IP to receive emphasis. A construction with a single nominal in Spec of IP is shown in (124):

(124) a. swęty ɣ-Mary k-wik-t-Ø-s
    who  det-Mary irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

    ‘Who did Mary see?’
I now represent a construction with movement to Spec of IP and adjunction to IP: \(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\) I assume following Chomsky (1991) that there is an aspectual projection. Dependent clitics are represented in Spec of Asp.
ʻWhen did Mary kiss her father?′
In (126-127) the nominal interpreted as the ergative could be in either external topic position or focus position.
‘John kissed Mary.’/*‘Mary kissed John.’

I-sk'ìrmérmiat m-cnín-(n)-Ø-s  r-spæq péq
det-child perf-eat-(fc)-3sO-3sS  det-berries
l-pæxyéwtas
det-yesterday

‘The child ate the berries yesterday.’

The wh-position can be eliminated on several grounds. The predicate lacks a
determiner, the nominal is not accompanied by a focus particle, and, finally, the
whole construction does not have the interpretation associated with contrastive
focus. It appears that context and subtle intonational clues would determine the
functional status of the preverbal nominal. These issues are outside of the
scope of this thesis. Here I wish only to establish that these positions exist.

3.2.3 Second-position Clitics

The external topic position contrasts with the wh-position with respect to
clitic placement. Second-position clitics may follow a wh-nominal but not an
external topic. However it is difficult to determine whether focus position can
host second-position clitics. This is because it is not possible to be certain that
the NP is, in fact, in the focus position, rather than in the wh position, as in (128)
below:
It is not possible to control for the focus position by having a nominal in the wh-position. The second-position clitic would then attach to the nominal in the wh-position.

(129) l-paŋyéwtaŋ akʷə ʁ-John 1-m-wíwk-t-sm-s əs
det-yesterday rep det-John det-perf-see+c-tr-1sO-3sS 3sdep
'(Somebody said) that it was yesterday that John saw me.'

However, the lack of a contrastive focus interpretation in (128) above, as well as the lack of a determiner on the predicate suggest that the nominal is in the focus position. On the basis of this, I shall assume that nominals in the focus position can host second-position clitics.

3.2.4 Island Constraints

Constructions with nominals in the focus position obey island constraints. However this is because the focus position is clause bounded. Nominals in the focus position cannot extract out of complements:

(130) pnhéʔn k-1əxéiskyəʔ-x-t-sm-x wəs ʁ-John m-qʷəččęč
when irr-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS 3sdep det-John perf-leave

When did you tell me that John left?
When did you tell me that John left?

It is predicted that they cannot extract out of complex NPs. Complex constructions containing a relative clause are shown in (132-133):

(132) *phé?n  k-x?e?k wæs  ṛ-sqélmxʷ  ta-cúm-qs-n-Ø-s
     when           irr-go 3sdep       det-man     obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

匣-Mary
det-Mary

‘Where is that man going, the one that kissed Mary?’

(133) phé?n  k-wik-t-Ø-x wæs  ṛ-sqélmxʷ
     when           irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep det-man

ta-cúm-qs-n-Ø-s  ṛ-Mary
obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-Mary

‘When did you see the man that kissed Mary?’

A nominal that is associated with a gap in the relative clause cannot occur in the focus position:
(134) *χή?n ρ-Mary k-χ?εk was ρ-sqélmx
where det-Mary irr-go 3sdep det-man

tε-c'úṁ-qs-n-t-Ø-m as
obl-kiss-Is-fc-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

'Where is that man going, the one that kissed Mary?'

(135) *πnχή?n ρ-Mary k-wik-t-Ø-x was ρ-sqélmx
when det-Mary irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS 3sdep det-man

tε-c'úṁ-qs-n-Ø-s
obl-kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS

'When did you see the man that kissed Mary?'

That (134-135) are ungrammatical follows if nominals in the focus position are subject to the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint.

The Adjunct Island Constraint can also be observed with respect to the focus position. A clause containing a clausal adjunct is shown in (136):

(136) swiętý (xućm) k-wik-t-Ø-x l-čkičx-Ø was
who also irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS det-arrive-3sS 3sdep

ρ-Mary
det-Mary

'Who did you see when Mary arrived?'

It is not possible for the subject of the clausal adjunct to occur in the focus position:
The constructions in this section, therefore, provide evidence that nominals in the focus position obey island constraints in Shuswap.13

3.2.5 **Doubling**

Direct arguments that occur in the focus position cannot be doubled by a strong deictic. Compare (138-139), which are grammatical without a deictic, with (140-141), which are ungrammatical with one.

(138) pnhēʔn ʷ-John k-m-qʷačéč-Ø as
    when det-John  irr-perf-leave-3sS 3sdep
    ‘When did John leave?’

(139) swéʔtỳ ʷ-John k-wik-t-Ø-s
    who det-John  irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS
    ‘Who did John see?’

---

13Nominals in the focus position obey islands because this position is clause bounded and does not allow long distance extraction.
(140) *pnhé?n ʁ-John  k-m-q"æçéç-Ø əs ʁi?
when    det-John   irr-perf-leave-3sS 3sdep  that one

'When did John leave?'

(141) *swétý ʁ-John  k-wik-t-Ø-s ʁi?
who      det-John   irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS  that

'Who did John see?'

On the other hand, locatives and temporals that occur in the focus position (142-143) can be doubled:

(142) swétý n-čitxʷ k-nik'-n-t-Ø-m as
who   loc-house  irr-cut-fc-tr-3abs-unsp 3sdep

'Which one of them in the house cut him?'

(143) swétý l-paŋyéwtas k-m-q"æçéç-Ø
who   det-yesterday   irr-perf-leave-3sS

'Who left yesterday?'

Evidence that locatives and temporals can be doubled with a deictic is provided by (144-145):

(144) swétý n-čitxʷ k-nik'-n-t-Ø-m as  naŋí?
who   loc-house  irr-cut-fc-tr-3abs-unsp 3sdep  there

'Which one of them in the house cut him there?'

(145) swétý l-paŋyéwtas k-m-q"æçéç-Ø  pnaŋí?
who   det-yesterday   irr-perf-leave-3sS  then

'Who left yesterday then?'
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There thus appears to be a contradiction with respect to doubling phenomena, unless an explanation can be found for the behaviour of (144-145). However, on the basis of the behaviour of the direct arguments, I shall assume that nominals in the focus position cannot be doubled.

3.3 Embedded Contexts

In this section I present evidence that only the cleft and focus positions are available in embedded contexts. A single preverbal nominal is grammatical in (146), but when there are two nominals the construction is bad (147).

(146)  ləxéxyəʔ-สะ-ไทม์-สะ xlink-John k-s-wik-t-∅-s
tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS det-John irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS
x-núxʷanxʷ
det-woman

‘You told me that John saw the woman.’

(147) *ləxéxyəʔ-สะ-ไทม์-สะ xlink-John x-núxʷanxʷ
tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS det-John det-woman
k-s-wik-t-∅-s
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘You told me that John saw the woman.’

That (147) is ungrammatical provides evidence that external topics do not occur in embedded contexts. The construction can be saved by using a focus particle, as shown in (148):
You told me that John was the one that saw the woman.\footnote{Notice that nominalizations behave differently from main clauses:}

\begin{verbatim}
(148)  lækéxyə-x-t-sm-x  ṭ-John  ṭi?  ṭ-nūxʷənəxʷ
tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS  det-John  part  det-woman
k-s-wik-t-Ø-s
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘You told me that John was the one that saw the woman.’\footnote{Notice that nominalizations behave differently from main clauses:}

\end{verbatim}

It is possible to have more than one nominal without the focus particle in negatives.

\begin{verbatim}
(149)  tə?  ṭ-qéʔčə-s  ṭ-Mary
neg  det-father-3sP  det-Mary
k-s-wik-t-Ø-s
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘Mary didn’t see her father.’

These nominals may occur in either order.

\begin{verbatim}
(150)  tə?  ṭ-Mary  ṭ-qéʔčə-s
neg  det-Mary  det-father-3sP
k-s-wik-t-Ø-s
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘Mary didn’t see her father.’

\end{verbatim}

\footnote{Notice that nominalizations behave differently from main clauses:}

In main clauses the only interpretation for the clefted nominal with a nominal in the focus position is the absolutive. In embedded nominalizations, the clefted nominal is interpreted as the ergative.
External topics, however, can refer to nominals in embedded clauses. Compare the construction in (151), where the agent is in the focus position, with the one in (152), where it is an external topic:

(151) yε n ri? ɣ-Mary k-ta? k-s-wik-t-∅-s
deic qu part det-Mary irr-neg  
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

l- quê?če-s
det-father-3sP

'Was it Mary that didn't see her father?'

(152) ɣ-Mary yε n ri? k-ta? k-s-wik-t-∅-s
det-Mary deic qu part irr-neg  
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

l- quê?če-s
det-father-3sP

'That Mary, is she the one that didn't see her father?'

Nominals in wh-position can also refer to elements in embedded contexts.

(153) ɣ-Mary ri? ta? ɣ-qé?če-s k-s-wik-t-∅-s
det-Mary part neg det-father-3sP  
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'It's Mary that didn't see her father.'

(154) ɣ-John ri? lαxέxyε?-x-t-sm-x ɣ-núx'əməx'
det-John part tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS det-woman

k-s-wik-t-∅-s  
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'It was John you told me that saw the woman.'
This section has presented evidence that wh-position and focus positions occur in embedded contexts, but the external topic does not.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, data have been presented to provide evidence for the existence of two preverbal positions in addition to the wh-position discussed in Chapter Two. Nominals may occur to the left of the wh-position:

(155) ḥ-John swétý k-wik-t-Ø-s
det-John who irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'That John, who did he see?'

I call the position to the left of the wh-position the external topic position. The external topic is represented as base-generated outside of CP:
It was shown that nominals may also occur in preverbal position to the right of the wh-position:

(157) \( \text{święty } \overset{\varphi}{\text{John}} \ k-wik-t-\emptyset\text{-s} \)

\( \text{who } \overset{\text{det}}{\text{John}} \text{ irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS} \)

'Who did John see?'

This is called the focus position and is represented as Spec of IP. The focus position functionally permits a nominal—or, if multiply filled, several nominals—to take mild emphasis.

(158) a. \( \text{święty } \overset{\varphi}{\text{Mary}} \ k-wik-t-\emptyset\text{-s} \)

\( \text{who } \overset{\text{det}}{\text{Mary}} \text{ irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS} \)

'Who did Mary see?'
Where there are several nominals in the focus position, I represent them as adjoined to IP.

It has been shown that different nominals can co-occur in external topic position, the wh-position, and the focus position in Shuswap:

(159) ę-John  swéty  ę-qéʔča-s  k-wik-t-Ø-s
det-John  who  det-father-3sP  irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'John, who did his father see?'
The syntactic properties of the three syntactic positions are shown in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E Topic</th>
<th>Wh</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wh Morphology</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Det on Predicates</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obey Island Constraints</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hosts 2nd Position Clitics</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows Doubling</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takes Focus Particles</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows Multiple Nominals</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possessors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Intr)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (tr)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (tr)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the chart, the external topic position contrasts with the wh position in lacking wh-agreement:

(160) ᵃ-John swétý k-wik-t-∅-m as det-John who irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

‘That John, who saw him.’

(161) ᵃ-John stémi k-s-kaw-t-∅-s det-John what irr-nom-give-tr-3sO-3sS

‘That John, what did he give him.’
In (160) wh-agreement is with the ergative in the wh-position, and not with the absolutive in external topic position. Similarly, wh-agreement in (161) is with the patient of the ditransitive, and not with the external topic agent or goal. The focus position also lacks wh-agreement:

(162) stéři n-čitxʷ k-níkʼ-n-Ø-s
what loc-house irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS

‘What did he cut in the house?’

(163) sw étū tə-sq lé1tn k-kəx-t-Ø-ës
who obl-salmon irr-give-tr-3sO-3sS

‘Who did he give the salmon?’

In (162-163) there is no wh-agreement with the nominal in the focus position. In (162), there is a locative in the focus position, and we see that the locative does not trigger cliticization. Similarly, in (163) we see that the patient of the ditransitive does not trigger nominalization.

The wh-position takes determiner phrase complements—in cases of wh-questions the dependent predicate is marked with an irrealis determiner /k-/, which can be observed in (160-163) above. Nominals in the external topic position or the focus position do not take determiner phrase complements. It is the lack of the determiner on the predicate, as well as wh-agreement, that allows these positions to be distinguished from the wh-position.

(164) r-John m-qʷəčëč-Ø
det-John perf-leave-3sS

‘John left.’
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The external topic position is unique in that external topics can violate island conditions and can be doubled by strong deictics. An island violation is shown in (166) and doubling with a strong deictic is shown in (167):

(166) ɣ-John  m-ɬaxɛ̌yaʔ-ɬ-t-sm-ɬ pnhɛʔn  k-m-qʷačéč as
      det-John  perf-tell+ɬ-red-tr-1sO-2sS when  irr-perf-leave 3sdep
      'That John, you told me when he left.'

(167) n-čitxʷ  spēcʼn  akʷə  k-níkʼ-n-Ø-s  ɣ-John  nə̌xí?
      loc-house  rope rep  irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John  there
      'Over at the house they say it was a rope that John had cut there.'

Nominals in the wh-position and the focus position can extract out of complements:

(168) swēt̓y  luʔ  ɣ-John  k-s-čut-s
      who  part  det-John  irr-nom-say-3sP
      k-čúm-qs-n-Ø-s  ɣ-Mary
      irr-kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS  det-Mary

      'Who did John say that Mary kissed?'
(169) swêtü lu? ḋ-John laxéyaʔ-x-t-s-s
who part det-John tell-red-tr-2sO-3sS
k-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

‘Who was it that John told you that he kissed?’

On the other hand, nominals in the wh-position (170-171), cannot extract out of complex NPs or adjuncts, which shows that they obey island constraints.

(170) *swêtü lu? ḋ-John k-wik-t-Ø-s ta-núxʷənəxʷ
who part det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS obl-woman
ta-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s
obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

*‘Who was it that John saw the woman who kissed?’

(171) *swêtü lu? ḋ-John k-wik-t-Ø-s ḋ-Mary
who part det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary
1-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s əs
det-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

*‘John see Mary when she kissed who?’

Nominals in the focus position obey island constraints. However, this is because there is no long distance extraction into the focus position at all.

The external topic cannot host second-position clitics (172), whereas nominals in the wh-position (173) can:
(172) *ə-John nka xyum-Ø ə-čitxʷ-s
det-John evid big-3sS det-house-3sP

'That John, I guess his house is big.'

(173) n-čitxʷ spéc'n akʷə k-ník'-n-Ø-s ə-John nəŋí?
loc-house rope rep irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John there

'Over at the house they say it was a rope that John had cut there.'

The behaviour of second-position clitics follows from the external topic being prefixed outside of the CP.

Only nominals in the external topic position can be doubled by a strong deictic:

(174) n-čitxʷ spéc'n akʷə k-ník'-n-Ø-s ə-John nəŋí?
loc-house rope rep irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John there

'Over at the house they say it was a rope that John had cut there.'

Nominals in the wh-position and the focus position cannot be doubled:

(175) *swétý k-m-qʷaččč-Ø ə?i?
who irr-perf-leave-3sS that one

'Who left?'

(176) *pnhéʔn ə-John k-m-qʷaččč-Ø əs ə?i?
when det-John irr-perf-leave-3sS 3sdep that one

'When did John leave?'

Further, the external topic position cannot be multiply filled (177), nor can it take focus particles (178):
(177) *ʁ-John l-paŋyéwtas swéty k-wik-t-Ø-m as
det-John det-yesterday who irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

‘That John, who saw him yesterday?’

(178) *ʁ-John ʁi? swéty k-wik-t-Ø-m as
det-John foc who irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

‘That John, who saw him?’

In contrast, nominals that occur in the wh-position (179) and the focus position (180) can be accompanied by focus particles:

(179) swéty ʁi? k-wik-t-Ø-m as
who part irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep

‘Who saw him?’

(180) swéty l-paŋyéwtas n-čitxʷ lu? k-nik’-n-Ø-s
who det-yesterday loc-house part irr-cut-fc-3sO-3sS

ʁ-spéc’n
det-rope

‘Who was it yesterday in the house that cut the rope?’

The focus position is unique in being able to be multiply filled:

(181) pnhéʔn ʁ-Mary ʁ-qéʔča-s
when det-Mary det-father-3sP

k-c’úm-qs-n-Ø-s as
irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

‘When did Mary kiss her father?’
‘When did John cut the rope in the house?’

In contrast, the external topic and the wh-position do not allow more than one nominal.

Possessors of subject NPs of intransitive constructions can occupy all three positions. The possessor is in the external topic position in (183), the wh-position in (184) and the focus position in (185).

(183) ʁ-John ʁ-ʃcitx^w-s ʁ-det-John ʁ-det-house-3sP
     det-John big det-house-3sP
‘That John, his house is big.’

(184) swetů k-xʷéym-∅ k-sqéxæ-s
     who irr-bark-3sS irr-dog-3sP
‘Whose dog barked?’

(185) xhé?n ʁ-John k-xʔek-∅ was ʁ-qeʔcæ-s
     where det-John irr-go-3sS 3sdep det-father-3sP
‘Where is John’s father going?’

On the other hand, possessors of transitive subjects or objects can occur in the external topic position, but not in the wh-position or the focus position.
(186) ṭ-Mary  swétý  ṭ-qéʔčə-s  k-wík-t-Ø-s  
det-Mary  who  det-father-3sP  irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'That Mary, who did her father see?'

(187) ṭ-John  m-wíwk-t-sm-s  ṭ-qéʔčə-s  
det-John  perf-see+c-tr-3sO-1sS  det-father-3sP

'That John, his father saw me.'

Possessors of transitive arguments can neither be questioned (188-189) nor occur in the focus position (190):

(188) *swétý  k-wíwk-t-sm-s  k-qéʔčə-s  
who  irr-see+c-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-father-3sP

'Whose father saw me?'

(189) *swétý  k-wík-t-Ø-x  k-qéʔčə-s  
who  irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS  irr-father-3sP

'Whose father did you see?'

(190) *swétý  ṭ-John  k-wík-Ø-s  ṭ-qéʔčə-s  
who  det-John  irr-see-3sO-3sS  det-father-3sP

'Who saw John's father?'

Finally preverbal positions in embedded contexts were discussed. It was shown that there are no embedded external topics:
If a focus particle is used within the embedded clause, the construction is grammatical. As can be seen in (192) more than one nominal can occur in preverbal position.

