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In this paper, I claim that Nte?kepmxcin has an underlying VSO order in transitive clauses. However, VOS is possible where pragmatically acceptable, and forced just in case the final DP is a possessor of the initial DP, since possession marking must be locally bound by its possessor. This binding condition indicates subject/object asymmetry, for which I provide further evidence. In addition, I distinguish two pre-verbal positions (Gardiner 1998 on Shuswap): an External Topic, which can host objects or subjects, and an Internal Topic, which may only host subjects. Finally, I look at word order across clauses as determined by Condition C. I show that r-expressions must not be bound within the clause, but may be co-referent with a c-commanding pro across a clause boundary (Davis 2006 on Lilooet Salish).

1 Introduction

Nte?kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish) is a member of the Northern Interior branch of the Salish language family, along with St’at’imcets (Lilooet Salish) and Secwepemctsin (Shuswap), two languages with which I will be drawing comparisons in this paper. The data in the present paper come from original fieldwork with two speakers of the Lytton dialect.

I have three main goals in this paper. First is to give a basic account of transitive word order in Nte?kepmxcin, which I will argue is underlyingly Verb - Subject - Object (VSO) (section 2). The second goal is to document deviations from this underlying word order. Post-predicatively, VOS is a common order, and is required when the object DP is possessed by the subject DP (section 3).

* Many thanks to Flora Ehrhardt and Patricia McKay for sharing their language, and for all the patience required for many of the examples in this paper. This work has benefited from comments by Henry Davis, Monique Charest and the audience at WSCLA XI. All errors are my own. Research for this paper has been supported by a SSHRC grant awarded to Lisa Matthewson, and by two Jacobs Research Grants to the author.

Nte?kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish) belongs to the Northern Interior branch of the Salish language family. The data in the present study come from two female speakers of the Lytton dialect. Translations are those given by the consultant unless otherwise noted; in some cases, I provide a more literal translation for explanatory purposes.
Pre-predicatively, we find both SVO and OVS. Following Gardiner on Shuswap (1993, 1998), I will present evidence for two pre-predicative positions in Nłe?kepmxcin (section 4).

The third goal is to look beyond matrix transitive clauses to word order in more complex sentences, by examining the role of Condition C in Nłe?kepmxcin (section 5). I will show that Condition C operates within the clause, but that r-expressions may be bound by a pronominal across a clause boundary (Davis 2006 on St’at’imcets), although relative clause boundaries may differ in this regard.

2 Word order basics: VSO

2.1 Background

Nłe?kepmxcin is a predicate initial language. However, a good deal of flexibility in word order is possible. In their grammar of the language, Thompson and Thompson (1992: 148) remark:

Sentences with both subject and object specified as complements to a single transitive predicate are occasionally used. Either order [VSO or VOS] is permissible. Subject and object are thus recognized by context rather than by formal means. The final position simply lends its emphatic force.

Similarly, Gardiner et al. (1993: 153-154), working with a Nłe?kepmxcin consultant from Spence’s Bridge, report that in “post-predicate position word order is free in Nłe?kepmxcin.” While it is true that both VSO and VOS order is observed, I will argue in this section that the basic transitive order is VSO.

2.2 Subjects precede objects

When context is of no help, there is a formal structural means of identifying subject and object without ambiguity. The underlying order becomes apparent in transitive clauses where either complement is a plausible agent.

In (1), either our mother or our brother could be doing the helping, yet (1a) only allows the reading where our mother is the subject; (1b) may only be interpreted with our brother as subject. Example (2) shows the same facts for the verb hit, (3) for punch, and (4) for pinch. I conclude that VSO is the underlying word order, since it is the only reading available in the cases below.¹

¹ Data are presented in the orthography developed in Thompson and Thompson (1992, 1996), and Kroeber (1997). The phonemic key to the orthography is as follows: c = [ʃ] or [ʃ], c = [ts], e = [e, æ, a, e, ø], æ = [a], i = [i, ei, ai], o = [o, ø], s = [ʃ] or [ʃ], s = [ʃ], u = [u, ø, ø], y = [y, i]. Nłe?kepmxcin [z] is more lateral than English [z], though there may be considerable regional or speaker variation.
(1) a. V  
    kən-t-Ø-és  xeʔ  [e skʃxʔ-kt]  
    help-trans-3o-3TS  dem  [det mother-1pl.poss]  
    O  
    [e sínciʔ-kt]  
    [det younger.brother-1pl.poss]  
    "Our mother helped our brother."  
    (*"Our brother helped our mother.")  

b. V  
    kən-t-Ø-és  xeʔ  [e sínciʔ-kt]  
    help-trans-3o-3TS  dem  [det younger.brother-1pl.poss]  
    O  
    [e skʃxʔ-kt]  
    [det mother-1pl.poss]  
    "Our brother helped our mother."  
    (*"Our mother helped our brother.")  

(2) V  
    sik-nwéʔ-Ø-s  xeʔə  [e n-sínciʔ]  
    hit-NCT-3o-3TS  dem  [det 1sg.poss-younger.brother]  
    O  
    [˥ n-snúʔeʔ]  
    [det 1sg.poss-friend]  
    "My younger brother accidentally hit my friend."  
    (*"My friend accidentally hit my younger brother.")  

(3) V  
    púys-t-Ø-s  xeʔə  [e n-sínciʔ]  
    beat.up-trans-3o-3TS  dem  [det 1sg.poss-younger.brother]  
    O  
    [e céʔeʔ-kt]  
    [det younger.sister-1pl.poss]  
    "My youngest brother punched our younger sister."  
    (*"Our younger sister punched my youngest brother.")  

Abbreviations used in the gloss (based on Thompson and Thompson 1992, 1996, Kroeber 1997, Jimmie 2002, 2003) are: ‘-’ = affix or clitic, ‘=’ = lexical suffix, appl = applicative, aug = augmentative reduplicant, aut = autonomous, caus = caussative, conj = conjunctive (i.e. subjunctive - see ft. 9), dem = demonstrative, det = determiner, dim = diminutive, drv = directive transitivizer, dvl = developmental, emph = emphatic, EVID = evidential, FUT = future, IM = immediate, inch = inchoative, instr = instrumental, INT = introductory predicate, irl = irrealis, loc = locative, MDL = middle, NCM = non-control middle, NCT = non-control transitivizer, neg = negation, nom = nominalizer, o = object, obl = oblique, PERS = persistent (emphatic particle), pl = plural, poss = possessive, prog = progressive, PRP = proportional, Q = y/n question, red = reduplicant, refl = reflexive, REL = relational, RFM = reaffirmative, sg = singular, STAT = stative prefix, subj.extr = subject extraction suffix, trans/tr = control transitivizer, TS = transitive subject.
When objects precede subjects: VOS

As Thompson and Thompson note (1992: 148), contextual factors can enable VOS word order interpretations. If the complement in final position in a transitive sentence is pragmatically favoured as subject, VOS is perfectly acceptable. For example, in (5), Jessica is interpreted as the subject, since dogs don’t normally give people medicine. Similarly, in (6), VOS is the only available reading since windows cannot wash people. Finally, (7) has a VOS interpretation since bad men typically beat up small men, not the other way around.