(192) ləxé̂xyəʔ-x-t-sm-x ʷ̓John ⁰̓yiʔ ʷ̓núxʷən̓xʷ
tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS  det-John  part  det-woman

k-s-wik-t-Ø-s
irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'You told me that John was the one that saw the woman.'

This suggests that the nominal with the focus particle is in the wh-position and the nominal in immediate preverbal position is in the focus position.
In this chapter, I discuss the evidence for structural asymmetries in Shuswap. Two types of asymmetries have been recognized in the literature—subject/object asymmetries and complement/non-complement asymmetries (Huang 1982, Rizzi 1990). Subject/object asymmetries are structural in nature. The object is the internal argument, complement to the verb, whereas the subject, assuming the VP internal subject hypothesis (Diesing 1990, Fukui and Speas 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Koopman and Sportiche 1991, Kuroda 1988), is the external argument in Spec of VP, as represented in (1):
Huang (1982) recognizes that subject/object asymmetries can be subsumed by a more general pattern of complement/non-complement asymmetries, which he formulated as the Condition on Extraction domains (CED). Viewed this way, subjects and adjuncts are predicted to behave alike for the purposes of extraction; subjects and adjuncts should be unable to extract in contrast to complements, which are able to extract. Extraction is briefly discussed in §4.4 of this chapter and more extensively in Chapter Five.

In non-configurational languages there are no structural asymmetries—rather both the subject and object are given a flat structure and are represented as sisters to the verb. This is shown in (2):¹

¹Word order is not crucial in (1) and (2). In Government and Binding theory, linear precedence relations are independent of hierarchical relations.
In §4.1 I discuss the properties that are associated with non-configurationality. I show that Shuswap has many surface properties characteristic of non-configurational languages. There are many striking resemblances between Shuswap and the aboriginal Australian language Warlpiri. In particular, Shuswap has the surface properties of free word order, discontinuous constituents, and pronominal drop, identified by Hale (1982, 1983, 1985) as typical of non-configurational languages. Shuswap has free word order of elements in post-predicate positions, (Chapter One), and moreover, there are several distinct preverbal positions (Chapters Two and Three), that contribute to word order variation. In this chapter, I investigate whether the word order variation found in Shuswap is to be attributed to non-configurationality or not.

A Non-Configurational Parameter to account for the properties of non-configurational languages is briefly discussed in §4.1. The empirical evidence as discussed by Speas (1990) does not support such a parameter. Moreover, Jelinek (1984) argues that a parametrization of the Projection Principle is not
desirable theoretically. I adopt the hypothesis that all languages are configurational in their underlying representations (Speas 1990). The challenge to this hypothesis is to find the principles in the grammars of individual languages that have led them to be viewed as non-configurational in the first place. I briefly discuss a set of syntactic properties proposed by Speas (1990) that can be used to determine the configurational status of a language. In §4.2 I discuss Shuswap binding. The binding facts provide evidence for structural asymmetries. This evidence also accounts for apparent weak crossover violations discussed in §4.4. In §4.3 the distribution of empty categories in Shuswap is investigated. An explanation is offered for the binding facts that are initially troublesome for a configurational account. Further evidence for structural asymmetries comes from the extraction facts discussed in §4.5. I conclude in §4.6 that Shuswap should not be considered non-configurational.
4.1 Non-Configurational Languages

Hale (1982, 1983, 1985), presenting data from the central Australian language Warlpiri, argued for a type of language he called "non-configurational." In a non-configurational language, the grammatical relations of subject (the external argument) and object (the internal argument) are not hierarchically distinguished as in (1), rather the clause is given a flat structure as in (2).

The superficial characteristics associated with the label "non-configurational" were identified by Hale (1983):²

(3)   a. "free" word order  
      b. the use of discontinuous expressions  
      c. free or frequent "pronoun drop"

These properties can be observed in the following Warlpiri sentences.

(4)  ngarrka-ngku ka wawirri panti-rni  
     man-erg aux kangaroo spear-non-past

'The man is spearing the kangaroo.'

In sentence (4) the constituents can occur in any order, with the exception of the auxiliary which must occur in second-position. This is shown in (5):

---

²In Hale (1982) the list also includes the lack of the NP-movement transformation, the lack of pleonastic NPs (it, there, it, ...), the use of a rich case system, and complex verb words or verb-cum-AUX systems.
(5) ngarrka-ngku ka panti-rni wawirri
    wawirri ka ngarrka-ngku panti-rni
    wawirri ka panti-rni ngarrka-ngku
    panti-rni ka wawirri ngarrka-ngku
    panti-rni ka ngarrka-ngku wawirri

Thus, Warlpiri is argued to have free word order.

Discontinuous constituency is shown in (6-7):

(6) wawirri yalumpu kapi-rna panti-rni
    kangaroo that aux spear-non-past

    ‘I will spear that kangaroo.’

(7) wawirri kapi-rna panti-rni yalumpu
    kangaroo aux spear-non-past that

    ‘I will spear that kangaroo.’

In Warlpiri, auxiliaries are second-position clitics that appear after the first
 constituent. This provides evidence that in (6) the forms /wawirri/ and /yalumpu/
 constitute a single constituent. On the other hand, the second-position clitic
 attaches to the nominal /wawirri/ in (7), providing evidence for its status as a
 constituent, discontinous from the demonstrative /yalumpu/.

Sentences (8-10) demonstrate pronoun drop, or missing arguments in
 various positions:

(8) ngarrka-ngku ka panti-rni
    man-erg aux spear-non-past

    ‘The man is spearing it.’
(9) wawirri ka panti-rni
kangaroo aux spear-non-past

'He/she is spearing the kangaroo.'

(10) panti-rni ka
spear-non-past aux

'He/she is spearing him/her/it.'

In (8) the object is dropped, in (9) the subject, and in (10) both the subject and the object are missing.

Shuswap is similar to Warlpiri regarding the properties of word order, discontinuous constituency, and pronoun drop. As discussed in Chapter One for postverbal nominals and Chapters Two and Three for preverbal nominals, there is considerable freedom of word order. Nominals following the predicate are freely ordered. Moreover, there are several preverbal positions available in the syntax of Shuswap. Thus, the constituents in (11) can occur in any order as shown in (12):

(11) c’um–qs–n–Ø–s ṅ–Mary ṅ–qéʔča–s
kiss–Is–fc–3sO–3sS det–Mary det–father–3sP

'Mary kissed her father.'

3Hale (1983) has noted that free word order is not a diagnostic of non-configurationality, given that possible non-configurational languages such as Navajo lack free word order.
(12) c’úṁqnsns ṭ-Mary ṭ-qéʔčəs
c’úṁqnsns ṭ-qéʔčəs ṭ-Mary
ṭ-Mary c’úṁqnsns ṭ-qéʔčəs
ṭ-qéʔčəs c’úṁqnsns ṭ-Mary
ṭ-Mary ṭ-qéʔčəs c’úṁqnsns
ṭ-qéʔčəs ṭ-Mary c’úṁqnsns

There is also superficial evidence of discontinuous constituency. In (13-14) the demonstrative or the quantifier are adjacent to their heads.

(13) q’wup-st-Ø-ēs qaʔeʔəna ta-sakʷmín ṭ-John
break-caus-3sO-3sS this obl-knife det-John

‘John broke this knife.’

(14) k’winx ta-sak’lēp ṭ-s-wik-m-s ṭ-John
how many obl-coyotes det-nom-see-mid-3sP det-John

‘How many coyotes did John see?’

Corresponding to the sentences in (13-14) are sentences in which the demonstrative (15-16) or the wh-quantifier (17) are discontinuous with the nominal that they specify:

(15) q’wup-st-Ø-ēs qaʔeʔəna ṭ-John ta-sakʷmín
break-caus-3sO-3sS deic det-John obl-knife

‘John broke this knife.’

(16) qaʔeʔəna q’up-st-Ø-ēs ta-sakʷmín ṭ-John
deic break-caus-3sO-3sS obl-knife det-John

‘John broke this knife.’
(17) k'wínx ʁ-s-wik-m-s ʁ-a-sək'lép ʁ-John
how many det-nom-see-unsp-3sP obl-coyotes det-John

‘How many coyotes did John see?’

In addition, Shuswap, like Walpíri, allows pronoun drop. Overt pronominals are only used for emphasis. Constructions with overt NPs are shown in (18-20):

(18) plq'-ilx-∅ ʁ-John
leave-aut-3sS det-John

‘John left.’

(19) nik'-n-∅-s ʁ-John ʁ-spéc'n
cut-fc-3sO-3sS det-John det-rope

‘John cut the rope.’

(20) č(u)-n-t-∅-ëm ʁ-John
punch-fc-3sO-unsp det-John

‘John was punched.’

It is possible to have null pronominals corresponding to the overt absolutive NPs in (21-23):

(21) plq'-ilx-∅
leave-aut-3sS

‘He left.’
(22) nik'-n-∅-s  ɣ-John
cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John

'He cut John.'

(23) č(u)-n-t-∅-ém
punch-fc-tr-3sO-unsp

'He was punched.'

The use of emphatic pronouns is shown in (24-26):

(24) plq'-i1x-∅  ɣ-nwi?-s
leave-aut-3sS  det-emph-3sP

'It's he that left.'

(25) ɣ-nwi?-s  ɣ-plq'-i1x-∅
det-emph-3sP  det-leave-aut-3sS

'It's he that left.'

(26) ɣ-nwi?-s  ɣ-nik'-n-∅-s  ɣ-John
det-emph-3sP  det-cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John

'It's he that cut John.'

Moreover, in transitive contructions, both arguments can be null:

---

*This construction can also mean 'John cut it', but not 'John cut him'. An overt ergative nominal can only occur with a null absolutive when the absolutive is inanimate.*
Shuswap thus exhibits all three of the surface properties that are centrally associated with the concept of non-configurationality.

Hale (1983) provides an account of non-configurationality that involves the relationship between two levels of representation—phrase structure (PS) and lexical structure (LS). He proposes that configurationality be stated in terms of the Projection Principle, which claims that the theta-marking properties of lexical items must be represented categorically at each syntactic level (Chomsky 1981, 1982). The Configurationality Parameter is given in (26):

(29) The Configurationality Parameter

a. In configurational languages, the Projection Principle holds of the pair (LS, PS).

b. In non-configurational languages, the Projection Principle holds of LS alone.

The Configurationality Parameter is also supported by Mohanan (1984), who proposes two autonomous levels of representation: Lexical Structure and Configurational Structure. Lexical Structure encodes only dominance relations, whereas Configurational Structure encodes both dominance relations and precedence relations.
In contrast, Jelinek (1984) claims that Hale is essentially correct regarding the status of empty categories but argues that the Projection Principle is universal. She claims that, in languages like Warlpiri, it is the clitic pronouns that are the syntactic arguments. This has come to be known as the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis. I discuss this hypothesis in Chapter Five.

On the other hand, Speas (1990) argues that all languages are configurational in their underlying representations. She claims that the surface behaviour of non-configurational languages can be seen as the operation of a small number of independent principles of grammar. Speas points out that positing a configurational or non-configurational structure for a particular language leads to different predictions about the language. Given that certain conditions universally make reference to structural relationships, these can be used to determine the configurational status of a language. Standard binding conditions are stated on the structural relationship of c-command. Similarly, standard treatments of weak crossover effects rely on variable binding. Likewise, conditions on the extraction of nominals are stated in terms of proper government, which in part, involves a structural condition. Thus, binding, weak crossover effects, and conditions on extraction can be used to determine the configurational status of a language. In §4.2 I summarize Speas' predictions concerning binding in configurational versus flat languages. The Shuswap binding facts are discussed in §4.2.1. Weak crossover is discussed in §4.4 followed by the Shuswap facts in §4.4.1. Finally, the predictions for conditions on the extraction of nominals are discussed in §4.5.
4.2 Binding

In this section I discuss the predictions for configurational and non-configurational languages made by binding theory. Binding theory recognizes three different types of nominals—anaphors, pronouns and r-expressions. Each type of nominal obeys different structural conditions on antecedence. Chomsky and Lasnik (1991) give the following conditions:

(30) A. An anaphor must be bound in a local domain.  
     B. A pronoun must be free in a local domain.  
     C. An r-expression must be free.

Speas (1990) shows the following binding facts for English.

(31) a. Mary likes her father.  
b. Mary's father likes her.  
c. Her father likes Mary.  
d. *She likes Mary's father.

The Binding Conditions given in (30) predict that coreference in a configurational language ought to be possible in (31a, b, c) but ruled out in (31d). In (31a) the r-expression Mary binds the the pronominal contained in the object NP, but the pronominal her is free within the NP. The r-expression Mary in (31b) corefers with the pronominal her but does not bind it since Mary does not c-command it. In (31c) the pronominal does not bind the r-expression since it doesn't c-command it. Moreover, the object NP is structurally lower than the subject, so that the r-expression does not c-command the pronominal in subject position. Thus, as Binding Theory predicts, (31c) is grammatical (at least for some speakers). In (31d) the pronominal she binds the r-expression Mary. This
is ruled out as a Condition C violation. The Binding Conditions along with a configurational structure make the correct predictions for English.

Speas predicts that for a 'flat' or non-configurational language, the judgements will be the same as for English, except that (31b) will also be ruled out:

(32)  
   a. Maryi likes heri father.
   b. *Mary'si father likes heri.
   c. Heri father likes Maryi.
   d. *Shei likes Mary'si father.

In a flat language, (32b) is predicted to be ungrammatical. The pronominal object NP would be a sister to the subject NP as represented in (33):

(33)
Since Mary would not be free in (33), a Condition C violation would arise.

4.2.1 Binding in Shuswap

In this section I discuss the binding properties of Shuswap. I first look at the Speas binding predictions for a flat language in §4.2.1. It will be shown that Shuswap is highly restrictive in its binding possibilities. In §4.2.2 I propose a condition on coreference that a pronoun must be c-commanded by its antecedent within the clause. Coreference between clauses is discussed in §4.3.6 where it is shown that there are parallelism constraints in the grammar of Shuswap. In addition to the standard binding facts, there are also constraints on the distribution of null pronominals. The status of empty categories in Shuswap is discussed in §4.3. I show in 4.3.1 that the crucial binding construction follows from a property of Shuswap grammar independent of binding. After briefly discussing Huang's Generalized Control Condition (1984) in §4.3.2, I propose a Generalized Condition on the Identification of Empty Categories in §4.3.3.
4.2.1.1 Binding Predictions for a Flat Language

In this section I discuss the Shuswap binding facts. Recall that Speas predicts the following behaviour for a configurational and a flat language repeated as (34):

(34) Configurational Language   Flat Language
    a. Maryi likes heri father.
    b. Mary'si father likes heri.
    c. Heri father likes Maryi.
    d. *Shei likes Mary'si father.

It is predicted that a flat language ought to have the same judgements as for a configurational language such as English, crucially differing only in (34b), which is predicted to be bad. In fact, Shuswap speakers judge the equivalent of (34b) ungrammatical, as predicted for a flat language. However, Shuswap appears to be more restrictive than either the configurational or the flat language predicted in (34), also disallowing (34c). I summarize the paradigm found in Shuswap as follows:

(35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Config.</th>
<th>Flat</th>
<th>Shuswap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Maryi likes heri father.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Mary'si father likes heri.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Heri father likes Maryi.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Shei likes Mary'si father.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, at first glance there appear to be good examples of (34d). I will argue, however, that these can be ruled out.

First I give the Shuswap equivalents of (34a):\(^5\)

\[
\begin{align*}
(36) & \quad \text{Mary} & \text{xi-st-Ø-és} & \text{qé?é-s} \\
& \quad \text{det-Mary} & \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS} & \text{det-father-3sP} \\
& \quad \text{Mary likes her father.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(37) & \quad \text{Mary} & \text{cúrn-qs-n-Ø-s} & \text{qé?é-s} \\
& \quad \text{det-Mary} & \text{kiss ls-fc-3sO-3sS} & \text{det-father-3sP} \\
& \quad \text{Mary kissed her father.}
\end{align*}
\]

Recall from Chapter One that word order is extremely free within the clause. All of the constructions in (38) can mean 'Mary likes her father' with a coreferential reading.\(^6\)

\(^5\)The Shuswap form /\textit{x}i\textit{stés}/ 'like', while lexically a causative, behaves like a regular transitive predicate and does not exhibit any syntactic peculiarities.

\(^6\)Throughout this section I shall be restricting discussion to coreferential readings.
As confirmed by the constructions in (38), the r-expression is able to antecede the possessive pronoun within the object NP.

The Shuswap equivalents of (34b) are given in (39-42):

(39) \(\text{Mary} \quad \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS} \)

*'Mary'si father likes her.'

(40) \(\text{Mary} \quad \text{father-3sP} \quad \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS} \)

*'Mary'si father likes her.'

(41) \(\text{Mary} \quad \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS} \)

*'Mary'si father kissed her.'

(42) \(\text{Mary} \quad \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS} \)

*'Mary'si father kissed her.'

---

7Speakers have a strong preference for SVO order, so that the OVS order is generally rejected unless some appropriate context is given. I assume then, that OVS order is pragmatically marked, but that there is nothing in the grammar of Shuswap to block it.
Speas predicts that it is the (34b) constructions that will crucially distinguish configurational languages from non-configurational languages. It can be seen that, in Shuswap, the equivalent of 'Mary's father likes her' is ungrammatical, as predicted for a flat language. The pronominal object NP is a sister to the subject NP and would bind the possessive r-expression 'Mary' thus causing a Condition C violation. The ungrammatical readings for (39-42) can be represented as (43):

(43) a. *[ʁ-qèʔčə-s ʁ-Maryi]i x̌i-st-Ø-ës tₐ proi
   det-father-3sP det-Mary like-caus-3sO-3sS
   'Mary's father likes her.'

b. *[ʁ-Maryi ʁ-qèʔčə-s]i x̌i-st-Ø-ës tₐ proi
   det-Mary det-father-3sP like-caus-3sO-3sS
   'Mary's father likes her.'

Crucially, it must be asked whether the Shuswap data in (39-42) provide evidence for the absence of subject/object asymmetries. In §4.3 I argue that the properties of these constructions do not follow from Condition C violations brought about by the object symmetrically c-commanding the subject. Rather, they are predicted by animacy hierarchy constraints on the distribution of empty pronominals. The properties of this construction follow from other principles in the grammar of Shuswap that have nothing to do with binding at all.

8Constructions such as (39-42) are grammatical with the reading 'Mary likes her father'. These are instances of (36) and can be represented as:

(i) a. Maryi [proi ʁ-qèʔčə-s]j x̌i-st-Ø-ës tₐ tₐ
    b. [proi ʁ-qèʔčə-s]j Maryi x̌i-st-Ø-ës tₐ tₐ
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The Shuswap equivalent of (34c) is shown in (44):

\[(44) \quad \text{x-
\text{qéʔčə-s}} \quad \chi^w_i-\text{st-Ø-ēs} \quad \text{x-Mary} \\
\text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-Mary} \]

*'Her\text{ı} father likes Mary\text{ı}.'
(Irrelevantly: 'Mary\text{ı} likes her\text{ı} father.')

\[(45) \quad \text{x-
\text{qéʔčə-s}} \quad \text{c'ūm-qs-n-Ø-s} \quad \text{x-Mary} \\
\text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-Mary} \]

*'Her\text{ı} father kissed Mary\text{ı}.'
(Irrelevantly: 'Mary\text{ı} kissed her\text{ı} father.')

The constructions shown in (44-45), unlike the one in (36-37), is ungrammatical with a coreferential reading.\(^9\) This is surprising in that there is nothing in the binding conditions given in (30) to predict its ungrammaticality. We will need an explanation for this fact. In §4.2.2 I claim that in order for a pronoun to corefer, it must be c-commanded by its antecedent.

Finally, the equivalents of (34d) are given:

\[(i) \quad \text{x-
\text{qéʔčə-s}} \quad \chi^w_i-\text{st-Ø-ēs} \quad \text{x-Mary} \\
\text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-Mary} \]

'Her\text{ı} father likes Mary\text{ı}.'

---

\(^9\)It might be supposed that there is a constraint in the grammar of Shuswap on possessed ergatives. However it is perfectly grammatical to have a possessed ergative when disjoint reference between the possessor and object is intended.
(46)  xʷi-st-ə-és  ᵃ-Mary  ᵃ-qéʔčə-s  
like-caus-3sO-3sS  det-Mary  det-father-3sP  
*‘She likes Mary’s father.’  
(Irrelevantly: ‘Mary likes her father.’)

(47)  xʷi-st-ə-és  ᵃ-qéʔčə-s  ᵃ-Mary  
like-caus-3sO-3sS  det-father-3sP  det-Mary  
*‘She likes Mary’s father.’  
(Irrelevantly: ‘Mary likes her father.’)

(48)  c’úm-qs-n-ə-s  ᵃ-Mary  ᵃ-qéʔčə-s  
kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  det-Mary  det-father-3sP  
*‘She kissed Mary’s father.’  
(Irrelevantly: ‘Mary kissed her father.’)

(49)  c’úm-qs-n-ə-s  ᵃ-qéʔčə-s  ᵃ-Mary  
kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  det-father-3sP  det-Mary  
*‘She kissed Mary’s father.’  
(Irrelevantly: ‘Mary kissed her father.’)

(46-49) confirm that, as predicted for either a configurational or a flat language, coreferential readings are not available when the pronominal is an antecedent for the r-expression in object position. Apparently, neither (46-47) nor (48-49) can mean 'She likes Mary’s father' with a coreferential reading.⁠¹⁰ (46-47) are represented in (50):

---

⁠¹⁰In Halkomelem (Donna Gerdts, p.c.) the common way of expressing 'Mary likes her father' would be the equivalent of (46-49) 'She likes Mary's father.' In Halkomelem there is evidence that 'Mary's father' forms a constituent. These data, which show Condition C violations, thus can provide evidence for the adjunct status of the NP.
The NP containing the possessive can occur in the wh-position:

(51) ɬ-wi-st-Ø-és ɬ-Mary ɬ-qéʔčə-s
     like-caus-3sO-3sS det-Mary det-father-3sP

*'ɬ-Mary’s father that shei likes.'
(Irrelevantly: ‘Maryi likes her father.’)

However, coreference is not possible between the pronominal subject and the r-expression possessor, even though at S-structure there is no binding relation.

The lack of coreference is predicted if nominals in the wh-position reconstruct at LF and there are Condition C effects between NPs in Shuswap.¹¹

¹¹The judgements on these constructions are very delicate. Note that the possessive phrase constituent does not have morphological marking to distinguish it from a construction in which ‘Mary’ and ‘her father’ are separate arguments. This is further complicated by the various possible word orders.
4.2.1.2 Conditions on Coreference Within the Clause

There is a contrast in (36) and (44) repeated here as (52-53):

(52) ɣ-Mary  xwi-st-Ø-és  ɣ-qué?ča-s
det-Mary  like-caus-3sO-3sS  det-father-3sP

'Maryl likes herl father.'

(53) ɣ-qué?ča-s  xwi-st-Ø-és  ɣ-Maryl
det-father-3sP  like-caus-3sO-3sS  det-Mary

‘Herl father likes Maryl.’

The distribution of coreference possibilities shown by (52-53) points to a fundamental structural asymmetry. Apparently Mary can only be an antecedent for the pronominal possessor when it is higher in the structure, i.e. it can be an antecedent for an object pronominal possessor when it is in subject position. Mary cannot be an antecedent when it is in object position and the pronominal possessor is in subject position. I state the generalization in (54):\(^{12}\)

(54) A pronoun must be c-commanded by its antecedent.

\(^{12}\)The condition proposed in (54) is not unmotivated cross-linguistically. It has been argued for in Chamorro (Chung 1990). Actually Chung claims both a structural and precedence condition for identifying an antecedent:

If a pronoun β is coindexed with a nonpronoun α, and β is not preceded by α, then β must be c-commanded by α.
At what level does the c-command condition apply? It can easily be observed that this cannot be a condition at S-Structure. Constructions such as (55-56) show that surface word order does not affect coreference interpretations.

(55) ṭ-ʔéʔčə-s ʰwɨ-st-ʔ-és ṭ-Mary
det-father-3sP  like-caus-3sO-3sS det-Mary

‘Herī father likes Mary.”

(56) ṭ-ʔéʔčə-s ṭ-Mary ʰwɨ-st-ʔ-és
det-father-3sP det-Mary  like-caus-3sO-3sS

‘Herī father likes Mary.”

Assuming the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis (Diesing 1990, Fukui and Speas 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Koopman and Sportiche 1991, Kuroda 1988), I give the D-Structure representation of ‘Mary likes her father’, where the coreferential interpretation is available:

(57) a. ṭ-Mary ʰwɨ-st-ʔ-és ṭ-ʔéʔčə-s
det-Mary  like-caus-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

‘Mary likes her father.’
The D-Structure representation of 'Her father likes Mary' is given in (58):

(58) a. ρ-γαβέρε-ς χιστ-θές ρ-Μαρυ
det-father-3sP like-caus-3sO-3sS det-Mary

*'Her father likes Mary.'
It can be seen that the c-command condition predicts that coreference is possible in (57) but not in (58). Given the configurational structure in (57) and the c-command condition for antecedence, the r-expression Mary c-commands the pronominal possessor and thus can be a legitimate antecedent. However, in (58) the r-expression is not in a structural position to c-command the pronominal possessor and cannot serve as an antecedent. Shuswap speakers consistently provide passive constructions for the coreferential reading of 'Her father likes Mary', as shown in (59):

(59) x-Mary xwistés ta-qéʔčaʔ s
     det-Mary xwitsts like-caus-3sO-unsp obl-father-3sP

'Maryi is liked by heri father.'

The passive is given the structure in (60):
The representation of the passive in (60) shows that the r-expression *Mary* c-commands the pronominal possessor and thus can serve as an antecedent, correctly predicting that coreference is possible.

There is also the possibility that this coreference condition applies at LF. As claimed in Chapters Two and Three, there are three distinct preverbal positions that a potential antecedent may occur in. One is the cleft position. It was argued in Chapter Two that clefts involve empty operator movement. Thus the antecedent in cleft constructions would be an empty operator. In Chapter Three I argued that focus involved adjunction to *IP* (and potentially substitution in Spec of *IP*). Both wh and focus constructions involve A-bar movement. Apparently the r-expression *Mary*, which can occur in either cleft position or focus position at S-structure, cannot be an antecedent for the pronominal possessor in (55-56). The third preverbal position, the left dislocation position is also an A-bar antecedent for a pronominal within the CP, but differs from the other positions in that nominals are base-generated rather than moved into them.
I represent a cleft formed on an absolutive nominal (see (61a)) as in (61b):

(61) a. ły-Mary ły-qéʔčə-s ływí-st-Ø-és
      det-Mary det-father-3sP like-caus-3sO-3sS
      **'Her father likes Mary.'

b.
In (62b) I represent a construction in which the absolutive nominal is in focus position (see (62a)):

(62) a. \( \text{det-Mary det-father-3sP like-caus-3sO-3sS} \)

*'Her father likes Mary.'

b.

I claim, following standard assumptions, that there is reconstruction at LF of nominals that undergo A-bar movement. In reconstruction, nominals in A-bar positions at S-structure are moved back into their underlying position at LF (Mahajan 1990, Cinque 1991). Given that both cleft and focus constructions involve A-bar movement, the absolutive nominal would reconstruct into a
structural position where it would not serve as an antecedent for the possessive pronoun. Thus, I propose that, given the lack of nominals counting as antecedents in cleft and focus position, the condition on antecedence applies at LF.

The Shuswap data presented in this section provide striking evidence of a fundamental structural asymmetry present in the language. Given the condition on antecedence, it can be seen that only when the nominal is in external argument position can it serve as an antecedent for the possessive pronoun in internal argument position. This is a standard subject/object asymmetry.

A second set of facts follows from the c-command condition on antecedence. The c-command condition can be used to argue for the underlying positions of oblique nominals with respect to one another. Given that arguments in A-bar positions reconstruct into the positions that they occupy in underlying representations, then the interpretation of coreference provides evidence that the antecedent is structurally higher at D-structure. In the following constructions either the subject or object nominal can be the antecedent for the possessive pronoun in the locative and instrument respectively:
That either the subject or object can be an antecedent for the oblique provides evidence that at underlying representation the direct arguments are structurally higher than the obliques (Speas 1990). I provide a representation of (64) in (65):

(65)
The coreference interpretations, along with the condition on antecedence, thus support the underlying representations proposed by Speas, where arguments inside the VP are hierarchically arranged according to their thematic status.\(^{13}\)

In this section I have argued that the coreference facts are best stated over a configurational structure. Given this configurational structure plus the condition on antecedence, the contrast between (34a-34c) is derived. The interpretations of coreference follow from the fundamental asymmetry of the direct arguments in Shuswap.

### 4.3 The Status of Empty Categories in Shuswap

In this section I claim that Shuswap has a disambiguation device that serves to locate the site of empty categories. I propose a condition that bans the occurrence of absolutive pronominal objects with either overt NP ergatives or their variables.

Empty categories can arise in two ways. First, they may be null pronomininals licenced by agreement. Secondly, the empty category may be a variable. Null pronomininals are shown in (66-67):

\(^{13}\)In this view, the verb would raise into heads of agreement projections and the nominals marked for agreement on the verb would raise into the specifiers of these agreement projections.
In (66) the empty pronominal is associated with the absolutive argument, whereas in (67) it must be associated with the ergative argument only. Notice from the gloss that the empty pronominal cannot be associated with the absolutive.

Variables are shown in (68-69):

(68) swétů k-m-qʷačč-Ø
    who irr-perf- leave-3sS
    'Who left?'

(69) swétů k-m-wik-t-Ø-s  r-sək'lép
    who irr-perf- see-tr-3sO-3sS  det-coyote
    'Who saw the coyote?/Who did the coyote see?'

The variables in (68-69) are associated with the wh stem. In Chapter Two I argued that the variables are bound by empty operators and that the wh stems are clefts.

In §4.3.1 I discuss the distribution of null pronominals. The pattern of arguments displayed in (66-67) is identical to that of Halkomelem. Gerdts (1988b) proposes an interpretive rule to identify the status of the overt nominal. I propose that it is actually the null object pronominal that is crucial in the
grammar of Shuswap. Huang's analysis of null objects is discussed in §4.3.2. In §4.3.3 I discuss the interpretation of variables in transitive constructions. I relate the Peripheral Gap Constraint to the properties of null pronominals discussed in §4.3.1 and propose a unification called the Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories. In §4.3.4 I claim that the Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories is the effect of person and animacy constraints operating in the grammar of Shuswap. Finally, I show in §4.3.5 that disambiguation constraints are quite widespread in the grammars of verb-initial languages, drawing on similar facts from Chamorro and Jacaltec.

4.3.1 The Distribution of Null Pronominals

It is widely recognized that empty pronominal categories frequently correlate with rich agreement (Jaeggli 1982, Rizzi 1982). Shuswap has both subject and object agreement, so it is not surprising to find pro-drop. In this section I discuss the conditions on pro-drop in Shuswap.

All nominal arguments are optional in Shuswap. In (70-71) the predicate is marked for subject and object pronominal agreement and there are no overt pronominals.
(70)  wik-t-s-n  
    see-tr-2sO-1sS  
    ‘I saw you.’

(71)  wik-t-Ø-s  
    see-tr-3sO-3sS  
    ‘He saw her.’

Overt pronouns are reserved for emphatic readings.

(72)  plq’-ilx-Ø  r-nwi?-s  
    leave-aut-3sS  det-emph-3sP  
    ‘It’s he that left.’

(73)  r-?-nwi?  r-plq’-ilx-Ø  
    det-2sP-emph  leave-aut-3sS  
    ‘It's you that left.’

(74)  r-n-čéčwa  r-nik’-n-Ø-s  r-John  
    det-1sP-emph+c  det-cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-John  
    ‘I'm the one that cut John.’

Under the assumption that the pronominal agreement on the predicate licences non-overt pronominal categories in the clause, (70-71) can be represented as (75):

(75)  a.  wik-t-s-n pro pro  
    b.  wik-t-Ø-s pro pro

Potential instances of ambiguity arise when one of the arguments is an overt nominal. This is shown in (76):  
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In (76), as shown by the gloss, it is only possible to interpret the null pronominal category as the ergative and the overt nominal as the absolutive.

Given a language with pronominal drop, it is reasonable to expect some device to interpret the order of the overt nominal and the pronominal category. Gerdts (1988b) proposes a rule of One-Nominal Interpretation to identify the overt nominal in Halkomelem:

(77) One-Nominal Interpretation

In the absence of marking for other persons, a single 3rd person nominal is interpreted as the absolutive.

The generalization can also be observed in Shuswap. The single overt nominal in (78-79) can only be interpreted as the absolutive. It can also be observed that in the transitive clause (79) the overt nominal cannot be interpreted as the ergative.

(78) lcʔ-Ø  r̓-sqé̱lmxʷ
    well-3sS  det-man

    ‘The man is well.’

(79) c̓ú̱rh-qs-n-Ø-s  r̓-sqé̱lmxʷ
    kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  det-man

    ‘She kissed the man./‘The man kissed her.’
One-Nominal Interpretation is restricted to constructions with only third person arguments. In (80-81) there are first and second person pronominal categories and the overt nominal gets interpreted as the ergative:

(80)  c'úm-qs-n-t-sm-s  ð-núx"enx"w
kiss-ls-fc-1sO-3sS  det-woman

'The woman kissed me.'

(81)  c'úm-qs-n-t-s-s  ð-sqé1mx"w
kiss-ls-fc-tr-2sO-3sS  det-man

'The man kissed you.'

This restriction must be elaborated if it is to apply to Shuswap. In (82) the single overt nominal can be interpreted as either the absolutive or the ergative.

(82)  ník'-n-Ø-s  ð-sqé1mx"w
cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-man

'He cut the man.'/'The man cut it.'/'The man cut him.'

However, if the nominal is interpreted as the ergative, the object is necessarily interpreted as inanimate. That there is a restriction on the possible interpretations suggests that the position of the empty category must be distinguished with respect to the overt nominal. In (83) I represent the possibilities that are available to transitive clauses with a third person null pronominal category, given here as pro, and an overt third person nominal, given here as NP.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14}The placement of the predicate is ignored in (83).
What is suggested by the representation in (83) is that there is some principle in the grammar of Salish that would force a choice between (83a) and (83b). I would like to initially restate the One-nominal Interpretation as the following condition:

(84) NP pro Condition

\[ *\text{NP pro} \text{ (if pro=3rd person animate)} \]

The *NP pro Condition has the effect of disallowing an empty pronominal category from following an overt nominal when both arguments are animate third persons. It predicts grammatical readings for clauses that have an empty pronominal preceding an overt nominal. The condition would allow the representation in (85a) and would block (85b).

(85) a. \text{c'úm-qs-n-Ø-s pro x-sqélmxʷ} \\
    b. \text{*c'úm-qs-n-Ø-s x-sqélmxʷ pro}

When there is a single nominal in preverbal position, Shuswap speakers interpret the construction as having a preposed object or judge the construction to be incomplete.

(86) \text{x-sqélmxʷ c'úm-qs-n-Ø-s} \\
    \text{det-man kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS}

'It's the man she kissed.'/*'The man kissed her.'
The effect of constructions like (86) with preposed absolutes is that the interpretation is exactly the same as if the nominal were postverbal.

To return to the binding predictions, it can be seen that (87) is ruled out by principles in the grammar of Shuswap that have nothing directly to do with binding at all.

(87) ʁ-quéčas ʁ-Mary xʷistés
det-father-3sP det-Mary like-caus-3sO-3sS

'Mary likes her father.'/"Mary's father likes her.'

The ungrammatical reading follows from the *NP pro Condition. I represent the structures that violate this constraint in (88):

(88) a  *[ʁ-Mary ʁ-quéčas] xʷistés pro
b  *[ʁ-quéčas ʁ-Mary] xʷistés pro
c  *xʷistés [ʁ-quéčas ʁ-Mary] pro

"Mary's father likes her.'

What remains is to find an explanation for this generalization. In §4.3.2 I discuss a proposal by Huang (1984) to account for the distribution of empty categories in Mandarin.

4.3.2 Generalized Control

The *NP pro Condition is not unique to Shuswap. A similar account has been observed in Navajo by Speas (1990), building on the observations of
Platero on the distribution of null pronominals. Platero initially formulated the condition as *NP PRO but abandoned this due to the behaviour of relative clauses. Speas restates *NP PRO in terms of Huang's Generalized Control Rule, accounting for the relative clause data on additional assumptions regarding parallel structures.

Huang (1984) discusses data from Mandarin suggesting that pro-drop can also be discourse-oriented. Mandarin, Japanese, and Korean lack agreement but are discourse-oriented and have frequent pronominal drop, including object NPs. Huang argues that in Mandarin the object empty categories are not instances of pro-drop but are variables bound by an empty operator.

Huang shows that the distribution of pro objects in Mandarin is much more restricted than that of pro subjects. This is shown in (89-92):

(89) [e] lai-le
come-LE

'He came.'

(90) Lisi
hen
xihuan [e]
Lisi
very
like

'Lisi likes him very much.'