(5)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{malám-Ø-es} & \text{xe?} & [\text{t sqáqxa}] \\
\text{heal-tr-3o-3TS} & \text{dem} & [\text{det dog}] \\
\end{array}
\]

Jessica

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
?e & \text{s-ye-wíx-s} & [\text{t smútéc}] \\
\text{and nom- good-dvl-3sg.poss} & & [\text{det 1 sg.poss-offspring det woman}] \\
\end{array}
\]

"Jessica gave the dog medicine and it got better."

(6)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{céw-Ø-Ø-es} & \text{xe?ø} & [\text{t n-kwéni=ús-tn}] \\
\text{wash-tr-3o-3TS} & \text{dem} & [\text{det loc-look=face-instr}] \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{S} & [\text{t n-skwúze?-s}] & [\text{t smútéc}] \\
\text{[det 1 sg.poss-offspring det woman]} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

"My daughter was the one that washed the windows."

(*"The windows washed my daughter.")

(7)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{puys-t-Ø-Ø-es} & \text{xe?ø} & [\text{ơ k“m-ifme? te ḥu?sqáyxw"}], \\
\text{beat.up-tr-3o-3plTS} & \text{dem} & [\text{det small-PRP obl man}], \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{S} & [\text{t n-ks=énk} & \text{te sqáyqayxw"}] \\
\text{[det loc-bad=belly obl man[aug]]} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

"They beat up a small man, the men that are mean."

The final position, which Thompson and Thompson (1992) identify as “mildly emphatic,” may be a focus position. This is suggested also by the clefted translation of (6), and by the fact that the final subject DP in (7) is preceded by a
pause, again reflected in the translation. Note that the sentence-final subjects in
examples (6) and (7) are also “heavy” (roughly, containing more than one
prosodic word), which may signal that these are cases of right extrapolation to
give VOS word order (see Davis 2005: ex. 55-56 on “heaviness” and post-
predicative word order alternations in St’at’imcets). The extent to which this
final position is correlated with phonetic markings of focus remains to be seen,
however.

In Koch (2006b), I presented data which showed that, in addition to
pragmatics, satisfaction of binding conditions can also force a VOS
interpretation. The examples involve transitive sentences in which a possession
relationship exists between the two complements of the verb (i.e. John and his
dog or his cat in (8) below). In this case, the possessor John must be interpreted
as the subject, even when this is pragmatically aberrant (as in (8) - since people
don’t usually bite dogs or cats) and even though it violates the underlying VSO
word order.

(8) a. V O S
qəl-t-Ø-és xeʔə [ tà sqáqxs-a] [ tà John]
bite-trans-3o-3TS dem [det dog-3sg.poss] [det John]
“John, bit his, dog.” [VOS]
(*“His, dog bit John,”) [*VSO]

b. V O S
nwé:n xeʔ qəl-t-Ø-és [ e pús-c ] [ e John ]
already dem bite-tr-3o-3TS [det cat-3sg.poss] [det John]
“John already bit the [his] cat.” [VOS]
(*“His, cat already bit John,”) [*VSO]

*VSO is ruled out in (8) because 3\textsuperscript{rd} person possession marking -s must be
bound by its possessor. These facts have previously been documented for
another speaker of Nłe?kepmxcin (Matthewson et al. 1993:220), and also hold
in Shuswap (Gardiner 1993), and in Lower St’at’imcets, which shares the
underlying VSO word order of Nłe?kepmxcin (Davis 1999).

Examples (9) through (13) show the same facts as (8): VOS is the only
interpretation, when the object bears 3\textsuperscript{rd} person possession marking.

(9) V O
qʷíyi-Xf-t-Ø-s xeʔə [ tà sqáčx-s ]
cook-appl-tr-3o-3TS dem [det father-3sg.poss]
S Oblique
[ e Máry] [te sqéytn]
[det Mary] [obl salmon]
“Mary, barbecued some salmon for her dad.”
(*“Mary’s dad barbecued some salmon for Mary.”)
The binding approach used to account for the absence of a VSO reading in the above examples assumes an asymmetry between subject and object, with the subject occupying a higher structural position that c-commands the object. Since only the VOS reading is available here, examples (9-13) already point to such an asymmetry. However, there is also independent evidence that such an asymmetry exists. Multiple wh-questions show superiority effects: the subject must precede the object, as in English (previously documented for Nlèkepmxcin by Davis et al. 1993:82; see also Davis 2005:ex. 25-27 on St'at'imcets).

A second piece of evidence for subject-object asymmetry comes from VP anaphora. Davis (2005:ex. 25-27) notes that in co-ordinations in St'at'imcets, the light verb xilem ‘do (so)’ functions as a pro-VP (like English “do so”). In Nlèkepmxcin, cognate ñaym behaves the same way. This pro-VP
gets an interpretation as a constituent containing the verb and the object (cut up
the tree below), not the verb and the subject. Again, this fact suggests an
asymmetry, wherein subjects are external to VP, while objects are internal and
may form a constituent with the verb, excluding the subject.

(15) ník-á-Ø-Ø-ne xe? ncéwe? † syáp
cut-driv-trans-3o-1sgTS dem 1sg.emph det tree
?et ḥáym ?et ñu? † n-sínčí?
and do ACCM PERS det 1sg.poss-younger.brother
“I cut up the tree and my brother did the same.”

So far, I have established that the basic post-predicative word order is
VSO. However, if pragmatics make clear which argument is subject and which
object, VOS order is permissible. In addition, VOS order may be forced. In the
cases examined, this occurs because 3rd person possession marking must be
bound by the possessor DP. Thus, the possessor is necessarily the subject.3 So
far, Nłeʔképmxcin resembles the Lower dialect of St’át’imcets, which is also
underlyingly VSO with a VOS alternate (Davis 1999).