(91) Zhangsanì
xiwang [[eí]]
keyi
kanjian
Lisi
Zhangsan
hope
can
see
Lisi

'Zhangsanì hopes that he can see Lisi.'
(92) *Zhangsan xiwang [Lisi keyi kanjian [e]]

Zhangsan hope Lisi can see

‘Zhangsan hopes that Lisi can see him.’

(89-90) show that empty categories can occur in both subject and object position. However, the distribution of object empty categories is much more restricted, as can be seen in the clausal complements in (91-92). When the empty category is a subject, it can be bound by a nominal in the main clause (91) whereas when the empty category is an object (92), it cannot. Huang claims that subject empty categories are capable of being pronominals. On the other hand, empty category objects are instances of variables being bound by an empty operator in topic position. He then formulates the condition on the control of empty pronominals as the Generalized Control Rule:

(93) Generalized Control Rule

Coindex an empty pronominal with the closest nominal element.

Instances of controlled empty pronominals can then be ruled out by Condition B of Binding Theory, which Huang states as the Disjoint Reference Rule:

(94) Disjoint Reference Rule

A pronoun must be free in its governing category.

If the empty category objects are pronominals, the Generalized Control Rule will cause a weak crossover violation. However, if the object empty category is a variable bound by a null operator in topic position, it will avoid the Generalized Control Rule and give a grammatical reading:
In (95) the empty category cannot be a pronominal. The Generalized Control Rule would force the empty category to be coindexed with Lisi, causing a Condition B violation by the Disjoint Reference Rule. On the other hand, the empty category may be a variable, thus escaping the Generalized Control Rule. The variable can be bound by an empty operator topic. (95) is grammatical under the reading where the variable is disjoint from either Lisi or Zhangsan. If the variable were coindexed with either nominal, weak crossover effects would occur.

Can the Generalized Control Rule be extended to Shuswap? It must be determined whether empty categories are pronominals or variables in Shuswap. There are problems with positing the object empty categories as variables, bound by an empty operator. The empty category does not behave like a variable. I provide an example of a variable bound by an empty operator in (96):

(96) swêt̄j k-χʷi-st-Ø-ès ỳ-John
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS det-John

‘Who likes John?/Who does John like?’

---

\(^{15}\)Chung (1984) argues that Generalized Control cannot be extended to Chamorro.
This construction is ambiguous. The two readings can be represented as (97a, b):

(97) a. swẹt̂yì k-χʷi-st-Ø-έs e₁ ᵉ-John
    b. swẹt̂yì k-χʷi-st-Ø-έs ᵉ-John e₁

The following construction illustrates the *NP pro Constraint. Notice that the empty category does not behave like a variable:

(98) χʷi-st-Ø-έs ᵉ-John
    irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS det-John

'She likes John.'/"John like her.'

Clause (99) doesn't permit the ambiguity of the operator/variable construction (96). This provides evidence that the empty category in (98) is not a variable. I conclude then that the empty category is a pronominal. The principle that predicts (98) must therefore be stated in terms of null pronominals.

4.3.3 The Generalized Interpretation of Empty Categories

In Chapter 2.3 I discussed a constraint on the identification of syntactic gaps. This is the Peripheral Gap Constraint, repeated in (99):
(99) Peripheral GapConstraint

If any interpretation is possible for an unacceptable ambiguous structure, it will be that interpretation under which the location of the deletion site is peripheral rather than internal.

In this section I propose that the Peripheral Gap Constraint can be unified with the *NP pro Condition.

The Peripheral Gap Constraint predicts the behaviour of wh questions in Shuswap.

(100) swétų k-χʷi-st-∅-és
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS

‘Who does she like?/*Who likes her?’

It is possible to extract the absolutive argument in (100). As can be observed from the second gloss, it is not possible to extract the ergative. Yet (101) shows that it is not a property of the ergative itself that resists extraction.16

(101) swétų k-χʷi-st-∅-és ᵔMary
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS det-Mary

‘Who does Mary like?’/*Who likes Mary?’

Apparently, when there is an overt nominal it is also possible to extract the ergative. Thus, the Peripheral Gap Constraint must distinguish pronominals from overt NPs. In (102) I represent the behaviour of variables:

16Aissen (1993) discusses constructions in Tzotzil which allow the ergative to be extracted.
The configuration that is blocked by the Peripheral Gap Constraint is the one in which a variable cooccurs with a null pronominal object. But this is exactly the configuration blocked by the *NP pro Condition repeated as (103):

(103) NP pro Condition

*NP pro (when pro is animate)

In fact, it is possible to unify these two condition. The structures that are ungrammatical are represented in (104):

(104) *e pro
    *NP pro

I informally state a unification of the *NP pro Condition and the Peripheral Gap Constraint in (105):

(105) Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories

An overt NP or a variable subject cannot occur with a null pronominal object.

The Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories is related to disambiguation, allowing the position of the empty category to be identified. In §4.3.4 I claim that this condition is the effect of person and animacy constraints.
4.3.4 An Agent Hierarchy

In §4.3.2 I rejected the claim that empty categories in object position were variables. However, if the empty category in Shuswap is a pronominal, perhaps Huang's Generalized Control Rule, given in (106), can be extended to Shuswap.

(106) Generalized Control Rule

Coindex an empty pronominal with the closest nominal element.

Thus given that the empty category in object position in the following construction is a pronominal, the Generalized Control Rule would obligatorily force coindexing:

(107) c'úm-qs-n-Ø-s r-núxʷ-anxʷ_i pro
    kiss-Ic-3sO-3sS det-woman

"The woman kissed him."

The coindexing of the empty pronominal in (107) would cause a violation of the Disjoint Reference Rule. The only derivation possible would be the one illustrated in (108), where the empty pronominal is in the subject position: 17

17A more precise statement of the 'nearest nominal element' of the GCR can be stated in terms of minimality: the 'nearest nominal element' is the closest nominal that c-commands the empty pronominal. Thus, in (101), given a configurational structure, the nominal in object position does not constitute the
The Generalized Control Rule also predicts that, when both subject and objects are null pronominals, the construction should be possible. This is confirmed in (109):

(109) c'úr̓ n̓ q̓ s-n-Ø-s   r̓ n̓ úx̑ wən̓ x̑ w
    kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS   det-woman

'He kissed the woman.'

While the Generalized Control Rule gives the right results, it must be asked why there is obligatory co-indexing. The rule is stipulative and ad hoc. Rather than adopt it for Shuswap, I would like to pursue an alternative line of thought.

A possible explanation for the Generalized Condition on the Identification of Empty Categories is to claim that it is really the effect of person and animacy constraints. That this is plausible is suggested by the fact that inanimate null pronouns can occur with overt subject nominals:

(110) ní̱ k̓'n-Ø-s   r̓ sq̓ ełmx̑ w
    cut-fc-3sO-3sS   det-man

'He cut the man.'/"The man cut it.'

'nearest nominal element.' Secondly, it needs to be stated that the nominal is lexical rather than null.
Thus, I am appealing to conditions that are otherwise needed in the grammar of Shuswap. Agent hierarchies were discussed in §1.6, where the following generalizations were stated:

(111) a. Agent Condition

Objects cannot outrank subjects on the agent hierarchy.

b. Agent Hierarchies

i. animates > inanimates
ii. singular > plural
iii. pronominals > nominals

The agent hierarchies are ranked—i > ii > iii.

The Agent Condition (111a) and the Agent Hierarchies in (111b) make the correct predictions for the interpretations available for (112):

(112) nik'-n-Ø-s ɣ-núxʷənəxʷ
cut-fc-3sO-3sS  det-woman

a. 'He cut the woman.'
b. '*The woman cut him.'
c. 'The woman cut it.'

Notice that the statements in the Agent Hierarchy in (104) must be ranked, so that condition (104b.i.) outranks condition (104b.iii.). Thus the circularity can be resolved in cases like (105c.) with an inanimate pronoun. (104b.i.) states that animates outrank inanimates, but (104b.iii.) states that pronouns outrank nominals. This is not a problem if condition (104b.i.) outranks (104b.iii.).
(112a) is predicted to be grammatical and (112b) ungrammatical, by the hierarchy in (111c) that pronominals outrank nominals. Thus, by the Agent Condition stated in (111), there can be no pronominal objects with nominal subjects. (112c) is predicted to be grammatical by by the hierarchy in (111a) that animates outrank inanimates. Thus, a null inanimate pronominal can co-occur with an animate subject. Given that animacy conditions are otherwise necessary in the grammar of Shuswap, I propose that this is the superior analysis.

4.3.5 Typological Speculations

In this section I would like to make a typological observation regarding the identification of empty categories in verb-initial languages. It cannot be an accident that Jacaltec, a Mayan language, Chamorro, an Austronesian language, and Shuswap, a Salish language, all share exactly the same conditions on empty pronominal objects. According to Craig (1977:220): "There is no sentence in Jacaltec with a VSO word order corresponding to the reading 'His father hit him.' She gives data like (113-114) to illustrate this point:

(113) xil [smam naj pel] [e] (Craig 1977:174)
saw poss-father cl Peter

'Peter's father saw it.'/'Peter's father saw him.'
(114) xil [smam naj] [e] (Craig 1977:174)
saw poss-father cl

'His father saw it./*His_i father saw him_i.'

In (113-114) it is not possible for the classifier to antecede the empty category in object position. The empty category is interpreted as an inanimate. In Jacaltec the way to express 'Peter's_i father saw him_i' is to prepose the NP containing the possessor to preverbal position.

(115) [smam naj pel] x'il-ni [e] (Craig 1977:178)
poss-father cl Peter saw

'Peter's_i father saw him_i.'

Notice that the preposing process involves the use of special morphology on the predicate.

In Chamorro it is also impossible to have pronominal objects. However, in Chamorro pronominals are lexical.

(116) *Para u-latatdi gui' si Maria (Chung 1981:28b)
fut 3s-scold him unm Maria

'Maria is going to scold him.'

19Woolford (1991) argues that (113-114) provide evidence that the object c-commands the subject in Jacaltec. Trechsel (1993) rejects these claims, showing that they are ungrammatical for independent reasons.

20Woolford (1991) states that the special morphology is triggered by NP movement.
The ungrammaticality of (116) is due to a hierarchy in Chamorro for irrealis clauses, where the subject must be ranked higher or equal to the object (Chung 1981).\footnote{Chamorro, although recently argued to be a VOS language (Chung 1990), was previously analysed as VSO. Under a VSO analysis, the object in (116) must have scrambled into immediate post-verbal position.} Third person pronouns are higher on the hierarchy than lexical NPs, as shown by the following ranking:

(117) pronouns > non-pronouns

It is possible to avoid the ungrammaticality of (116) by scrambling the lexical NP into preverbal position, as Chung shows with the data in (118):

(118) si Maria pära u-latatdi gui' (Chung 1981:47b)
    unm Maria fut 3s-scold him
    'Maria is going to scold him.'

Chamorro behaves like Jacaltec in using preposing processes to avoid ungrammatical structures, but does not employ special morphology.\footnote{There are special morphological devices in Chamorro referred to as 'wh agreement' by Chung (1982, 1992).}

Presumably for the purposes of the hierarchical account, pronominals do not outrank traces.

In this chapter I have provided evidence that Shuswap does not permit (animate) empty pronominal objects:
(119) \( \text{nik'}-n-\emptyset-s \quad \text{r-nux\textsuperscript{w}enx\textsuperscript{w}} \)
\( \text{cut-fc-3sO-3sS \quad det-woman} \)

a. 'He cut the woman.'
b. "The woman cut him.'
c. 'The woman cut it.'

In order to express (119b), a passive (120) or a focus passive (121) is employed:

(120) \( \text{nik'}-n-t-\emptyset-m \quad \text{te-nux\textsuperscript{w}enx\textsuperscript{w}} \)
\( \text{cut-fc-3sO-unsp \quad obl-woman} \)

'He was cut by the woman.'

(121) \( \text{te-nux\textsuperscript{w}enx\textsuperscript{w}} \quad \text{xi? \quad r-nik'}-n-t-\emptyset-m-as \)
\( \text{obl-woman \quad part \quad det-cut-fc-3sO-unsp} \)

'It was by the woman that he was cut.'

Shuswap behaves remarkably like other verb-initial languages in its distribution of pronominal objects. While it employs special voice morphology like Jacaltec, I wish to claim that the underlying explanation for this morphology is to be found in an animacy hierarchy similar to Chamorro.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23}While I have limited this discussion to verb-initial languages, it should be pointed out that Hungarian also prohibits pronominal objects with lexical NP subjects. See Speas (1990).
4.3.6 Coreference Conditions Between Clauses

In this section I discuss the conditions of coreference that obtain between clauses. I consider the distribution of coreference in sentential complements, relative clauses, and adjunct clauses. There are several questions that I wish to ask with respect to coreference conditions between clauses:

(122) a Does Condition C of binding theory hold between clauses?  
b Does the condition on antecedence hold between clauses?  
c In contexts where both Condition C and the condition on antecedence (if applicable) are met, are there other conditions that are relevant for the determination of coreference?

A sentential complement is shown in (123):

(123) m-ləxɛxyəʔ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-xʷi-st-Ø-ės  
perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-3sS

γ-John  γ-Mary  
det-John  det-Mary

a. 'Mary$_i$ told me that she$_i$ likes John.'  
b. "Mary$_i$ told me that John likes her$_i$."  
c. 'She$_i$ told me that Mary$_{ij}$ likes John.'  
d. 'She$_i$ told me that John likes Mary$_{ij}.$'

Of the range of possible interpretations available for (123), there is a contrast between (123a), where Mary is a possible antecedent for the pronominal in the embedded clauses, and (123c-d), where a pronominal subject in the main clause cannot be an antecedent for the r-expression in the subordinate
clauses. This contrast is consistent with either the claim that the condition on antecedence applies between clauses in Shuswap or the claim that Condition C applies between clauses. The (123c-d) readings could provide evidence of Condition C violations.

Fortunately, adjunct clauses can be used to disentangle which conditions are relevant to the determination of coreference between clauses. An adjunct clause is given in (124):

(124) c'úrin-qs-n-Ø-s  l-wik-t-Ø-s as  r-Mary
kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  det-see-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep  det-Mary

r-John
det-John

'She kissed him when Mary saw John.'

Crucially, coreference is possible between the pronominals in the main clause and the r-expressions in the adjunct clause. That these pronominals can be antecedents for the r-expressions is evidence that the condition on antecedence only applies within the clause. Secondly, given that the r-expressions are within an adjunct clause, they are not bound by the pronominals in the main clause. This suggests that a Condition C account can provide an explanation why (123c-d) are ungrammatical with coreference. The r-expressions are bound by the pronominals in the main clause and, since r-expressions must be free in all domains, it is predicted that these are ungrammatical. We now have an answer

---

24Irrelevantly, (123a) is possible with disjoint reference. On the other hand (123b) is ungrammatical, even with disjoint reference due to the Generalized Condition on the Identification of Empty Categories (105).
to the first two questions posed at the beginning of this section: Condition C, but not the condition on antecedence, applies between clauses in Shuswap.

The ungrammaticality of (123b) follows from the same principle that restricts the distribution of null pronominals—the Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories discussed in §4.3.1. Thus, (123b) is ungrammatical, but by principles outside of binding theory.

I now turn to the third question: are there other conditions that are relevant for the determination of coreference? The answer is affirmative. There is another condition on the interpretation of coreference that can be observed in Shuswap. In (125) there are no overt nominals in the complement clause, yet the interpretations are nevertheless restricted:

(125)  m-1ax6xiaʔ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-xʷi-st-Ø-ēs
       perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-3sS

‘She1 told me that she1 likes him.’”‘She1 told me that he likes her1.’

There is a parallelism constraint operating in Shuswap: a nominal in a subordinate clause coreferring to the main clause subject or object must be the subject.25 This is not surprising as parallelism conditions are a common disambiguation strategy in languages with null pronominals (Speas 1990). Similar devices have been reported for other Salish languages (Davis and Saunders 1984 for Bella Coola, Kinkade 1989, 1990 for Columbian, Upper Chehalis and other languages, Matthewson 1993 for Lillooet).

25Alternatively, the condition may more accurately be stated in terms of ‘control’: only subjects may be controlled.
In order to get the interpretation 'She told me that he likes her', a passive construction is used:

(126)  m-ləx̣éxyəʔ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-χwi-st-Ø-é̱m
       perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-unsp

'She₁ told me that she₃ is liked.'

Parallelism is also observed with overt nominals in the complement:

(127)  m-ləx̣éxyəʔ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-χwi-st-Ø-é̱m
       perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-unsp

  tə-John
  obl-John

'She₁ told me that she₃ is liked by John.'

A passive complement with overt nominals can also be used as evidence for Condition C effects in Shuswap.

(128)  m-ləx̣éxyəʔ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-χwi-st-Ø-é̱m
       perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-unsp

  ɣ-Mary  tə-John
  det-Mary  obl-John

'She₁ told me that Mary$_{1j}$ is liked by John.'

In (128) the r-expression Mary is within the embedded clause and cannot have the pronominal subject of the main clause as its antecedent. This would be a violation of Condition C of binding theory.

A relative clause is given in (129):
The interpretations (129a-b) provide evidence that Condition C also operates into relative clauses in Shuswap. The r-expression can bind the pronominal in the relative clause in (129a), but the pronominal cannot bind the r-expression in the interpretation (129b). The interpretation for (129c), where the pronominal cannot be an antecedent for the r-expression, provides evidence that the condition on antecedence applies to relative clauses but not, as seen earlier, to embedded clausal complements of predicates.

In order to express the reading 'Mary kissed the man who loves her', a passive would be used in the relative clause. This follows from the condition on the use of null pronominal objects discussed in §4.3.1. 

(130)  
\[
\text{c'úrm-qs-n-Ø-s} \quad \text{r-sqélmx}^w \quad \text{ta-x}^w\text{ist-Ø-és} \\
\text{kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-man} \quad \text{obl-like-caus-3sO-3sS} \\
\text{r-Mary} \\
\text{det-Mary}
\]

'Mary\textsubscript{i} kissed the man she\textsubscript{i} is loved by.'
4.3.7 Summary

In this section I have shown that several conditions can affect the coreference judgments provided earlier. First, Condition C applies both within the clause and between clauses. The domain of Condition C is discussed further in Chapter Five. Secondly, the condition on antecedence applies to relative clauses but not to sentential complements of predicates. Finally, I have established that there is a parallelism constraint that determines the interpretation of coreference across clauses in exactly those environments where the conditions on coreference do not apply.

4.4 Weak Crossover

Weak crossover effects occur when a quantifier moves across a pronoun with which it is indexed and where neither the resulting variable nor the pronoun c-commands the other. This is shown in (131):

(131) *Whoi does hisi mother love ti?

Under current theoretical assumptions, the behaviour of constructions like (131) that exhibit weak crossover effects provides evidence for traces and for VP constituency. When the wh quantifier is extracted from subject position, there are no weak crossover effects and either individual or distributed interpretations are available.
Who loves his mother?

(132) shows that in English the pronominal possessor can either be a bound variable or a pronominal and receive a disjoint reference interpretation. Wh quantification involves syntactic movement in English. Assuming movement at LF for quantifiers and for elements in focus, the contrasts in (133-134) show the same behaviour with respect to weak crossover effects.

(133) *His mother loves everyone.
   Everyone loves his mother.

(134) *His mother loves JOHN.
   JOHN loves his mother.

The unacceptable interpretations in (133-134) are parallel to (133) assuming movement at LF. These are represented in (135):

(135) *[Everyone [his mother loves t]].
      *[JOHN [his mother loves t]].

These weak crossover constructions are standardly ruled out in a number of ways. Chomsky (1975) ruled them out by linear precedence relations. This was stated as the Leftness Condition:

(136) Leftness Condition

A variable cannot be the antecedent of a pronoun to its left.

26Although I am assuming the Bijection Principle here, nothing crucially depends on it.
On the other hand, Koopman and Sportiche (1983) ruled out these constructions by conditions on the binding of variables by operators. This was stated as the Bijection Principle:

(137) Bijection Principle

Every operator must locally bind exactly one variable, and every variable must be locally bound by exactly one operator.

It can be shown that the Bijection Principle must apply at LF. Quantifiers and focus nominals in English do not move at S-structure.

(138) repeats the standard weak crossover data for English.

(138) *Who does hisi mother love ti?

(138) will be ruled out by the Bijection Principle in the following manner. The wh quantifier binds its trace (which is not c-commanded by the possessive pronoun contained in the complex noun phrase). The trace is therefore A'-bound and is a variable, assuming the Functional Determination of Empty Categories (Chomsky 1982).27 The possessive pronoun is in subject position

27The Functional Determination of Empty Categories (Chomsky 1982:35) states:

(i) a. An empty category is a variable if it is in an A-position and is locally A'-bound.
   b. An empty category in an A-position that is not a variable is an anaphor.
   c. An empty category that is not a variable is a pronominal if it is free or locally A'-bound by an antecedent with an independent 0-role.
and (assuming a VP) is not bound by the trace in argument position. The possessive pronoun is therefore also a variable by this account. This construction will be ruled out by the Bijection Principle, stated in (137) which forces the uniqueness of operator binding. The following diagram shows the configuration that violates the Bijection Principle:

(139)  a. *Who does his mother love ti?

28In the English weak crossover representations I ignore the Spec of VP position which I assume forms a chain with the nominal in Spec of IP.
On the other hand there is nothing to rule out (140):

(140) Who does he love his mother?

In this construction the wh operator A'-binds its trace, which functions as a variable. However, the trace, which is in an argument position, A-binds the possessive pronoun, which is therefore a bound pronoun. The construction is permitted because the operator only binds one variable. This is shown in (141):
The quantifier raising and focus constructions in (133-134) can receive a similar account. Quantifiers in English move at LF. Thus the following representation of the well-formed sentence 'Everyone loves his mother' shows that the Bijection Principle is not violated:
(142)  a. Everyone$_i$ loves his$_i$ mother.
    
b.

On the other hand, when the quantifier moves from object position at LF, the Bijection Principle is violated. This is shown in (143):
(143)  a.  *Hisi mother loves everyonei.

b.

In (143) the quantifer binds both the possessive pronoun in subject position and its variable in object position, in violation of the Bijection Principle.

Finally, focus constructions provide a third argument for a structural asymmetry. The nominai that is focussed moves at LF to Spec CP. When it moves from subject position it A'-binds its variable, which in turn can A-bind the possessive pronoun in object position. This is shown in (144):
(144) a. JOHN₁ loves his₁ mother.
b.

On the other hand, when the nominal that is placed in focus originates in object position, it causes a violation of the Bijection Principle, as can be seen in (145):
(145)  a. *His$_i$ mother loves JOHN$_i$.

b. [Diagram of syntactic tree]

This analysis of the English constructions is based on the assumption that there is a VP in English. Should there be no VP, (146) should have a possible interpretation and not exhibit weak crossover effects, contrary to the English judgements.

(146) *Who$_i$ does his$_i$ mother love $t_1$?
Assuming that there is no VP, the wh operator would A'-bind its trace, which would then be in a configuration to A-bind the possessive pronoun. This interpretation is apparently available in Warlpiri (Farmer, Hale and Tsujimura 1986).

(147) Ngana ka nyanungu-nyangu maliki-rliv
whom pres he-poss dog-erg

wajilipi-nyi
chase-non-past

'Who is his dog chasing ti?'

In (147) the wh operator can be interpreted as co-referential to the possessive pronoun. This constitutes important evidence bearing on the status of configurationality in Warlpiri.

Hungarian also apparently lacks weak crossover (Georgopoulos 1991 from Kiss 1987).

(148) kití szeret ti az proi anyja
whom loves the mother-his

'Whom does his mother love?'

(149) mindenkití szeret ti az proi anyja
everybody-acc loves the mother-his

'His mother loves everybody.'

Languages that lack weak crossover effects present a challenge to a theory that claims that all languages are configurational in their underlying representations. The lack of weak crossover effects must be seen to follow from other principles.
of grammar, such as the ability of variables to licence parasitic gaps in Mohawk (Baker 1991). Mohawk is discussed in Chapter Five. In §4.4.1 I discuss the weak crossover facts for Shuswap.

4.4.1 Weak Crossover in Shuswap

In this section I present a set of constructions relevant to testing the weak crossover effect in Shuswap. I provide data from wh quantification, quantifier raising, and focus constructions. The exact structure of these constructions is discussed in Chapter Two, where it is determined that they are cleft constructions. The Shuswap facts show weak crossover effects and provide evidence for configurationality. In fact, the effects follow from the condition on antecedence, which claims that an a pronoun must be c-commanded by its antecedent at LF (see §4.4.2). This is illustrated in (150):

(150) ʁ-qéʔčə-s ñwi-st-ʔ-ʔs ʁ-Mary
det-father-3sP like-caus-3sO-3sS det-Mary

"Her father likes Mary:"

---

29See Georgopoulous (1991) and Speas (1990) for a discussion of languages that do not exhibit weak crossover effects. There have been other proposals such as a binding condition that the variable must c-command the pronoun (Georgopoulous 1991). Precedence may be necessary in the statement of the behaviour of anaphors and pronouns in Japanese (Saito and Hoji 1983). Georgopoulous (1991) argues that in Palauan both precedence and c-command of the antecedent are necessary and ultimately derives the weak crossover effects from an extension of the ECP. Precedence has also been implicated in binding constructions in Chamorro (Chung 1990).
The condition on antecedence can be observed in simple constructions such as (150), where *Mary* cannot be an antecedent for the pronominal possessor in the subject NP. (150) follows if the object NP does not c-command the subject NP. These judgements are extremely clear for most Shuswap speakers.\(^{30}\)

Coreference in (150), as in all weak crossover contexts, will be blocked in just those cases where the *r*-expression in object position does not bind the possessive pronoun. This condition on antecedence derives all of the constructions that show apparent weak crossover effects. Nevertheless, I wish to include these facts as a descriptive contribution and note that their behaviour is consistent with the view of configurationality proposed in this thesis.

\(^{30}\)Of all of the speakers that I have investigated weak crossover with, only one is able to get a coreferential reading for (150). For this speaker, then, it is striking that weak crossover effects are present. The Thompson language (personal fieldnotes) appears to behave like Shuswap, disallowing coreference in equivalent structures to (150). See Davis, Gardiner and Matthewson (1993) for a discussion of the crossover facts in Northern Interior Salish.
4.4.1.1 Wh-Quantification

In the Shuswap data in (151), the possessive pronoun can have either a coreferential or a disjoint reference interpretation.31

(151) swéty k-χwî-st-Ø-ès ṭ-qéʔčə-s
who irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

'Who i likes his/her father?'

As represented in (152), the wh-operator binds a variable that is interpreted as the subject:32

---

31 Speakers suggest that the following construction would be used if the pronoun and the variable refer to different persons:

(i) swéty k-χwîay-χí-t-Ø-mas tə-qéʔčəs
who irr-like-red-tr-3sO-unsp 3sdep obl-father-3sP

'Who i likes her-vi father?'

32 Throughout this section on weak crossover I assume an SVO order within the VP.
The construction in (153) has only one interpretation available, that in which the possessive pronoun is interpreted as disjoint in reference:

(153) **swęty** ſi? ſ-eča-s k-ši-st-0-ės
    who part det-father-3sP irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS

'Who does her father like?'
As represented in (154), the wh-operator is binding two variables—the pronominal possessor within the subject NP and the object:

(154)

That this construction is impossible is predicted by the Bijection Principle. The pronominal possessor within the subject NP does not bind the object NP, thus the operator binds two variables.
A passive can be used to indicate coreference between the patient and the possessor contained in the passive agent NP:

(155) swétý ʁi? k-xʷi-st-Ø-é民族文化 tə-qéʔćə-s
who part irr-like-caus-3sO-unsp det-father-3sP

'Who i is liked by his/her father?'

As represented by (156) the wh-operator binds the variable in Spec of IP:
The passive representation shows how the Bijection Principle violation can be avoided. The passive patient is in a position structurally higher than the possessor of the passive agent. Thus, the operator A'-binds the passive patient, which in turn A-binds the possessive pronoun within the passive agent.
4.4.1.2 Quantifier Raising

In this section, the behaviour of quantifiers is examined with respect to weak crossover. In Shuswap, constructions are grammatical when the quantifier is within the subject NP but not within the object NP. Quantification is illustrated in (157):

\[(157) \text{xwexwéyt tə-swət }\quad \text{xwi-st-Ø-és }\quad \text{γ-ɡéʔčə-s}\]
\[
\text{everybody }\quad \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS }\quad \text{det-father-3sP}\]

'Everybody likes his/her father.'

In (157) there are two interpretations available. One interpretation has a quantifier disjoint in reference from the possessive pronoun. The other reading is a distributive one, in which there is coreference between the variable and the possessive pronoun. The distributive reading, where the possessor is a bound variable, is represented in (158):
On the other hand, when the quantifier binds a variable in object position it is impossible to interpret the possessive pronoun as coreferential:
(159) a. ḥ-qéʔčasí  ḥwí-st-∅-éś
det-father-3sP  like-caus-3sO-3sS

χwəχwə́y tə-sweť-i/j
all  obl-who

'Her father likes everybody.'

b.

In (159) the operator binds both its variable and the possessive pronoun, in violation of the Bijection Principle.

In order to get a coreferential reading, a passive must be used.
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The quantifier constructions thus can be taken as evidence of a structural asymmetry in Shuswap.

### 4.4.1.3 Focus Constructions

Focus constructions also provide evidence of structural asymmetries since they also are sensitive to weak crossover effects. (161-162) are cleft constructions in which the focussed element is an ergative.

(161) ə-Mary ə? xwi-st-Ø-é̄s ə-qéʔča-s  
       det-Mary part like-caus-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP  

'It's Mary that likes her father.'

(162) yɐʔēy ə-Mary xwi-st-Ø-é̄s ə-qéʔča-s  
       deic det-Mary like-caus-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP  

'It's Mary that likes her father.'

In both of these constructions the preferred reading is one in which the possessive pronoun refers to Mary.33

---

33The second reading, that of disjoint reference, is available, but an applicative construction would be preferred for this reading.
Given the structure of the cleft proposed in Chapter Two, there is an empty operator in Spec of CP. The operator A'-binds its variable in Spec of IP. The variable in Spec of IP in turn A-binds the possessive pronoun in object position. There is no violation of the Bijection Principle and as predicted, the construction is grammatical.

As shown in §4.2.2, there is no active construction available for the reading 'Her father likes Mary', due to conditions on antecedence. Consequently, there is no cleft available for 'It is her father that likes Mary' with a coreferential reading. As illustrated in (163), the construction can only mean 'It's her father that Mary likes'.

\[(163) \text{\textit{\textls[200]{x-qé?ča-s\ yi\ xwi-st-Ø-és\ Mary}}}\]
\[
\text{det-father-3sP\ part\ like-caus-3sO-3sS\ det-Mary}
\]

'It's her father that likes Mary.'

In order to express 'Her father likes Mary' with coreference, a passive construction would be used:

\[(i) \text{\textls[200]{x-Mary\ yi\ xwi-xí-t-Ø-m\ tæ-qé?ča-s}}\]
\[
\text{det-Mary\ part\ like-red-tr-3sO-unsp\ obl-father-3sP}
\]

'It's Mary that likes her father.'

\[(ii) \text{\textls[200]{yaxéy\ x-Mary\ xwi-xí-t-Ø-m\ tæ-qé?ča-s}}\]
\[
\text{deic\ det-Mary\ like-red-tr-3sO-unsp\ obl-father-3sP}
\]

'It's Mary that likes her father.'
Focus constructions in Shuswap therefore behave exactly like wh-questions and quantification by avoiding the weak crossover environment by the use of the passive. It was proposed earlier that there is a binding condition operating on antecedence. If this condition is plausible, it removes the argument for weak crossover effects and the positing of a configurational structure. Nevertheless, it can be seen that the antecedence condition is a more robust piece of evidence for structural asymmetries. Secondly, the data are consistent with an analysis that claims weak crossover.

4.5 Proper Government

A final set of facts that can be used to detect structural asymmetries is based on the extraction possibilities of nominals. In English it is possible to extract the complement of a verb, but not the subject. This is illustrated in (166):
The paradigm in (166) demonstrates *that*-trace effects. The explanation for the distribution of the constructions in (162) typically relies on some formulation of the ECP (Chomsky 1981, 1986, Huang 1982, Rizzi 1990, Cinque 1991, Lasnik and Saito 1992). However, there are a number of conceptual problems beyond the scope of this study. One notable problem is the failure of the ECP to predict the grammaticality of (166c). There are further problems for an account of the extraction facts in VSO languages. VSO languages typically lack *that*-trace effects and the kinds of structural asymmetries associated with extraction (Chung 1983, 1992, Chung and McCloskey 1987). Rizzi (1990) makes the strong prediction that all VSO languages will lack *that*-trace effects due to the fact that Infl canonically governs both subject and object positions. He proposes that it is only SVO languages that show *that*-trace effects.

As predicted by Rizzi (1990), there is no subject/object asymmetry in the extraction facts in Shuswap, due to Infl being in a position to canonically govern both of these positions. The extraction of an absolutive argument is shown in (167):

(167) stémi k-1axéxyə?-x-t-sm-x k-s-k’úl-n-Ø-s
     what    irr-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS   irr-nom-make-tr-3sO-3sS
     det-John
     ɣ-John

‘What did you tell me that John made?’
As can be seen in (167), it is unproblematic to extract an absolutive nominal from the complement of a verb.

(168) swéty k-1əxéxyaʔ-x-t-sm-x k-s-k’il-n-Ø-s
who irr-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS irr-nom-make-tr-3sO-3sS

γ-stukčn
det-dipnet

'Who did you tell me that made the dipnet?'

As can be seen in (168), it is also possible to directly extract the ergative argument when there is an overt absolutive nominal. This confirms that there is no subject/object asymmetry with respect to extraction in Shuswap.

The extraction of adjuncts is more problematic. First, there is special morphology associated with the extraction of non-direct arguments. Secondly, there are scopal properties. As illustrated in (169), the upper predicate has the clitic associated with the extraction of temporal adjuncts:

(169) pnheʔn k-1əxéxyaʔ-x-t-sm-x was γ-John
when irr-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS 3sdep det-John

k-s-k’il-n-Ø-s γ-stukčn
irr-nom-make-tr-3sO-3sS det-dipnet

'When did you tell me that John made the dipnet?'

This construction apparently has only wide scope and the temporal cannot be associated with the embedded clause. It cannot be interpreted as 'when John made the dipnet'. In order to indicate narrow scope, the following construction would be used:
Thus, there are locality conditions in the interpretation of scope of temporal adjuncts.

The Shuswap extraction facts support the claims of Rizzi (1990) that there are no subject/object asymmetries, due to the fact that Infl canonically governs both subject and object positions. In Chapter Five I look in more detail at extraction in Shuswap.

4.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I investigated the evidence for structural asymmetries in Shuswap in order to determine its configurational status. First I observed that Shuswap superficially has all of the properties associated with non-configurationality (Hale 1983): free word order, the use of discontinuous expressions, and free or frequent pro drop. In fact, the relative freedom of word order and pro drop are two of the salient features of Shuswap syntax. Word order has received extensive discussion in the preceding chapters. It was shown §1.3, that postverbal word order was completely free, subject to what I assume are discourse principles. Moreover, in Chapters Two and Three, I
determined that there are three distinct preverbal positions available to nominals: the external topic position (§3.1), the wh-position (Chapter Two), and the focus position (§3.2). Finally, the use of pro drop, a feature of the Salish language family in general, is exhibited in Shuswap. The surface properties of Shuswap thus suggest that it is potentially a non-configurational language.

I then turned to the central questions of the chapter—the behaviour of Shuswap with respect to the standard diagnostics of structural asymmetries. First, the properties of binding constructions were investigated. Speas (1990) predicts different distributions for configurational and non-configurational languages equivalent to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Configurational</th>
<th>Flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Mary_i likes her_i father.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mary's_i father likes her_i.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Her_i father likes Mary_i.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. She_i likes Mary's_i father.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the predictions for a non-configurational language contrast with configurational languages such as English, in not allowing (171b). Given the lack of structural asymmetries in non-configurational languages, the pronominal in object position would bind the r-expression possessor within the subject NP and cause a Condition C violation.

At first, the binding data in Shuswap appear to support the claim that it is non-configurational, since the equivalent of (171b) is ungrammatical. However, an explanation for this fact is proposed in §4.3.4 which derives, not from binding, but from an agent hierarchy.
Shuswap, in fact, differs from both configurational and non-configurational languages in not allowing the equivalent of (171c). I proposed that the contrast between (172) and (173) follows from a fundamental structural asymmetry with respect to antecedence. The relevant constructions are repeated in (172-173):

(172) ᵄ-Mary ʰʷi-st-ʊ-és ᵄ-qéʔčə-s
det-Mary like-caus-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

‘Maryi likes heri father.’

(173) ᵄ-qéʔčə-s ʰʷi-st-ʊ-és ᵄ-Mary
det-father-3sP like-caus-3sO-3sS det-Mary

*‘Heri father likes Maryi.’
(Irrelevantly: ‘Maryi likes heri father.’)