In the next section, I look at cases where one of the complements of the
verb is fronted. We shall see that, like Lower St’át’imcets, Nłeʔképmxcin also
permits SVO order.

4 Unmarked fronting: External and Internal Topics

In matrix clauses, it is possible to front either the subject or object. This
gives us two further possible word orders: SVO or OVS. These are cases that
Kroeber identifies as “unmarked fronting,”4 and are also attested in the Interior

2 The two clitics following the light verb ḥáym are two emphatic markers that Thompson
and Thompson (1992) call “accomplished” (ACCM) ?et and “persistent” (PERS) ñu?.
Together, they appear to mean something akin to also in constructions like this example.

3 When the possession marked object is preposed before a transitive predicate, Lower
St’át’imcets permits only an SVO reading (Davis 1999), while Shuswap permits only the
OVS interpretation (though these are rare, with the passive typically used instead –
like Shuswap in this regard, in that consultants consistently use the passive in this case
(see also Koch 2006b on other strategies in possessive constructions). However, I have
recorded one case of a possessed DP fronting before a transitive verb, which received a
SVO interpretation, like Lower St’át’imcets.

(i) e-šťmált-šk key-kéy-Ø-Ø-es e Bill
   det cattle-3sg.poss aug-chase-tr-3o-3TS det Bill
   “His cattle chased Bill.”

4 Kroeber (1999) distinguishes unmarked fronting from other fronting constructions like
clefs, wh-questions and relative clauses, because in “unmarked fronting,” the material
following the fronted constituent is not introduced by a complementizer, nor is the
following predicate marked by any subordinating/extraction morphology.
Salish languages Shuswap, Okanagan and Kalispel (1999: 391-395), and the Lower dialect of St’at’imcets (Davis 1999).

Regarding Nle?kepmxcin, Thompson and Thompson call these fronted constructions “emphatic topics” (1992: 159-161). They find that, when a DP is fronted, the initial determiner is dropped (though this is not generally true for my consultants, as we shall see below). Thompson and Thompson note that SVO is commonly produced in elicitation sessions, but rarely in conversation, a finding with which I generally concur. As a result, they suggest that fronting is influenced by English word order. However, whether SVO is due to the influence of English word order, or to the often increased complexity of “out-of-the-blue” elicitation sentences (vis a vis conversational contexts) is not clear to me. In any case, the presence of OVS is not explained as simple translation from English, nor is the absence of SVO in embedded sentences (see Davis 1999:ft. 3, for more discussion on the non-influence of English).

In this section, I present data indicating that there may be more than one position of unmarked fronting in Nle?kepmxcin, as reported by Gardiner (1993, 1998) for Shuswap. Gardiner distinguishes an Internal Topic and an External Topic. I will examine several diagnostics for External and Internal Topics in Nle?kepmxcin, offering a comparison to Shuswap (Gardiner 1993, 1998, Kroeber 1999). We shall see that, while the External Topic behaves much like it does in Shuswap, the Internal Topic position appears to be more restricted: only subjects may occupy the Internal Topic position in Nle?kepmxcin.

4.1 External Topics: SVO

SVO is a common order in matrix clauses. Some examples are given below (see also Koch 2005, 2006a).

(16) $S\ V\ O$

[t $\chi$zum-éyx=qn $t$ smútec], ?uípi-Ø-Ø-s xe? [t sqéytn]
[det big-aut=head det woman], eat-tr-3o-3TS dem [det salmon]
“The big woman ate the salmon.”

(17) $S\ V\ O$

[t-ex mítl-m-t-Ø-iyxs Ø sëytknmx], qex-Ø-t-Ø-íyx$[det-prog visit-rel-tr-3o-3plTS det people], fry-dr$[det trout]$[det salmon]
xe? [t swéwét] ?e s-?uípí-t-Ø-íyx$ dem [det trout] and nom-eat-tr-3o-3plTS
“The people that are coming to visit, they’re gonna’ fry up the fish and then they’re gonna’ eat it.”

In (16-17), we have left-dislocated subjects. These are what Gardiner (1998) describes as “External Topics;” note that they are separated from the remainder of the sentence with a pause (indicated by the comma). Gardiner
claims that External Topics are base-generated as adjuncts to CP, and are entirely out of the clause.

I now examine Gardiner’s diagnostics for the External Topic. First, Gardiner claims that External Topics are phonetically marked, by a following pause. This is generally true in Nte?kepmxcin (though not always, as in example (18) below; however, there may be other phonetic markers of the External Topic).

Next, Gardiner notes that the External Topic is used as a contrastive topic, to “switch reference.” Again, this appears to be true in Nte?kepmxcin, as shown by the conversation below. In this example, consultants were asked to role play and have a conversation about planning a get-together. Person A is making suggestions about what she could bring to the party; in each case, Person B tells her that someone else (Fiona, Karsten or Ian) is already planning to bring that item. This “someone else” is fronted as an External Topic in each case below, since it switches reference from Speaker A to Fiona, Karsten or Ian.

(18)

A: sté? xʷúy̓ k n-s-cʔé?̓s-m.
what FUT irl 1sg.poss-nom-come-middle.
ke? k n-s-cʔé?̓s-m xʷúy̓ tk sʔúqʷe?.
what irl 1sg.poss-nom-come-MDL FUT obl.irl nom-drink
“What can I bring? Can I bring something to drink?”

B: t̓ Fióna xʷúy̓ xeʔ cʔé?̓s-m tk sʔúqʷe?.
det Fióna FUT dem bring-MDL obl.irl nom-drink
“Fiona is bringing something to drink.”

A: óo. keʔ xʷúy̓ k n-s-cʔé?̓s-m tk sqyéytn.
oh. what FUT irl 1sg.poss-nom-come-MDL obl.irl salmon
“Oh. Can I bring some salmon?”

B: Kársen ?ex cú-t k s-xʷúy̓-s
Karsten prog say-IM irl nom-FUT-3sg.poss
cʔé?̓s-m tk sqyéytn.
come-MDL obl.irl salmon
“Karsten said he was going to bring some salmon.”

A: húʔet. kéʔ ... kéʔ xʷúy̓ k n-s-cʔé?̓s-m
ok. what ... what FUT irl 1sg.poss-nom-come-MDL
 tk peták.
obl.irl potato
“OK. Can I bring some potatoes?”

B: Ian xʷúy̓ xeʔ cʔé?̓s-m tk štqóls.
Ian FUT dem come-middle obl.irl potato.
“Ian is going to bring some potatoes.” [note: my translations]
Another diagnostic for the External Topic, as noted for Shuswap by Gardiner (1993, 1998), is that it does not obey island constraints (Ross 1967), suggesting that it is not extracted, but rather base-generated in a position outside of the main clause. In (19), a possessor (the woman that was inside the house) is the External Topic; if External Topics underwent movement, (19) would violate the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint since the External Topic is the possessor of her brother, the object of the matrix clause. In (20), the External Topic e nkʷənkwʷə̱iǔstan 'the windows' would violate the Adjunct Island Constraint, since it would have to come from inside a "when" clause. However, both sentences are grammatical.

(19)  
EXTERIOR TOPIC  
[V  [S]  
[† sùmu.tec te w?éx ne cítxʷ], kən-t-0-éne  
[det woman obl prog in.det house], help-tr-3o-1sgTS  
O  
[te sínčiʔ-s] te w?éx ne ?éyʔqeʔ  
[det younger.brother-3sgposs] obl prog in.det outside  
"The woman that was inside the house, I helped her younger brother that is/was outside."

(20)  
EXTERIOR TOPIC  
[V  
[ę n-kʷən-kʷə̱n̓=ús-tn],  
[det loc-aug-look.at=face-instr], good dem det heart-3sg.poss  
S  
[ə n-skwíxseʔ]  
[det 1sg.poss-mother] det wash-drw-tr-3o-1sgTS 3conj  
"My mother was happy when I washed all the windows."
lit.: "All the windows, my mother was happy when I washed them."

In Shuswap, since the External Topic is outside of the main clause, it can be doubled with a strong demonstrative later in the clause (DPs can not generally be doubled with strong deictics in argument position - Gardiner 1998). While my evidence for this is limited, (21) suggests that this is probably also true in Nteʔkepmxcin. In this case the fronted prepositional phrase in the lake is doubled by Ileʔe there (note that the External Topic in (21) also violates the Adjunct Island constraint, since it comes from inside a "when" clause).

(21)  
EXTERIOR TOPIC  
[V  S  
[ntə le pəʔús=kʷu], (w)?éx kn xeʔ ťáxi  
[in det lake=water], prog 1sg dem cold  
† w?éx wn n-qáy-ix nέʔe  
det prog 1sg.conj loc-swim-aut there  
"I got cold when I went swimming in there, in the lake."
Next, second position clitics like the demonstrative xeʔ(ε)\textsuperscript{5} or the question particle \textit{ʔi} do not move to immediately follow an External Topic. This is true in both Shuswap and N\textit{ʔeʔkepmxcin}. While Gardiner (1998) uses this as a diagnostic to distinguish External and Internal Topics in Shuswap, in N\textit{ʔeʔkepmxcin} Internal Topics also fail to attract these second position clitics. In both cases, the clitics follow the first word of the main predicate. (22a) is ungrammatical if xeʔ follows the initial subject DP \textit{Mary} rather than the predicate visit; (22b) shows the same facts for a fronted object DP the roof. (22c) is illicit if the yes/no questions marker \textit{ʔ} follows the left-dislocated subject \textit{your friend Henry} instead of the first auxiliary \textit{wʔex}; and (22d) shows the same facts for the fronted object DP the small child.

(22) a. [\textit{Mary}] (*/xeʔ?) miłʔ-m-t-sm-s xeʔ \\
[det \textit{Mary}] (*/dem) visit-MDL-tr-1sgo-3TS dem \\
\textit{Sárah} \\
\textit{Sarah} \\
“Mary went to visit her friend Sarah.”

b. [\textit{sqáʔ̕tl̕xʷ-tn}]. (*/xeʔ?) swet xeʔ k-ex cu-t-Ø-émus \\
[det tent-instr], (*/dem) who dem irl-prog fix-trans-3o-subj.extr\textsuperscript{6} \\
“The roof, somebody is fixing it?”

c. [\textit{eʔ?-snúʔkw̓eʔ?}] \textit{Hénty}, (*/ʔ) (w)?ex \textit{ʔi} xeʔ \\
[det 2sg.poss-friend \textit{det Henry}, (*/Q) prog Q dem \\
\textit{te} n-téw-mn \\
work-middle in.det shoe obl loc-buy-instr \\
“Does your friend Henry work in the shoe store?”

d. [\textit{kʷm-iʔmeʔ? \textit{skʷúkʷm̕iʔt}]. (*/ʔ) wíkt-nxʷ \textit{ʔi} \\
[det small-PRP det child], (*/Q) see-tr-3o-2sgTS Q \\
“The small child, did you see it?” [my translation]

To summarize, External Topics in N\textit{ʔeʔkepmxcin} are generally (but not always) followed by a pause; they are contrastive, used to switch reference; they do not obey island constraints; they may be doubled by a strong deictic; and they fail to attract second position clitics. This suggests, following Gardiner (1998),

\textsuperscript{5} The astute reader will have noted that the demonstrative xeʔ(ε) appears in the majority of utterances, always in the second position (along with other second position clitics). It does not seem to serve any obvious deictic purpose, but its ubiquitous use has been reported for other speakers of N\textit{ʔeʔkepmxcin} (Kroeber, p.c.)

\textsuperscript{6} Extraction of subjects (swet ‘who’ in 22b) from transitive predicates induces subject extraction morphology -(e)mus. Though it appears to be derived historically from the passive -(e)m and the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subjunctive us (“conjunctive” in the terminology of Thompson and Thompson 1992), it behaves synchronically as a single suffix to the verb (Kroeber 1997, 1999). Notably, unmarked fronting of subjects induces no such extraction morphology.
that External Topics are not moved from inside the clause, but rather adjoin to a position outside of CP, akin to English left dislocation.

4.2 More External Topics: OVS

Since External Topics are left-dislocated, OVS should be a possible order, – indeed, we have already seen two cases in (22). Further cases below involve inanimate objects, which are unlikely to eat people (23), paint people (24), cut people up (25), or sew people (26); so, OVS is the reading we get here. The fronted object is followed by a pause, indicating its status as External Topic.

(23)    O
    V
    S

| t     | s-méx-∅-∅-ne | t     | sq"ýt], |
| det   | nom-mix-trans-3o-1sgTS | obl det | fruit], |

eat-trans-3o-3TS | [t] n-kžé

“The fruit that I mixed, my grandmother ate.”