The relevant condition is given in (174):

(174) A pronoun must be c-commanded by its antecedent.

This condition, which finds support cross-linguistically in other verb-initial languages (Chung 1990), provides evidence for a fundamental structural asymmetry in Shuswap.

The evidence for a structural asymmetry in Shuswap is contradicted by the equivalent of (171b) shown below:
(175) \( \text{Mary} \quad \text{qéʔčas} \quad \text{ist} \quad \text{e} \)
\( \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{det-father-3sP} \quad \text{like-caus-3sO-3sS} \)

*'Mary’s father likes her.'
(Irrelevantly: ‘Mary’s father likes her.’)

However, an alternative explanation has been given for (175): it was proposed that (175) follows from a condition on the distribution of pronominal objects, which is independently required in the grammar of Shuswap. Pronominal objects can only occur when there are also pronominal subjects, not when there are lexical NP subjects. This is initially called the *NP pro Condition.

Next I discussed the Peripheral Gap Constraint repeated below:

(176) Peripheral Gap Constraint

If any interpretation is possible for an unacceptable ambiguous structure, it will be that interpretation under which the location of the deletion site is peripheral rather than internal.

Crucially the Peripheral Gap Constraint, which is a disambiguation device to locate the site of variables, only applies when there are object pronominals. It predicts that the operator in (177) may only bind an object variable.

(177) \( \text{swéty} \quad \text{k-x}*i-st-Ø-ēs \)
\( \text{who} \quad \text{irr-like-caus-3sO-3sS} \)

'Who does she like?/"Who likes her?"

I proposed to unify the *NP pro Condition with the Peripheral Gap Constraint. Their unification is termed the Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories:
An overt NP or a variable subject cannot occur with a null pronominal object.

Furthermore, I showed that as far as Shuswap is concerned (178) follows from the Agent Condition (see Chapter One). This prohibits objects from outranking subjects on the Agent Hierarchy. Moreover, I proposed that pronominals outrank lexical NPs and variables on the Agent Hierarchy.

The final condition on coreference is discussed in §4.3.6. This condition is a parallelism constraint and is shown to operate between clauses. It can be observed in the following contrast:

(179)  
\[
\text{m-ləxémentə-x-t-sm-s} \quad \text{k-s-χʷi-st-Ø-és} \\
\text{perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS} \quad \text{irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-3sS}
\]

'She told me that she likes him.'

(180)  
\[
\text{m-ləxémentə-x-t-sm-s} \quad \text{k-s-χʷi-st-Ø-ėm} \\
\text{perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS} \quad \text{irr-nom-like-caus-3sO-unsp}
\]

'She told me that she is liked.'

Across clauses it can be observed that it is only the subject NP in the complement clause that can locate an antecedent in the higher clause.

I then turn my attention to weak crossover. It was shown that Shuswap wh-questions, quantification, and focus constructions exhibit weak crossover effects. However, the behaviour of these constructions follows from the condition on antecedence (174) given above. Therefore, the relevant data in Shuswap have no bearing on the issue of configurality.
Thus, an analysis of Shuswap can be given that is consistent with configurationality. Furthermore the treatment of binding proposed here relies crucially upon Shuswap being configurational.
Chapter 5

NPs as Arguments

5.0 Introduction

It has been claimed (Boas 1911, Hukari 1976, Jelinek 1984, Mithun 1987, Nichols 1986) that, in some languages, lexical NPs are not the syntactic arguments of the predicate. Rather, the pronominal markers on the predicate constitute the syntactic arguments, and the lexical NPs are adjuncts to the clause. Languages in which pronominals constitute the syntactic arguments of the predicate are called pronominal argument languages. For Jelinek, this is a consequence of the thematic properties of pronouns. Only the pronouns are able to bear thematic roles in these languages.

Jelinek (in press, Jelinek and Demers 1982) indicates that the Coast Salish language Lummi, is a pronominal argument language. Her claims for the adjunct status of NPs in Lummi build upon the observations of Kinkade (1983) regarding the lack of a noun/verb distinction in Salish and the behaviour of NPs as adjuncts in discourse. It also builds upon the observations of Davis and Saunders (1981) that Bella Coola lacks clausal embedding. Given that nominals resemble clauses, they can be viewed as adjoined clauses. However, there has been little empirical syntactic evidence to support the view that only pronouns are the syntactic arguments of the predicate. The issue is an important one. If all nominals are adjuncts, they should not show structural asymmetries. In fact, the pronominal argument hypothesis predicts that there will be no asymmetries at all with respect to adjunct nominals. This hypothesis
would capture the free word order facts of many non-configurational languages. It would also provide an explanation for the relationship between rich agreement and pro-drop.

Recent work on Mohawk (Baker 1991) has explored the syntactic consequences of a pronominal argument language. Baker's hypothesis is that Mohawk is a pronominal argument language with multiple dislocation of overt nominals. He proposes an analysis based on the hypothesis that pronominal affixes absorb case. The lexical NPs are base-generated in adjunct position and are able to escape the Case Filter.\(^1\) Therefore, nominal adjuncts will display no structural asymmetries. They will show apparent violations of Condition C of Binding Theory and lack weak crossover effects. The Condition on Extraction Domains also predicts that adjunct nominals, or elements contained in them, will be unable to extract.

In contrast to lexical nominals, Baker shows that nominals in clausal complements are arguments. They obey Condition C, show weak crossover effects, and are able to extract. The difference between clauses and NPs derives from the fact that clauses are the syntactic arguments of predicates but NPs are not.

In Chapter Four I presented evidence from binding and weak crossover that Shuswap has structural asymmetries. In this chapter I examine this evidence in the light of the pronominal argument hypothesis. In §5.1 I introduce the syntactic tests that will be used to determine the argument status of lexical

\(^1\)Baker considers two possibilities on how adjunct NPs are able to escape the Case Filter. One is that the Case Filter applies only within the minimal clause (IP). Another is that default case is assigned to nominals in non-argument positions.
NPs—Condition C effects, conditions on the extraction out of NPs, and weak crossover effects. Condition C effects are discussed in §5.2, conditions on extraction out of NPs in §5.3, and weak crossover effects in §5.4. Finally, in §5.5 I discuss the same syntactic tests as they apply to clauses. On the basis of data in Shuswap I conclude that lexical NPs are in argument positions.

5.1 Syntactic Tests for the Argument Status of NPs

In this section I discuss three syntactic tests that can be used to determine the argument status of NPs: Condition C effects, conditions on extraction out of NPs, and weak crossover effects.

Condition C of binding theory makes clear predictions regarding the argument status of NPs. NPs are r-expressions, and thus must be free in all domains. Notice in the following English constructions that the r-expression contained in the possessive NP (1) and the clausal complement (2) cannot be coreferential with the subject NP:

(1) He saw John’s father.

(2) He said that John saw Mary.

The lack of coreference in (1-2) follows from the fact that the clausal complement and the NP containing the possessive are in argument position in English. Thus, the subject pronouns are in a structural position to bind the r-expression. Sentence (1) is represented in (3):
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In languages such as English, where lexical NPs are in argument position, the subject pronoun cannot bind an r-expression contained in the object NP. This is a Condition C violation.

However, in a pronominal argument language, a construction equivalent to (1) is predicted to be grammatical. The subject pronoun would not bind the r-expression. This is represented in (4):
Thus, Condition C effects provide a test for the argument status of NPs. Condition C effects within NPs for Mohawk and Shuswap are discussed in §5.2.

A second test for determining the argument status of lexical NPs comes from their behavior in extraction domains. Huang (1982) observes that subject/object asymmetries are part of a larger complement/non-complement asymmetry. He relates this pattern to proper government, formulated as the Condition on Extraction Domains:

(5) A phrase A may be extracted out of a domain B only if B is properly governed.
The Condition on Extraction Domains unifies the Subject Condition and the Adjunct Island Condition. If a language permits extraction out of NPs, this provides an argument that the NP is in an argument position, provided of course that extraction from clear adjuncts is impossible. Secondly, it is predicted that it ought to be possible to extract NPs from clausal complements, but not from sentential subjects or adjuncts.

If a language permits, for example, the extraction of possessors out of NPs, this provides evidence that such NPs are arguments. This is represented in (6):
In order for the trace of the possessor to be properly governed, the NP that it is extracted out of must be an argument, where it can be head-governed by the verb. A language that permits possessor extraction out of NP may not allow all possessors to be extracted. There may be an asymmetry—either a subject/object asymmetry or an argument/adjunct asymmetry. Notice that English does not permit possessor extraction at all. Under the assumption that nominals are in argument positions in English, it does not follow that if a language disallows extraction of possessors out of NPs that these NPs are adjuncts.
However, languages that have lexical NPs in adjunct positions are predicted not to allow the extraction out of NPs at all. Possessors, for example, if extracted out of NP, would not be properly governed by the verb:

(7)

As shown in (7), the NP out of which the possessor is extracted is in an adjunct position. As predicted by the Condition on Extraction Domains, this construction would be ungrammatical in a pronominal argument language, because the trace of the possessor is not properly governed by the verb. Extraction out of NPs in Mohawk and Shuswap is discussed in §5.3.
A final test for the argument status of lexical NPs comes from weak crossover effects. A language with lexical NPs in argument positions is predicted to exhibit an asymmetry in A'-binding constructions. A possessive pronoun within an object NP can have a subject wh-trace as its antecedent. However, a possessive pronoun within a subject NP cannot have an object wh-trace as its antecedent. This follows from the Bijection Principle, which is a condition on variable binding.

(8) Bijection Principle

Every operator must locally bind exactly one variable, and every variable must be locally bound by exactly one operator.

The Bijection Principle predicts that the following English construction is grammatical.
(9)   a Who, ti loves hisi, mother?

b

The wh-operator A'-binds its variable in subject position, which in turn A-binds the possessive pronoun in object position. There is no violation of the Bijection Principle—the operator binds only one variable.

However, when the wh-operator originates in object position, the Bijection Principle is violated and weak crossover effects emerge:
The wh-operator binds two variables in (10) above, thereby violating the Bijection Principle. The asymmetry within A'-binding constructions follows only if lexical NPs are in argument positions.

It is predicted that if lexical NPs are all in adjunct positions, there will be no asymmetry with respect to weak crossover effects. Weak crossover effects
will occur in all environments, irrespective of whether the wh-operator originates in subject or object position. This is shown in (11):

\[(11) \quad \text{a.} \quad *\text{Who}_i \ e_i \ \text{loves his}_i \ \text{father}_j?\]

\[\text{b.} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{Who}_i \\
\text{C} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{IP} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{e}_i \\
\text{I} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{saw} \quad \text{him}_j
\end{array}
\]

In (11) the wh-operator must bind its own trace and the pronominal possessor of the NP in adjunct position, in violation of the Bijection Principle.

Thus weak crossover effects can be used as evidence in determining the argument status of lexical NPs. No weak crossover effects should appear when a wh-operator originates in subject position, as shown in (11) for a nominal argument language. However, weak crossover effects should emerge when a
wh-operator originates in subject position in pronominal argument languages, as shown in (11). In §5.4 I discuss the behaviour of Mohawk and Shuswap with respect to weak crossover.

5.2 Condition C Effects

Mohawk does not show asymmetries with respect to Condition C effects in NPs. Coreference between the pronominal and the r-expression is possible, regardless of their structural positions:

(12) wa'-t-ha-ya'k-e' Sak rao-a'share'
    fact-dup-MsS-break-punc Sak MsP-knife

‘Hei broke Sak’si knife.’ (Baker 1991: 544 (ex 11a))

(13) ro-ya'takehnha-s Sak rao-a'share'
    MsO-help-hab Sak MsP-knife

‘Sak’si knife helps himi.’ (Baker 1991: 544 (ex 11b))

The behaviour of binding in (12-13) follows if NPs are in adjunct position. The lack of a structural asymmetry also appears in relative clauses in Mohawk.

(14) wa'-t-huwa-noru'kwanyu-' ne rukwe' ne Uwari
    fact-dup-FsS/MsO-kiss-punc NE man NE Mary

ruwa-nuhwe'-s
FsS/MsO-like-hab

‘Shei kissed the man that Maryi likes.’ (Baker 1991: 546 (ex 17a))
(15) wa'-te-shako-noru'kwanyu'- ne rukwe’ ne Uwari
    fact-dup-MsS/FsO-kiss-punc  NE man  NE Mary
    ruwa-nuhwe'-s
    MsS/FsO-like-hab

    ‘The man that Maryi likes kissed heri.’ (Baker 1991: 546 (ex 17b))

Mohawk data involving phrasal coordination do not show Condition C effects either.

(16) kanat-aku wa'-etsiseni-kv'- isi tanu' Sak
town-in fact-MsS/2dO-see-punc you and Sak
    rao-skare'
    MsP-friend

    ‘Hei saw you and Sak’si girlfriend in town.’ (Baker 1991: 546 (ex 18))

The lack of Condition C effects follows directly from NPs being in adjunct positions.

    Shuswap, on the other hand, shows Condition C effects in NPs. R-
expressions may be antecedents when they are subjects (17-18), but not when they are objects (19-20):

(17) r-Mary c’úrh-qs-n-Ø-s r-qé?ča-s
det-Mary kiss-Is-fc-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

    ‘Maryi kissed heri father.’
(18) \( \gamma \)-John \( q'\-p\-st\-0\-\acute{e}\-s \) \( \gamma \)-sak\(^{w}\)mi\(\acute{n}\)-s  \\
\text{det-}John \text{ break-res-caus-}3S\text{O-}3S \text{ det-knife-his}  \\
'\text{John broke his knife.}'

(19) c'\(\acute{u}\)nh-qs-n-0-s \( \gamma \)-Mary \( \gamma \)-q\(\acute{e}\)?\(\acute{c}\)a-s]  \\
\text{kiss-}ls-fc-3S\text{O-}3S \text{ det-}Mary \text{ det-father-}3S\text{P}  \\
'She kissed Mary's father.'

(20) q'\-p\-st\-0\-\acute{e}\-s \[\gamma \text{-}John \ \gamma \text{-sak}^{w}\text{mi}\(\acute{n}\)-s]  \\
\text{break-res-caus-}3S\text{O-}3S \text{ det-}John \text{ det-knife-his}  \\
'It's John's knife that he broke.'

The asymmetry between (17-18), where the r-expression is in subject position, and (19-20), where it is in object position, provides evidence that NPs are in argument position in Shuswap. It is also not possible to get coreference when the NP containing the r-expression is in the wh-position.

(21) \[\gamma \text{-}Mary \ \gamma \text{-q\(\acute{e}\)?\(\acute{c}\)a-s] \ c'\(\acute{u}\)nh-qs-n-0-s  \\
\text{det-}Mary \text{ det-father-}3S\text{P} \text{ kiss-}ls-fc-3S\text{O-}3S  \\
'It's Mary's father that she kissed.'

(22) \[\gamma \text{-}John \ \gamma \text{-sak}^{w}\text{mi}\(\acute{n}\)-s] \ q'\-p\-st\-0\-\acute{e}\-s  \\
\text{det-}John \text{ det-knife-his} \text{ break-res-caus-}3S\text{O-}3S  \\
'It's John's knife that he broke.'

The behaviour of (21-22) is predicted if nominals in the wh-position reconstruct, and Condition C effects apply in Shuswap.\(^{2}\)

\(^{2}\)Word order complicates matters in Shuswap. For example, in chapter four it was observed that constructions such as (19) could have any word order.
Condition C effects can also be observed in relative clauses in Shuswap. In (23-24) the r-expression is a subject and can be an antecedent for the pronominal inside the relative clause.

\[\text{(23)} \quad \text{wik-t-Ø-s} \quad \text{r-sqellamx} \quad \text{ta-kax-t-Ø-és} \quad \text{ta-sqéltn} \]
\[\text{see-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-man} \quad \text{obl-give-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{obl-salmon} \]
\[\text{r-Mary} \quad \text{det-Mary} \]
\[\text{‘Mary saw the man that she gave the salmon to.’} \]

\[\text{(24)} \quad \text{c'úm-qn-Ø-s} \quad \text{r-sqellamx} \quad \text{ta-χwi-st-Ø-és} \]
\[\text{kiss-Is-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-man} \quad \text{obl-like-caus-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-Mary} \]
\[\text{r-Mary} \]
\[\text{‘Mary kissed the man she likes.’} \]

However, when the r-expression is contained inside the relative clause, coreference is not possible.

\[\text{(25)} \quad \text{wik-t-Ø-s} \quad \text{r-sqellamx} \quad \text{ta-kax-t-Ø-és} \quad \text{r-Mary} \]
\[\text{see-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-man} \quad \text{obl-give-tr-3sO-3sS} \quad \text{det-Mary} \]
\[\text{ta-sqéltn} \quad \text{obl-salmon} \]
\[\text{‘She saw the man that Mary gave the salmon to.’} \]

Thus, it is not possible to use word order to control for the required interpretation. Nevertheless, it should be observed that, regardless of word order, speakers do not interpret ‘She kissed Mary’s father’ with coreference. In addition, special determiners are not used in possessive constructions in Shuswap. Thus, it is not possible to determine if the possessive NP is a constituent.
The contrast between (23-24) and (25) follows if relative clauses are in argument positions.

Finally, Condition C effects are also apparent in NP coordinations.

\begin{equation}
(26) \quad \text{m-wik-t-s-s} \quad ?\text{anwí?} \quad \text{métə úq'í?-s} \quad \text{ð-John}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{perf-see-tr-2sO-3sS} \quad \text{you} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{brother-3sP det-John}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{n-skeetchestn}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{loc-skeetchestn}
\end{equation}

‘Hei saw you with John's\textsuperscript{i} brother in Deadman's Creek.’

The behaviour provides evidence of Condition C effects in Shuswap provide evidence that, in Mohawk, NPs are best analysed as being in argument position.\textsuperscript{3}

5.3 Extraction from NPs

In Mohawk there is no apparent asymmetry with respect to extraction out of NPs. This is correctly predicted if all NPs are in adjunct positions. Extraction out of NP would violate the Condition on Extraction Domains. As expected possessors cannot extract in Mohawk:

\textsuperscript{3}Some preliminary research suggests that Thompson behaves like Shuswap. Condition C effects do not appear in relative clauses in Lilooet (Matthewson, Davis, and Gardiner 1993) or Halkomelem (Donna Gerdts p.c). Lilooet thus appears to be following a Coast Salish pattern in this respect.
While the wh-word in (29) cannot be extracted, apparently referential NPs can:

(29) Mary wa-ke-tshvri-'
who fact-1sS-find-punc FsP-money

‘I found Mary's money (not John's).’ (Baker 1991: 555 (ex 38))

Baker attributes this contrast to the fact that wh-words are subject to the Condition on Extraction domains, whereas ordinary NPs can be base-generated in adjoined positions.