(24)    O
    V
    S

| e     | qa'tmín | te     | n'tq"áptn-s | e Mary], |
| det   | old     | obl    | chair-3sg.poss | det Mary], |

paint-driv-3o-3TS | [e John]

dem | [det John]

“Mary’s old chair, John painted it.”

(25)    O
    V
    S

| t     | zík-t | t syép], | ník-∅-∅-es | xe? | [t x'u?sqáyx"w]
| det fall-1M | det tree], | cut-tr-3o-3TS | dem | [det man]

“The tree that fell down, the man cut it up.”

(26)    O
    V
    S

| t     | sqáq?us | t-ex | că'p], |
| det   | pants[dim] | det-prog | rip-inch], |

FUT
| det sew-trans-3o-3TS | [t n-skíxze?]|

“The shorts that were ripped, my mother’s gonna’ sew them.”

The second set of examples involves transitive sentences with 1st person subjects; since 1st person subjects are marked with agreement on the verb, it is clear that the overt 3rd person DP is the object, and OVS is the only interpretation available (see 22d for a case with a 2nd person subject). In (28), no noticeable pause separates the fronted DP from the main predicate I helped (though other phonetic markers may indicate its status as External Topic, an
issue that will have to await future research); however, the translation given for 
(28) still suggests left dislocation.

\[
(27) \quad \text{O}
\]
\[
[\text{det} \quad 1\text{sg.poss-nom-warm} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{egg} \],
\]
\[
V \quad [\text{S}]
\]
\[
\text{o} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{p=ekst-m-Ø-Ø-ne} \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{flow=e}
\]
\[
\text{fill.space-inch=hand-rel-tr-3o-1sgTS} \quad \text{in.det} \quad \text{floor}
\]
\[
\text{“I dropped the boiled egg on the floor.”}
\]

\[
(28) \quad \text{O}
\]
\[
[\text{det} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{obl} \quad \text{blister-1M} \quad \text{det nom-foot-3sg.poss}]
\]
\[
V \quad [\text{S}]
\]
\[
\text{k=t-t-Ø-éne}
\]
\[
\text{help-trans-3o-1sgTS}
\]
\[
\text{“The child that got blisters on their feet, I helped him or her.”}
\]

\[
(29) \quad \text{O}
\]
\[
[\text{det} \quad 1\text{sg.poss-nom-borrow-middle} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{nom-watch}]
\]
\[
V \quad [\text{S}]
\]
\[
\text{tu} \quad \text{Máry}], \quad \text{pi?}-\text{p-s-t-éne}
\]
\[
\text{from det Mary}], \quad \text{lose-inch-caus-trans-3o-1sgTS}
\]
\[
\text{“The book I borrowed from Mary, I lost it.”}
\]

\[
4.3 \quad \text{Internal Topics: SVO only}
\]

In contrast, the fronted subjects in (30-31) are not separated from the
main clause with a pause (again, whether this is always the case in
Nɬeʔkepmxcin remains to be established). These correspond to what Gardiner
(1998) calls an “Internal Topic.” Gardiner claims that these are in a focus
position in IP and are used for continuing topics in discourse.

\[
(30) \quad \text{S}
\]
\[
[\text{det} \quad 1\text{sg.poss-grandfather} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{horse[aug]-3sg.poss}]
\]
\[
V \quad \text{O}
\]
\[
\text{cuk“-t-Ø-éš} \quad \text{xe?} \quad [\text{det} \quad \text{súypm}]
\]
\[
\text{pull-trans-3o-3TS} \quad \text{dem} \quad [\text{det} \quad \text{log}]
\]
\[
\text{“My grandfather’s horses pulled the logs.”}
\]
Of course, we would like more ways of distinguishing Internal from External Topics than just the absence of a pause in (30-31). One diagnostic that Gardiner employs for Shuswap is the fact that Internal Topics attract second position clitics (1998). Thus, we would expect the ubiquitous second position demonstrative \( \text{xe?} \) in (30-31) to follow the subject; however, it does not, maintaining its place immediately after the predicate (\( \text{cuk wétes} \) in (30), and \( \text{wiktc} \) in (31)). Thus, this diagnostic fails to tell apart External from Internal Topics in \( \text{Nte?kepmxcin} \).

In more complex clauses, however, evidence does exist. In wh-questions and negated sentences, Internal Topics occupy an intermediary position, different from the initial External Topic. Moreover, only transitive subjects are permitted as Internal Topics.

Wh-questions are formed with a wh-word in predicative position (\( \text{sté?} \) in (32)); standardly, the remainder of the clause is introduced with irrealis complementizer \( k \), followed by the predicate and then its arguments and adjuncts (32a). Optionally, the subject \text{Hermann} can move to an intermediate position, after the wh-word but preceding the subordinated clause (32b). This is the Internal Topic position, and contrasts with the External Topic position in (32c), where \text{Hermann} precedes the entire utterance. Internal Topics in this position, unlike External Topics, are rarely spontaneously given in elicitation sessions, but are judged grammatical and produced upon inquiry.

Further examples of Internal Topics in wh-questions are given in (33-34); in each case, (a) is the standard post-predicative order, while (b) has the subject move to an Internal Topic position.
Negation téteʔ is also predicative in Ntéʔkepmxcin, occupying the initial predicate position. Standardly, the rest of the clause is introduced by irrealis complementizer k, which is followed by the nominalized verb and its arguments (35a, 36a). The subject can also move to the Internal Topic position, after negation but before the subordinated clause (35b, 36b). This contrasts from the External Topic position, in which the subject precedes negation (35c, 36c).

Hermann in (35) is the consultant’s dog.

(33) a. swét xeʔ(ə) [cp k wík-t-Ø-s e Bill] who dem [cp irl see-tr-3o-3TS det Bill] “Who did Bill see?”

b. swét xeʔ e Bill [cp k wík-t-Ø-s] who dem det Bill [cp irl see-tr-3o-3TS] “Who was that that Bill saw?”


(35) a. téteʔ [cp k s-ʔúpi-Ø-Ø-s e Hérmann e cíkn] NEG [cp irl nom-eat-tr-3o-3TS det Hérmann det chicken] “Hermann didn’t eat the chicken.”

b. téteʔ e Hérmann [cp k s-ʔúpi-Ø-Ø-s e cíkn] NEG det Hérmann [cp irl nom-eat-tr-3o-3TS det chicken] “Hermann didn’t eat the chicken.”

c. e Hérmann, téteʔ [cp k s-ʔúpi-Ø-Ø-s e cíkn] det Hérmann, NEG [cp irl nom-eat-tr-3o-3TS det chicken] “Hermann didn’t eat the chicken.”