Under Baker's analysis, the inability to extract possessors from NP follows from the Condition on Extraction Domains and supports his analysis that all NPs are adjuncts. In contrast, at least some possessors can extract in Shuswap. This suggests that the nominals from which these elements are extracted are arguments. Otherwise, if the nominals were adjuncts, it is predicted by the Condition on Extraction Domains that they would be unable to extract.

Intransitive clauses containing possessive constructions are shown below.
'John's dog barked.'

'John's house is big.'

The entire possessive construction can be preposed as a constituent:

(32) \[
\text{det-John} \quad \text{det-dog-3sP \ perf-bark} \quad \text{m-xwéym} \quad [\text{det-John} \quad \text{det-dog-3sP \ perf-bark} \quad \text{m-xwéym}] \\
\text{'John's dog barked.'}
\]

'John's house is big.'

There is also evidence that the possessor can extract:

(33) \[
\text{det-John} \quad \text{det-house-3sP \ big} \quad \text{xyum} \quad [\text{det-John} \quad \text{det-house-3sP \ big} \quad \text{xyum}] \\
\text{'John's house is big.'}
\]

Wh-possessive phrases behave like the possessive phrases above. The entire NP containing the wh-possessive NP precedes the predicate (36-37):
(36) swětý   k-sqéxα-s   k-xwęym-Ø
who       irr-dog-3sP   irr-bark-3sS

'Whose dog barked?'

(37) swětý   k-čitxʷ-s   k-xyum-Ø
who       irr-house-3sP   irr-big-3sS

'Whose house is big?'

In addition, the wh-possessor can prepose, leaving behind the head of the possessive construction. This provides evidence that possessor extraction is in fact involved:

(38) swětý   k-xwęym-Ø   k-sqéxα-s
who       irr-bark-3sS   irr-dog-3sP

'Whose dog barked?'

(39) swětý   k-xyum-Ø   k-čitxʷ-s
who       irr-big-3sS   irr-house-3sP

'Whose house is big?'

On the other hand, possessors cannot extract from adjunct NPs. Recall that the first nominal bears the syntactic case of the entire construction:

(40) a  m-xwęym-Ø   Ṿ-sqéxα   n-čitxʷ-s   Ṿ-John
perf-bark-3sS   det-dog   loc-house-3sP   det-John

'The dog barked in John's house.'

4Recall that in chapter two I argue that wh-questions are base-generated cleft constructions. Under that analysis, empty operator movement is involved.
b m-/transcrip/éym-∅ ɣ-sqéxa n-John ɣ-čitxʷ-s
perf-bark-3sS det-dog loc-John det-house-3sP

'The dog barked in John's house.'

(41) m-nəs-k tə-tk'mlúps méta ʔúqʷi-s ɣ-John
perf-go-2sSobl-Kamloops with brother-3sP det-John

'You went to Kamloops with John's brother.'

(42) m-nəs-k tə-tk'mlúps méta John ɣ-ʔúqʷi-s
perf-go-2sSobl-Kamloops with John det-brother-3sP

'You went to Kamloops with John's brother.'

It is not possible to extract the possessor from locative and comitative constructions:5

(43) *ɣ-John m-/transcrip/éym-∅ ɣ-sqéxa n-čitxʷ-s
det-John perf-bark-3sS det-dog loc-house-3sP

'The dog barked at John's house.'

(44) *ɣ-John m-qʷəčəč-k tə-čitxʷ-s
det-John perf-leave-2sS obl-house-3sP

'You left John's house.'

(45) *ɣ-John m-nəs-k tə-tk'mlúps méta ʔúqʷi-s
det-John perf-go-2sSobl-Kamloops with brother-3sP

'You went to Kamloops with John's brother.'

5The comitative construction may be ungrammatical for independent reasons. The particle /méta/ 'with' may be functioning as a conjunction. Therefore the Coordinate Structure Constraint would block (50).
A similar point can be made with instruments. Possessors cannot be extracted from instruments. Compare (46-47):

(46) m-nik'-m k ta-spéc'n ta-sâkʷmín-s x-John
    perf-cut-unsp 2sind obl-rope obl-knife-3sP det-John

    ‘You cut the rope with John's knife.’

(47) *x-John m-nik'-m k ta-spéc'n ta-sâkʷmín-s
    det-John perf-cut-unsp 2sind obl-rope obl-knife-3sP

    ‘You cut the rope with John’s knife.’

In contrast, questions can be formed on the possessives of locatives:

(48) swétû k-čitxʷ-s k-m-qʷəčéč ux
    who irr-house-3sP irr-perf-leave 2sdep

    ‘Whose house did you leave from?’

(49) swétû k-čitxʷ-s k-m-xʷéym aš x-sqéxə
    who irr-house-3sP perf-bark 3sdep det-dog

    ‘Whose house did the dog bark in?’

However, a wh-possessor cannot be extracted out of a NP:

(50) *swétû k-m-qʷəčéč-k ta-čitxʷ-s
    who irrperf-go-2sS obl-house-3sP

    ‘Whose house did you leave from?’
In summary, the fact that possessors extract out of intransitive subject NPs, but not out of locatives or comitatives, provides evidence that subject NPs are arguments.

At first it appears that Shuswap permits extraction of NPs out of transitive constructions, as shown in (52-53):

(52) ɣ-John  m-wíwkt-Ø-n  ɣ-qéʔčə-s
      det-John  perf-see+c-tr-3sO-1sS  det-father-3sP
       'I saw John's father.'

(53) ɣ-John  wíwkt-sm-s  ɣ-qéʔčə-s
      det-John  see+c-tr-1sgo-3sO  det-father-3sP
       'John's father saw me.'

However, the equivalent data involving the extraction of wh-possessors are not possible:

6This construction can apparently mean 'Which of you had a barking dog at his house?'
(54) *swéty k-wik-t-Ø-x k-qéʔčə-s
who irr-see-tr-Ø-2sS irr-father-3sP

‘Whose father did you see?’

(55) *swéty k-wíwk-t-sm-s k-qéʔčə-s
who irr-see+c-tr-1sO-3sS irr-father-3sP

‘Whose father saw me?’

This suggests that the lexical NP possessor is an external topic in (52-53). External topics are discussed in §3.1.

It is unclear why there is no possessor extraction out of arguments in transitive constructions. However, as expected, it is not possible to extract wh-possessors out of adjunct NPs:

(56) *swéty k-m-wík-t-Ø-x ʁ-Bill n-čitxʷ-s
who irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-2sS det-Bill loc-house-3sP

‘Whose house did you see Bill at?’

(57) *swéty k-m-wík-t-Ø-x ʁ-Bill mé̓tə-kúkpiʔ-s
who irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-2sS det-Bill with-chief-3sP

‘Whose chief did you see Bill with?’

Thus we see that possessors cannot be extracted out of nominals in transitive clauses at all.

In this section, evidence has been presented that there are instances of possessor extraction in Shuswap. I have shown that possessors can be extracted from the subject of intranstive clauses. Possessor extraction is more
restricted in Shuswap than in Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988b). Halkomelem allows possessor extraction out of absolutive NPs in both intransitive and transitive clauses. Thus there is an ergative/absolutive asymmetry. That there is possessor extraction out of NP at all in Shuswap and Halkomelem provides an argument that at least some lexical NPs in Salish languages are arguments.

5.4 Weak Crossover Effects

In this section I very briefly consider the evidence for the syntactic status of lexical NPs with respect to weak crossover. The Mohawk facts are initially surprising. If NPs are in adjunct positions it is predicted that there would be no asymmetry. This is the case; however the constructions are grammatical rather than ungrammatical as predicted. Baker analyses these structures as parasitic gaps, structures that are currently unattested in Shuswap. Second, the Shuswap facts, which are discussed in §4.4, follow from a condition on antecedence, so that it is not clear that it is weak crossover at all that is responsible for the ungrammatical structures.

Mohawk lacks asymmetries in weak crossover environments with simple NPs. Both (58-59) are good constructions with the pronominal having a bound reading.

7Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988b) is the only other Salish language that I have information on at this time.
In this case one would predict that if NPs are adjuncts, a bound reading would be impossible in both subject and object positions. There would be no asymmetry, but the results would be exactly the opposite. For this reason he analyses these constructions as parasitic gaps. Confirmation of the analysis of these constructions is found in relative clause constructions. Parasitic gaps obey island effects so that it is predicted that in relative clauses the parasitic gap cannot be licenced. Weak crossover effects do appear in these environments as shown in (60).

(60) uhka wa'-te-shako-noru'kwanyu'- ne rukwe ne
who fact-dup-MsS/FsO-kiss-punc NE man NE
shako-nuhwe'-s
MsS/FsO-like-hab

**'Who did the man who likes her*i/j kiss ei?'
(Baker 1991: 559 (ex 46b))

This confirms that, while Mohawk has weak crossover effects, they do not apply to NPs.

As discussed in §4.4 Shuswap has apparent weak crossover violations as shown for the wh-questions in (61-62):
Thus a structural asymmetry can be observed with respect to operator/variable binding. In (61) the operator can bind A'-bind the variable in subject position. The variable can in turn A-bind the pronominal in object position. On the other hand, in (62) the operator binds two variables, violating the Bijection Principle. The same point was made in §4.4 with respect to quantifiers and focus nominals. In §4.4 I claimed that all of the weak crossover effects followed from a condition on antecedence:

(63) A pronoun must be c-commanded by its antecedent.

While there is an alternate explanation for the behaviour of these apparent weak crossover constructions, the pertinent observation is that there appear to be structural asymmetries. These asymmetries are completely unexpected if all lexical NPs are in adjunct positions.
5.5 Clausal Complement/Adjunct Asymmetries

In this section I discuss the behaviour of Mohawk and Shuswap clauses with respect to the syntactic tests of Condition C, extraction domains, and weak crossover effects. It is shown that both Mohawk and Shuswap clauses behave alike. First, there are Condition C effects in clausal complements but not in adjuncts. Secondly, it is possible to extract out of clausal complements but not out of adjuncts.

5.5.1 Mohawk

Mohawk shows an asymmetry with respect to Condition C between clausal complements and clausal adjuncts. A coreferential reading is possible in (64), but not in (65), where the clause is a complement:
The asymmetry observed above follows from the clause being in adjunct position in (64) but in argument position in (65). In (65) the r-expression must be free. It could not be bound without violating Condition C. This asymmetry can also be observed in the contrast between sentential subjects and sentential objects:

Thus the pronoun can antecede an r-expression contained in a sentential subject but not an r-expression in the sentential object.

Mohawk also displays a clausal complement/adjunct asymmetry with respect to extraction. In (68) a wh-element is extracted from a clausal complement:
(68) uhka i-hs-ehr-e’ v-ye-atyatawi-tsher-a-hninu’
who Ø-2sS-think fut-FsS-dress-nom-buy-punc

‘Who do you think will buy a dress?’ (Baker 1991: 551 (ex 28))

Subjects and adjuncts also can be extracted from clausal complements. On the other hand, it is not possible to extract from sentential subjects (69) or from adjuncts (70):

(69) *uhka we-sa-tsituni-’
who fact-NsS/2sO-make.cry-punc that

wa’-t-ha-a’shar-ya’k-e’
fact-dup-MsS-knife-break-punc

‘*Who did that (he) broke the knife make you cry?’ (Baker 1991: 552 (ex 30a))

(70) *oh niyotyeru tsi sa-nakuni-s tsi
why that NsS/2sO-make.mad-hab that

wa-hya-hrewaht-e’
fact-MsS/2sO-punish-punc

‘*Why did it make you mad [that he punished you ej]?’ (Baker 1991: 552 (ex 31a))

Mohawk also obeys the Complex NP Constraint.

(71) *nahotv wa-hse-riyo-’ ne erhar ne wa’-ka-nvsko-’
what fact-2sS-kill-punc NE dog NE fact-NsS-steal-punc

‘What did you kill the dog that stole?’ (Baker 1991: 553 (ex 33))
In sum, the data above show that there is a complement/non-complement asymmetry with respect to extraction.

5.5.2 Shuswap

There is an asymmetry between clausal complements and clausal adjuncts in Shuswap with respect to Condition C:

(72)  m-łəxéξə?-x-t-sm-s  k-s-wɨk-t-ʔ-ēm  ə-Mary
      perf-tell+c-red-tr-1S0-3S  irr-nom-see-tr-3S0-unsp  det-Mary

tə-John
cbl-John

'She told me that Mary was seen by John.'

(73)  m-łəxéξə?-x-t-sm-s  l-pəxɣwətəs  meʔ
      perf-tell+c-red-tr-1S0-3S  det-yesterday  exp

wɨk-t-ʔ-s (əkʷə)  ə-Mary  ə-John  e pəxɣwətəs
      see-tr-3S0-3S  rep  det-Mary  det-John  part  tomorrow

'She told me yesterday that Mary will see John tomorrow.'

Coreference is blocked in (72-73), providing evidence that Condition C applies to clauses.

---

8Caution must be used in testing these constructions since, as noted §4.3.6, there are parallelism constraints in Shuswap. In these data, the r-expression is in subject position in the clausal complement.
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On the other hand, coreference is possible with r-expressions in adjunct clauses:

(74) m-c'úrn-qs-n-Ø-x 1-q"ečēč-Ø əs ʁ-Mary
      perf-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-2sS det-leave-3sS 3sdep det-Mary

‘You kissed her when Mary left.’

Thus, there is evidence that Condition C operates in clauses in Shuswap.

Shuswap also has a clausal complement/non-complement asymmetry with respect to extraction. It is possible to extract NPs out of clausal complements:

(75) swétỳ 1u? 1əxéxyə?-x-t-sm-x k-s-k'ul-n-Ø-s
      who part tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS irr-nom-make-fc-3sO-3sS

      ʁ-stúkčn
      det-dipnet

‘Who did you tell me that made the dipnet?’
(76) swęty lu? r-John k-s-wik-t-∅-s
who part det-John irr-nom-see-tr-3sO-3sS
k-c’úrn-qs-n-∅-s r-Mary
irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-Mary

‘Who did John see kiss Mary?’/‘Who did John see Mary kiss?’

(77) stěmî lu? 1ałęxya?-x-t-sm-x k-s-k’ul-n-∅-s
what part tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS irr-nom-make-fc-3sO-3sS
r-Sam
det-Sam

‘What did you tell me that Sam made?’

Notice that both subjects and objects can extract. Moreover, long distance
extraction is possible:

(78) swęty lu? 1-ʔ-s-čut r-Paul
who part det-2sP-nom-say det-Paul
k-wik-t-∅-s ex ta-k’ul-m-∅ as ta-stúkčn
irr--see-tr-3sO-3sS exist obl-make-unsp-3sS 3sdep det-dipnet

‘Who do you think Paul saw making a dipnet?’

(79) stěmî lu? 1-ʔ-s-čut r-Paul k-wik-t-∅-s
what part det-2sP-nom-say det-Paul irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS
ex k-č-k’ul-st-∅-s as r-Sam
exist irr-hab-make-caus-3sO-3sS 3sdep det-Sam

‘What do you think Paul saw Sam making?’
While it is possible to extract nominals from complements, it is not possible to extract from adjuncts:

(81) *swétę  lu?  r-John  k-m-wik-t-Ø-s  r-Mary
    who    part    det-John    irr-perf-see-tr-3sO-3sS    det-Mary

χαι?  pnhén  k-c’úm-q-s-n-Ø-s  aš
part    when    irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  3sdep

"Who was it that John saw Mary when she kissed eį?"

(82) *sténti  xi?  k-č-1x-m-st-Ø-êś
    what    part    irr-hab-know-unsp-caus-3sO-3sS    pnhéʔn
    r-Sam  k-k’úl-n-Ø-s  aš
    det-Sam    irr-make-fc-3sO-3sS  3sdep

"What was it he knows when Sam made eį?"

The asymmetry can also be seen in instances of possessor extraction. It is possible to extract a possessor out of a complement clause in Shuswap (83-84) but not out of an adjunct clause (85-86).
(83) ỳ-John m-čut kn k-m-s-xʷéym-s ỳ-sqéxə-s
det-John peír-said 1sind irr-perf-nom-bark-3sP det-dog-3sP

'I said that John's dog barked.'

(84) ỳ-John yéywəs-(n)-Ø-n ex tə-xʷéym as
det-John annoyed+c-fc-3sO-1sS exist obl-bark 3sdep

1-sqéxə-s yəwí? wə plqiq'lx kn
det-dog-3sP that part returned+c 1sind

'I was annoyed with John's dog's barking, that's why I went home.'

(85) ỳ-John m-čut n k pnhéʔn k-m-qʷčéq as
det-John perf-say qu 2sind when irr-perf-die 3sdep

ỳ-qéʔčə-s
det-father-3sP

'John, did you say when his father died?'

(86) ỳ-John qʷəčéč k 1-xʷéym as ỳ-sqéxə-s
det-John leave 2sind det-bark 3sdep det-dog-3sP

'You left when John's dog barked.'

This extraction asymmetry is also observable with wh-possessors. They can be extracted out of complements, as shown in (87-88):

(87) swéťy k-čut k k-s-xʷéym-s k-sqéxə-s
who irr-say 2sind irr-nom-bark-3sP irr-dog-3sP

'Who was it that you said that his dog barked?'
(88) swét'ý k-čut k k-s-xyum-s k-čitxʷ-s
who irr-say 2sind irr-nom-big-3sP irr-house-3sP

‘Who was it that you said had a big house?’

However, it is not possible to extract wh possessors out of adjuncts:

(89) *swét'ý k-qʷaččʰ k k-xʷéym as ḥ-sqéxa-s
det-John irr-leave 2sind irr-bark 3sdep det-dog-3sP

‘Who did you leave when his dog barked?’

Thus Shuswap and Mohawk clauses exhibit comparable behaviour.

5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined the evidence for whether Shuswap is best analysed as a pronominal argument language. While Jelinek (in press) and Jelinek and Demers (1982) analyse the Coast Salish language Lummi as a pronominal argument language, I provide evidence that lexical NPs are arguments in Shuswap. Evidence comes from a set of tests applied by Baker (1991) to Mohawk. The tests include Condition C of Binding theory, conditions on extraction, and weak crossover.

First I investigate the Condition C effects. A language in which all lexical NPs are in adjunct positions should not have Condition C effects. Shuswap however has Condition C effects. The two languages differ with respect to NPs. No Condition C effects can be observed in NPs in Mohawk, whereas in Shuswap there are Condition C effects. This can be seen in NPs with possessive phrases:
Relative clauses and co-ordinate NPs also provide evidence that Condition C applies to NPs in Shuswap. Thus on the basis of evidence from Condition C, Shuswap behaves as if lexical NPs are in argument positions.