(36) a. téteʔ [cp k s-wík-t-Ø-s e Hénry e sqáč] NEG [cp irl nom-see-tr-3o-3TS det Henry det chicken.hawk] “Henry didn’t see the policeman.”

b. tém ekʷu téʔ e Hénry NEG EVID dem det Henry [cp k s-wík-t-Ø-s e sqáč] [cp irl nom-see-tr-3o-3TS det chicken.hawk] “They said that / I heard that Henry didn’t see the policeman.”
c. det Henry, NEG [CP k s-wík-t-Ø-s e sqáč] det Henry, 

"Henry didn’t see the policeman.”

Unlike Shuswap, where multiple DPs can appear in the Internal Topic position (Gardiner 1998), only the subject DP appears to be possible as an Internal Topic in Nteʔkepmxícin (37a, 38ab, 39). Multiple DPs in this position are therefore also not permitted (37b, 38b). Example (38b) is particularly instructive on both these points, since the only interpretation available is where both fronted DPs my friend and Peter form one constituent my friend Peter, which must be the subject (the example even apparently violates the One Nominal Interpretation effect [Gerdts 1988], since there is no overt DP present that gets an object interpretation). Example (39) shows that only a subject may occupy the Internal Topic position; the attempt to topicalize the object the chicken of (35a) gives only the somewhat surprising interpretation where the chicken attempted to eat Hermann (a dog).

(37) a. piʔ-steʔ xeʔ e Bill point.in.time-what dem det Bill [CP k né-x-t-Ø-s us e Máry_te púkʷ] [CP irl give-appl-tr-3o-3TS 3conj det Mary_obl book] “When did BILL give Mary the book?”

b. *piʔ-steʔ xeʔ e Bill e Máry point.in.time-what dem det Bill det Mary [CP k né-x-t-Ø-s us te púkʷ] [CP irl give-appl-tr-3o-3TS 3conj obl book] intended: “When did BILL give MARY the book?”

(38) a. kénm met xeʔ he n-snúkʷe? why cnsq dem det 1sg.poss-friend [e sik-t-Ø-és e Píthah] [det hit-tr-3o-3TS det Peter] “Why did my friend hit Peter?”

b. kénm met xeʔ he n-snúkʷe? e Píthah why cnsq dem det 1sg.poss-friend det Peter [CP e sik-t-Ø-és] [CP det hit-tr-3o-3TS] “Why did my friend Peter hit somebody?”

* “Why did somebody hit my friend Peter?”
* “Why did my friend hit Peter?”
* “Why did Peter hit my friend?”

7 ‘Chicken hawk’ is slang for ‘police’ because they both “swoop down and grab you,” according to my consultants.
Even in sentences where either argument of the transitive predicate is a plausible subject, only the SVO interpretation is possible; OVS is not available. These facts are illustrated below with the transitive verbs help, talk to, hit, and see (see Gardiner 1993:129 on Shuswap, where OVS is not generally possible unless some other element has been extracted; Davis 1999 on Lower St’at’imcets, which also permits only subjects pre-predicatively).

(40) a. S V O

[Peter] kon-t-Ø-és xeʔə [e Fréd]  
[Peter] help-tr-3o-3TS dem [det Fred]

“Peter helped Fred.” (*“Fred helped Peter.”)

b. S V O

[Fréd] kon-t-Ø-és xeʔə [e Péter]  
[Fréd] help-tr-3o-3TS dem [det Peter]

“Fred helped Peter.” (*“Peter helped Fred.”)

(41) a. S V O

[Linda] qʷin-t-Ø-és xeʔə [ə Jánət]  
[Linda] talk.to-tr-3o-3TS dem [det Janet]

“Linda talked to Janet.” (*“Janet talked to Linda.”)

b. S V O

[Jánət] qʷin-t-Ø-és xeʔə [ə Línnda]  
[Jánət] talk.to-tr-3o-3TS dem [det Linda]

“Janet talked to Linda.” (*“Linda talked to Janet.”)

(42) a. S V O

[ə n-qéck] čəq-t-Ø-és [ə n-snúkʷeʔ]  
[det lsg.poss-older.brother] hit-tr-3o-3TS [det lsg.poss-friend]

“My older brother hit my friend.”  
(*“My friend hit my older brother.”)

b. S V O

[ə n-snúkʷeʔ] čəq-t-Ø-és [ə n-qéck]  
[det lsg.poss-friend] hit-tr-3o-3TS [det lsg.poss-older.brother]

“My friend hit my older brother.”  
(*“My older brother hit my friend.”)
If these fronted subjects are in a structural topic position, the SVO-only interpretation follows since only subjects are topics in transitive clauses in Salish; on the other hand, thematic objects are topical in passive constructions. (Kinkade 1989, 1990, Matthewson et al. 1993, Davis 1994b, Roberts 1994, Gerdts and Hukari 2004). This topic-tracking is shown in (44). The topic of this utterance is e spé?ec 'the bear', and is the subject of the first two transitive verbs wík'tsms 'it saw me' and paq'ú?tsms 'it startled me.' However, when the bear becomes the theme of the final predicate 'chase,' the passive is used to maintain the bear as the topic.

(44) wík-t-sm-s xe? e spé?ec ?e s-paq'ú?-t-sm-s ...
    see-tr-1sgo-3TS dem det bear and nom-startle-tr-1sgo-3TS ...
    ?e s-key-kéy-a-t-m te sqáq'xa
    and nom-aug-chase-driv-tr-PASS obl dog
    “The bear saw me and it startled me ... and then it got chased by the dog.” [my translation]

Thus, in order to front the object to the Internal Topic position, the “passive” can be used, since themes are topics in passive constructions:8

(45) a. THEME
    [ə n-k"ən=ús-tr-s] [t Bill]
    [det loc-look.at=face-instr-3sg.poss det Bill]
    V AGENT
    má?'-x-t-m xe? [te qéck-s]
    break-appl-trans-PASS dem [obl older.brother-3sg.poss]
    “His, oldest brother broke Bill,’s window.”

---

8 The cases in (45) could be taken as evidence that the passive promotes the object to an IP-internal subject position. However, we have already seen that the Internal Topic precedes complementizers in wh-questions and negation (32-39), suggesting that it is in a position adjoined to CP and not in IP (Kroeber 1999:392 on Shuswap). Davis (1999: ex. 37) argues that pre-predicative subjects in SV(O) structures in Lower St'at'imcets are a case of A-movement, since they induce no extraction morphology on the verb (among other tests); Davis concludes that the Internal Topic is a topicalization position, with the subject (or theme in passives) generated lower in a thematic position and raised to a non-thematic A-position. I will not aim to settle the status of the “passive” in Salish, though I note that there is evidence, if inconclusive, that the passive construction may be an impersonal construction (Gerdts 1988, Kroeber 1999, Wiltschko 2002).
Agents in these “passive” constructions, on the other hand, are rejected as Internal Topics ((a) below); again this follows since oblique-marked agents in passives are not topical. To make the agent an Internal Topic, a regular transitive is used (b).

(46) a. AGENT V THEME
* [te Jón] xwúy ekwú kən-t-éμ [e Máry]
[obl Jón] FUT EVID help-tr-PASS [det Máry]
intended: “By John, Mary’s gonna’ be helped.”

consultant comment: “No, that doesn’t sound right. Use [b].”

b. AGENT V THEME
[e Jón] xwúy ekwú kən-t-Ø-és [e Máry]
[det Jón] FUT EVID help-tr-3o-3TS [det Máry]
“John’s gonna’ help Mary.”

To summarize, Internal Topics in Nłe?kepmxcin, like in Shuswap, follow wh-words or negation, but precede the complementizer introducing the clause from which they have moved. Unlike Shuswap, Nłe?kepmxcin only...
allows subjects as Internal Topics, and disallows multiple Internal Topics. Themes may occupy the Internal Topic position just in case the verb has been passivized, since passive themes are topical. The Nłeʔkepmxcin facts are consistent with a structure in which subjects (or themes in passives) undergo A-movement from a thematic position to a non-thematic topicalized position in CP (Davis 1999 on Lower St’at’imcets).

Gardiner (1998) also notes that Internal Topics in Shuswap vacuously obey Island Constraints because they are clause-bound; this diagnostic needs further research in Nłeʔkepmxcin.

4.4 Limits to fronting

SVO and OVS word orders are limited to matrix clauses. Embedded or conjoined clauses must be predicate-initial. In (47), the complement clause that my friend was gonna’ be fixin’ his house is introduced by the irrealis complementizer k. The predicate (and auxiliaries) must immediately follow the complementizer (a); SVO is ruled out (b). In example (48), an intransitive clause, the clause following the conjunction ?e must also be predicate initial (a); SV order is not permitted (b).

(47) a. cú-t xeʔ Jóhn [k s-wʔéx-s xʷúy say-IM dem det John [irl nom-prog-3sg.poss FUT V S O] cu-t-és n-snúkʷeʔ cftxʷ-s] fix-tr-3o-3TS det 1sg.poss-friend det house-3sg.poss] “John said that my friend was gonna’ be fixin’ his house.”

b. S *cú-t xeʔ Jóhn [k n-snúkʷeʔ say-IM dem det John [irl det 1sg.poss-friend V O] s-wʔéx-s xʷúy cu-t-és cftxʷ-s] nom-prog-3sg.poss FUT fix-tr-3o-3TS det house-3sg.poss] intended: “John said my friend was gonna’ be fixin’ his house.”

(48) a. V xʷóst kn xʷúy nés [?e s-xʷúy-s nés go.home 1sg FUT go [and nom-FUT-3sg.poss go S] Moníque we ncéweʔ] det Moníque to.det 1sg.emph] “I’m going home and Monique is going home with me.”
Nte’?kepmxcin differs from its neighbour Shuswap in this regard, since Shuswap does allow SVO order in embedded clauses, but Nte’?kepmxcin patterns with its other Northern Interior neighbour St’at’imcets in disallowing embedded SVO (Davis 1999:ex. 24). In Gardiner’s terminology, we can say that Shuswap allows embedding of clauses up to and including the Internal Topic position, while in Nte’?kepmxcin (and St’at’imcets) the Internal Topic is outside of the permitted domain of embedded clauses. Assuming that embedded clauses are in fact full CPs, this suggests that the Internal Topic is also a position in the CP domain (as suggested by Kroeber 1999), and not in the IP domain (as speculated by Gardiner 1998).

A further restriction in Nte’?kepmxcin word order is that only one constituent may be fronted before the predicate; *SOV and *OSV word orders are not attested in my corpus (again, there appears to be some speaker variation on this fact: Gardiner et al. [1993:153-155] report that their Nte’?kepmxcin consultant allows multiple arguments to be preposed before the main predicate). Shuswap again differs in allowing more than one DP before the predicate (Gardiner 1998).

We thus have the following basic structure for the clause in Nte’?kepmxcin (50). The External Topic adjoins outside of CP. Wh-words and negation occupy a high position in the clause (for the present purposes it suffices to show them in the same position in CP; the crucial point is that they precede the Internal Topic). The Internal Topic is somewhat lower in the CP domain, occupying a topic projection. The verb and its arguments (the thematic subject and object positions) follow the complementizer, in IP.
5 Word order and binding

So far, I have established that the basic word order in Nle?kepmxcin is VSO, though VOS is possible where pragmatics clearly distinguish subject and object. In matrix clauses, SVO and OVS are possible in External Topic constructions (left dislocated), while only SVO is possible for Internal Topics.

In this section, I look at how binding conditions affect word order within the clause, and across clauses. As also noted for neighbouring St’at’imcets (Matthewson 1993, Matthewson et al. 1993, Demirdache 1997, Davis 1994a, 2006), I will show that in Nle?kepmxcin referential expressions can not be bound within a clause (Condition C), but that this binding condition does not hold across clause boundaries. In this paper, I focus on the co-reference portion of Condition C; an examination of variable binding will have to await future research.

5.1 Condition C holds within the clause

I presented data in section 3 showing that possession marking had to be bound by a co-referential r-expression within the clause (i.e. *His dog bit John). Examples like (8a – repeated below) show that both the underlying VSO word order and pragmatics (people don’t usually bite dogs) are overruled to satisfy this binding requirement: John must be the subject, or stated another way, John must bind co-referent his dog. It is noteworthy that Nle?kepmxcin differs from English in this regard, since, in English, word order (SVO) is not overruled to satisfy any such binding requirement.