Huang's (1982) Condition on Extraction Domains makes predictions with respect to movement phenomena. A language in which all lexical NPs are adjuncts would not be able to extract out of NPs. Extraction out of NPs would violate the Adjunct Island Condition. This is confirmed in Mohawk, where there is no possessor extraction, thus providing evidence that NPs are in adjunct position. Shuswap on the other hand, has apparent instances of possessor extraction, at least in intransitive clauses:

(90) ʁ-Mary c’úlm-qs-n-ʔ-s ʁ-qéʔčə-s
det-Mary kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

'Mary kissed her father.'

(91) c’úlm-qs-n-ʔ-s ʁ-Mary ʁ-qéʔčə-s
kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-Mary det-father-3sP

'She kissed Mary's father.'
(Irrelevantly: 'Mary kissed her father.')
Inasmuch as these are true instances of possessor extraction, they constitute evidence in support of the hypothesis that lexical NPs can occur in argument position in Shuswap. The ergative/absolutive asymmetry observed in quantifier extraction also lacks an explanation is all lexical NPs are adjuncts.

A third set of evidence comes from weak crossover effects. It is predicted that if all NPs are in adjunct positions there would be no asymmetry with respect to variable binding. All NP constructions containing a variable would be ungrammatical. Shuswap exhibits an asymmetry in variable binding. While operators can A'-bind variables in subject position, they cannot A'-bind variables in object position as predicted by the Bijection Principle.

(94) swétý k-c’úr̓q̓s-n-ð-s ṣ-qéʔčə-s
    who  irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  det-father-3sP

‘Whoʔi eʔi kissed hereʔi father?’

(95) swétý ṣiʔ ṣ-qéʔčə-s k-c’úr̓q̓s-n-ð-s
    who  part  det-father-3sP  k-c’úr̓q̓s-n-ð-s

‘Whoʔi did hereʔi father kiss eʔi?’

While the behaviour of these constructions may follow from a condition on antecedence rather than from weak crossover effects, nevertheless that there is an asymmetry at all supports an analysis that lexical NPs are in argument positions.

Finally it has been shown that Mohawk and Shuswap exhibit Condition C effects into clauses. As well there are clausal asymmetries with respect to extraction. In both languages nominals can extract from clausal complements but not from clausal adjuncts.
This chapter thus provides evidence that supports the hypothesis that lexical NPs can occur in argument position in Shuswap. The claim that all lexical NPs are in adjunct positions leaves the range of structural asymmetries discussed in this study totally unexplained.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

6.0 Introduction

This study is a contribution to the understanding of verb-initial languages. It is also a contribution to the understanding of Shuswap syntax. Shuswap allows nominals to co-occur in three distinct preverbal positions—a fact previously unnoted, except for a brief mention in Kroeber (1991). In addition, the surface properties of Shuswap make it appear to be a non-configurational language. However, after examining a number of syntactic tests for configurationality—binding, weak crossover effects, and proper government—I concluded that it is best analysed as configurational. Finally, I investigated the argument status of lexical NPs. Evidence from Condition C, conditions on extraction, and weak crossover indicate that lexical NPs in Shuswap are syntactic arguments.
6.1 Preverbal Positions

In Chapters Two and Three, evidence was presented that nominals may co-occur in three distinct preverbal positions in Shuswap:

(1) a. ŭ-Basile swę́ty ʁ-qéća-s k-wik-t-Ø-s
det-Basile who det-father-3sP irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

'Basile, who did his father see?'

b. 
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I call the position occupied by Basile in (1) the external topic position. The position occupied by /swětǐ/ who is called the wh-position and the position occupied by /qē?čas/ his father is called the focus position. The external topic position is analysed as a base-generated position, prefixed to CP. Wh-position is base-generated adjoined to IP, and focus position is analysed as Spec of IP. Each of the three syntactic positions has distinct properties. These are summarized in the following chart:

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ext Topic</th>
<th>Wh</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wh Morphology</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det on Predicates</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obeys Island Constraints</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosts 2nd Position Clitics</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows Doubling</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes Focus Particles</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows Multiple Nominals</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Intr)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (tr)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (tr)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the chart, the external topic position contrasts with the wh-position in lacking wh-agreement:
In (3) wh-agreement is with the ergative in the wh-position and not with the absolutive in external topic position. Similarly, wh-agreement in (4) is with the patient of the ditransitive and not with the external topic agent or goal. The focus position also lacks wh-agreement:

In (5-6) there is no wh-agreement with the nominal in the focus position. In (5), there is a locative in the focus position, and we see that the locative does not trigger cliticization. Similarly, in (6) we see that the patient of the ditransitive does not trigger nominalization.

The wh-position takes determiner phrase complements—in wh-questions the dependent predicate is marked with an irrealis determiner /k-/ , which can be observed in (4-6) above. Nominals in the external topic or the focus position
do not take determiner phrase complements. It is the lack of the determiner on
the predicate, as well as wh-agreement, that allows these positions to be
distinguished from the wh-position.

(7) ṩ-John m-qʷečč-Ø
det-John perf-leave-3sS

'John left.'

(8) ṩ-John w-úrm-qn-Ø-s ṩ-Mary
det-John kiss-ls-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary

'John kissed Mary.'

The external topic position is unique in that external topics can violate
island conditions:

(9) ṩ-John m-laxéxyaʔ-x-t-sm-x pnheʔn k-m-qʷečč-as
det-John perf-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-2sS when irr-perf-leave-3dep

'That John, you told me when he left.'

Nominals in the wh-position and the focus position show extraction
asymmetries. They can extract out of complements:

(10) swéτy 1uʔ ṩ-John k-s-čut-s
who part det-John irr-s-say-3sP

k-c-úrm-qn-Ø-s ṩ-Mary
irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-Mary

'Who did John say that Mary kissed?'
On the other hand, nominals in the wh-position cannot extract out of complex NPs or adjuncts, showing that they obey island constraints.

(12) *swětỳ lu? ɣ-John k-wīk-t-ø-s te-núxʷ'ənənχʷ
    who part det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS obl-woman

    te-c'úm-qs-n-ø-s
    obl-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

    'Who was it that John saw the woman who kissed (him)?'

(13) *swětỳ lu? ɣ-John k-wīk-t-ø-s ɣ-Mary
    who part det-John irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS det-Mary

    l-c'úm-qs-n-ø-s as
    det-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS 3sdep

    *'Who did John see Mary when she kissed?'

Nominals in the focus position also obey island constraints. However, this is because there is no long distance extraction into the focus position at all.

The external topic cannot host second-position clitics (14), whereas nominals in the wh-position (15) can:
‘That John, I guess his house is big.’

‘Over at the house they say it was a rope that John had cut there.’

The behaviour of second-position clitics follows from the external topic being prefixed outside of the CP.

Only nominals in the external topic position can be doubled by a strong deictic:

‘That rope, I cut it.’

Nominals in the wh-position and the focus position cannot be doubled:

‘Who left?’

‘When did John leave?’

Further, the external topic position cannot be multiply filled (19), and cannot take focus particles (20):
In contrast, nominals that occur in the wh-position (21) and the focus position (22) can be accompanied by focus particles:

(21) \( \text{swētū} \quad \text{ri}? \quad \text{k-wik-t-Ø-m-as} \)  
\( \text{who} \quad \text{part} \quad \text{irr-see-tr-3sO-unsp-3dep} \)

'Who saw him?'

(22) \( \text{swētū} \quad \text{l-paxyéwtas} \quad \text{n-čitx}^w \quad \text{lu}? \quad \text{k-nik'-n-Ø-s} \)  
\( \text{who} \quad \text{yesterday} \quad \text{loc-house} \quad \text{part} \quad \text{irr-cut-tr-3sO-3sS} \)

\( \text{ɾ-spéc'n} \)  
\( \text{det-rope} \)

'Who was it yesterday in the house that cut the rope?'

The focus position is unique in being able to be multiply filled: the external topic and the wh-position allow only one nominal.

(23) \( \text{pnhé?n} \quad \text{ɾ-Mary} \quad \text{ɾ-qéʔče-s} \)  
\( \text{when} \quad \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{det-father-3sP} \)

\( \text{k-c'úm-qs-n-Ø-s as} \)  
\( \text{irr-kiss-ls-tr-3sO-3sS 3sdep} \)

'When did Mary kiss her father?'
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(24) pnhéʔn  n-čitxʷ  ŋ-John  k-nik'-n-Ø-s-as
when loc-house det-John irr-cut-tr-3sO-3sS-3dep

‘When did John cut the rope in the house?’

Possessors of subject NPs of intransitive constructions can occupy all three positions:

(25) ŋ-John  rition  ŋ-čitxʷ-s
det-John  big  det-house-3sP

‘That John, his house is big.’

(26) swéť́y  k-xʷéym-Ø  k-sqéχa-s
who  irr-bark-3sS  irr-dog-3sP

‘Whose dog barked?’

(27) xhéʔn  ŋ-John  k-χʔek-Ø  wəs
where det-John  irr-go-3sS  3sdep det-father-3sP

‘Where is John’s father going?’

The possessor is in the external topic position in (25), the wh-position in (26), and the focus position in (27). On the other hand, possessors of transitive subjects or objects can only occur in the external topic position.

(28) ŋ-Mary  swéť́y  ŋ-qéʔča-s
det-Mary  who  det-father-3sP  irr-see-tr-3sO-3sS

‘That Mary, who did her father see?’
(29) ɬ-John m-wiwi-t-sm-s ɬ-qéʔčə-s
det-John perf-see+c-tr-3sO-1sS det-father-3sP

'That John, his father saw me.'

Possessors of transitive arguments can neither be questioned (30-31) nor occur in the focus position:

(30) *swéty k-wí(w)k-t-sm-s k-qéʔčə-s
    who irr-see-tr-1sO-3sS irr-father-3sP

'Whose father saw me?'

(31) *swéty k-wík-t-ʔ-x k-qéʔčə-s
    who irr-see-tr-3sO-2sS irr-father-3sP

'Whose father did you see?'

6.2 Configurationality

In Chapter Four, I investigated the evidence for structural asymmetries in Shuswap in order to determine its configurational status. First, I observed that Shuswap superficially has all of the properties associated with non-configurationality (Hale 1983): free word order, the use of discontinuous expressions, and free or frequent pro drop. In fact, the relative freedom of word order and pro drop are two of the most salient features of Shuswap syntax. Word order has received extensive discussion in the preceding chapters. It was shown in §1.3 that postverbal word order is completely free, subject to what I assume are discourse principles. Moreover, in Chapters Two and Three, I
determined that there are three distinct preverbal positions available to
nominals: the external topic position (§3.1), the wh-position (Chapter Two), and
the focus position (§3.2). Finally, the use of pro drop, a feature of the Salish
language family in general, is exhibited in Shuswap. The surface properties of
Shuswap thus suggest that it is potentially a non-configurational language.

I then turned to the central questions of the chapter—the behaviour of
Shuswap with respect to the standard diagnostics of structural asymmetries—
binding and weak crossover.

6.2.1 Binding

First, the properties of binding constructions were investigated. Shuswap
has the following binding facts:

(32) Shuswap

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Maryi likes heri father.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Mary'si father likes her.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Heri father likes Maryi.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Shei likes Mary'si father.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speas (1990) predicts different distributions for configurational and non-
configurational languages equivalent to the following:

(33) Configurational | Flat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Maryi likes heri father.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Mary'si father likes heri.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Heri father likes Maryi.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Shei likes Mary'si father.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The binding facts for Shuswap are not the same as for either the configurational or the non-configurational language. However, the binding data at first appear to support the claim that Shuswap is non-configurational, since the equivalent of (33b) is ungrammatical:

\[
(34) \quad \text{det-Mary} \quad \text{det-father-3P} \quad \text{like-caus-3SO-3SS}
\]

*‘Mary's father likes her.’
(Irrelevantly: ‘Mary likes her father.’)

However, an alternative explanation was given for the ungrammaticality (34): it follows from a condition on the distribution of pronominal objects, which is independently required in the grammar of Shuswap. Pronominal objects can only occur when there are also pronominal subjects, not when there are lexical NP subjects. This is termed the Generalized Condition on the Interpretation of Empty Categories:

\[
(35) \quad \text{An overt NP or a variable subject cannot occur with a null pronominal object.}
\]

Furthermore, I showed that as far as Shuswap is concerned (35) follows from the Agent Condition. This prohibits objects from outranking subjects on the Agent Hierarchy. Moreover, I proposed that third person pronominals outrank lexical NPs and variables on the Agent Hierarchy.

Shuswap, in fact, differs from both configurational and non-configurational languages in not allowing the equivalent of (33c). The relevant constructions are given in (36-37):
I proposed that the contrast follows from a fundamental structural asymmetry with respect to antecedence.

A pronoun must be c-commanded by its antecedent.

This condition, which finds support cross-linguistically in other verb-initial languages (Chung 1990), provides evidence for a fundamental structural asymmetry in Shuswap.

A final condition on coreference in Shuswap is a parallelism constraint and was shown to operate between clauses. It can be observed in the following contrast:

(39) ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s
       k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s
       compl-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-s-like-caus-3sO-3sS  irr-s-like-caus-3sO-3sS  irr-s-like-caus-3sO-3sS

'She_i told me that she_i likes him.'/'She_i told me that he likes her_i.'

(40) ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s
       k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s  k-s-ʁ-ʁeʔx-ʁ-x-t-sm-s
       compl-tell+c-red-tr-1sO-3sS  irr-s-like-caus-3sO-3sS  irr-s-like-caus-3sO-3sS  irr-s-like-caus-3sO-3sS

'She_i told me that she_i is liked.'
Nominals in subordinate clauses that are coreferential to the subject of the main clause must be in subject position.

### 6.2.2 Weak Crossover

It was then shown that Shuswap exhibits an asymmetry in variable binding. Wh-question, quantifier, and focus constructions all show weak crossover effects. Weak crossover effects can be observed in the following contrast in wh-question constructions:

(41) swétỳ k-c’úm-qs-n-∅-s ʁ-qéʔča-s
    who irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS det-father-3sP

‘Whoi ei kissed heri father?’

(42) swétỳ ʁi? ʁ-qéʔča-s k-c’úm-qs-n-∅-s
    who deic det-father-3sP irr-kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS

‘Whoi did heri father kiss ei?’

As predicted by the Bijection Principle, operators can A'-bind variables in subject position but they cannot A'-bind variables in object position. The behaviour of these constructions may actually follow from the condition on antecedence rather than from weak crossover effects. Nevertheless the data provide evidence that there is a structural asymmetry in Shuswap.
Thus, an analysis of Shuswap can be given that is consistent with configurationality. Furthermore the treatment of binding proposed here relies crucially upon Shuswap being configurational.

6.3 Nominal Arguments

In Chapter Five, I examined the evidence for whether Shuswap is best analysed as a pronominal argument language. The evidence comes from a set of tests applied by Baker (1991) to Mohawk. The tests include Condition C of binding theory, conditions on extraction, and weak crossover. Baker concludes that in Mohawk, lexical NPs cannot occur in argument positions in Mohawk. I discussed comparable structures and concluded that Shuswap has lexical NP arguments.

6.3.1 Condition C

First, I investigated the facts regarding Condition C in Shuswap. A language in which all lexical NPs are in adjunct positions should not have Condition C effects. Contrary to this prediction, Condition C can be seen in NPs with possessive phrases in Shuswap:

(43) ʁ-ʁMary  c’ú̂m-qs-n-ə-s  ʁ-qeʔə-s
det-Mary    kiss-ls-fc-3sO-3sS  det-father-3sP

'Mary kissed her father.'
Relative clauses (45-46) also provide evidence that Condition C applies to NPs in Shuswap:

(45) wik-t-ə-s  r-sqelamx [ta-kət-ə-és  ta-sqeltn]  
see-tr-3sO-3sS  det-man  obl-give-tr-3sO-3sS  obl-salmon  
\( r \)-Mary  
det-Mary  
‘Mary\(_i\) saw the man that she\(_i\) gave the salmon to.’

(46) wik-t-ə-s  r-sqelamx [ta-kət-ə-és  r-Mary]  
see-tr-3sO-3sS  det-man  obl-give-tr-3sO-3sS  det-Mary  
ta-sqeltn]  
obl-salmon  
‘She\(_i\) saw the man that Mary\(_i\) gave the salmon to.’

When the r-expression Mary is in the relative clause, it cannot be an antecedent for the pronominal subject of the main clause.

A final source of evidence showing Condition C effects comes from NP coordinations:
Thus, on the basis of evidence from Condition C, Shuswap behaves as if lexical NPs are in argument positions.

6.3.2 Conditions on Extraction

Huang's (1982) Condition on Extraction Domains makes predictions with respect to movement phenomena. A language in which all lexical NPs are adjuncts should not be able to extract out of NPs. This is confirmed in Mohawk, where there is no possessor extraction, thus providing evidence that NPs are in adjunct position. On the other hand Shuswap allows the extraction of possessors, at least in intransitive clauses:

(48) swétȟ who k-xʷéym-Ø k-sqéxә-s irr-bark-3sS irr-dog-3sP

‘Whose dog barked?’

(49) swétȟ who k-xyum-Ø k-čitxʷ-s irr-big-3sS irr-house-3sP

‘Whose house is big?’
Thus possessor extraction provides evidence in support of the hypothesis that 
lexical NPs can occur in argument position in Shuswap.

6.3.3 Weak Crossover

A third set of evidence comes from weak crossover effects. It is predicted 
that, if all NPs were adjuncts, there would be no asymmetry with respect to 
variable binding. All NP constructions containing a variable would be 
ungrammatical. However, as discussed in §6.2.2 above, Shuswap shows weak 
crossover effects in wh-question, quantifier, and focus constructions. This set of 
facts would be unexpected if lexical NPs were adjuncts.

The arguments from Condition C effects, conditions on extraction and 
weak crossover provide evidence that supports the hypothesis that lexical NPs 
can occur in argument position in Shuswap. A claim that all lexical NPs are 
adjuncts would be totally unable to explain the range of structural asymmetries 
discussed in this study.

6.4 Conclusion

This thesis, as a descriptive contribution, shows that Shuswap, unlike 
most members of the Salish language family, has three preverbal positions, 
each with distinct syntactic properties. Furthermore, on the basis of the binding 
and weak crossover facts, I conclude that Shuswap is best analysed as a
configurational nominal argument language. This study thus supports the hypothesis that all languages are configurational in underlying structure.
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