In this section I present more data that shows that, within the simple clause, r-expressions must not be bound by c-commanding referents (pro). The examples, adapted from Davis 2006, involve structures with 3rd person possession marking, an -s suffix. The first example involves a complex possessed DP. In (51), John is embedded inside a complex possessed DP e skíxze?-s e Jóhn e snúk*-e?-s, and so John could not be an overt subject. This leaves the possibility that John could be co-referent with a pro subject, but this interpretation is not available.

(51) kán-t-Ø-és xeʔ pro_/m help-trans-3o-3TS dem pro_/m
[dp e skíxze?-s e Jóhn e snúk*-e?-s]
[dp det mother-3sgposs det John_m det friend-3sg.poss]
"He_{kr}_m helped John_{m} ’s mother ’s friend / friend ’s mother."
(*"John helped his mother ’s friend / friend ’s mother.")

The next set of examples involve possessors embedded inside prepositional phrases. Again, since the possessor is embedded in the object DP, it could not possibly be an overt subject; and once again, the interpretation where the possessor is co-referent with a pro subject is unavailable.

(52) a. wew-ifyx xeʔ pro_m/_s [n/t Jánét_k t cítx*-s_k ]
cry[dim]-aut dem pro_m/_s [n/t in det Jánét_k det house-3sg.poss_k]
"S/he_{m} cried at Jánét_k ’s house."
(* "Jánét_k cried at her_k house,” lit. *“pro_k cried at Jánét_k ’s house.”)

b. qnóxʷ xeʔ pro_z/_s [n/t Chríst_x t káh-s ]
sick dem pro_z/_s [n/t in det Chríst_x det car-3sg.poss ]
"Somebody got sick in Chris ’s car."
(* “Chris_x got sick in her_x car,” lit. *“pro_x got sick in Chris_x ’s car”)

The final examples concern possessors embedded inside coordinated DPs (Max in (53a), Janet in (53b)). The logic is similar to the previous examples: since the possessor is embedded in a coordinated DP (Julia and Max in (a), Peter and Janet in (b)), it could not possibly be an overt subject on its own; as predicted by Condition C, the interpretation where a null pro subject is co-referent with the embedded DP is not possible.

(53) a. paq"ú/-st-es xeʔ [t Júlía ?et/pet t Máx_m ]
scare-caus-3o-3TS dem [det Júlía and/with det Max_m]
[t skíxze?-s_m ]
[det mother-3sg.poss_m]
"Julia and Max scared Max ’s mother."
(*"Max_{i} scared Julia and his_{i} mother,” lit. *“pro_{i} scared Julia and Max_{i} ’s mother.”)
Thus, I conclude that r-expressions must not be bound within the clause; that is, the co-reference part of Condition C holds within the simple clause in Nte?kepmxcin.

5.2 Condition C does not hold across clause boundaries

Condition C is not generally respected across at least some clause boundaries in Nte?kepmxcin (noted for Lillooet by Matthewson 1993, Matthewson et al. 1993, Davis 1994a, 2006). There appears to be some speaker variation on this fact, since Matthewson et al. (1993:225-7) report that Condition C is respected across clause boundaries for their Nte?kepmxcin consultant. (54) shows a Condition C violation across an adjunct clause boundary: the DP my friend is inside a “when” clause, yet is bound by pro in the matrix clause.

(54) kàm-t-Ø-éne xe? [CP † cu-xí-t-Ø-ne]
help-trans-3o-1sgTS dem [CP det fix-appl-trans-3o-1sgTS
us † n-snu?e? † kah-s]
3sg.conj det 1sg.poss-friend det car-3sg.poss]
"I helped my friend fix his car."
literally: "I helped pro when I fixed my friend’s car."

In (55-56), there is a Condition C violation across a complement clause boundary: in each case, the subject of the matrix clause is pro, binding a co-referent DP in the complement clause (my friend in (55), and Joe in (56)).

(55) ?ex cú-t [CP k s-x"úy-s n-t-sém-s
prog say-IM [CP irl nom-FUT-3sg.poss give-trans-1sgo-3TS
† n-sínci? tk n-ˈkətnín-tən]
det 1sg.poss-younger.brother obl.irl loc-rodfish-instrument]
“My youngest brother said he was gonna’ give me a fishing rod.”
lit.: “pro, said my youngest brother, was gonna’ give me a fishing rod.”

(56) piláx-t-sm-s xeʔə [CP k s-x"úy-s
tell-trans-1sgo-3TS dem [CP irl nom-FUT-3sg.poss
nes zéw-m † Jóe tk spiʔxáwt]
go dipnet-middle det Joe obl.irl day]
“Joe told me that he was gonna’ go dipnetting tomorrow.”
literally: “pro, told me that Joe was gonna’ go dipnetting tomorrow.”
Finally, Condition C may be violated across utterances joined with the conjunction ρe (54-55). This conjunction introduces a subordinated clause, indicated by the nominalization on the predicate; this nominalization is typical of various subordinated clauses in Nl'e?kemxcin (Kroeber 1997, 1999). In the cases below, a pro DP in the initial conjunct binds an overt DP in the subordinated conjunct (Peter’s dog in (57), John in (58), and Mary in (59)).

(57) ƛ?ék xe?ə ?e s-wé cân-me-s
arrive dem and nom-bark-middle-3sg.poss 
ə sqáqxa-s ɬ Pítah
det dog-3sg.poss det Peter
"Peter’s dog came and started barking."
literally: “pro came and Peter’s dog, started barking.”

(58) ƛ?k-Ø-Ø-es xe? e ƛzúm te syép ?e s-cwúm-s
fall-tr-3o-3TS dem det big obl tree and nom-make-3sgpess
xe? te ƛzúm te s-pəm ə Jón
dem obl big obl nom-burn det John
"John chopped a big tree down and made a big bonfire."
literally: pro cut a big tree down and John made a big bonfire.”

consultant: "it’s not someone else who chopped the tree down"

(59) n-t-ém xe? te cīkn te Bilł
give-tr-PASS dem obl chicken obl Bilł
?e s-kʷukʷ-Ø-Ø-es xe? e Máry
and nom-cook-tr-3o-3TS dem det Mary
"Bill gave some chicken to Mary and she cooked it."

For my consultants, Condition C violations across complement, adjunct or conjoined clause boundaries have been fairly easy to elicit, and are sometimes spontaneously produced. Relative clause boundaries, however, have proven resistant to Condition C effects (as in the English example in (60)).

(60) She*k/m kicked the horse that Maryk bought last week.

This would differentiate relative clauses in Nl'e?kemxcin from other types of subordinate clauses, and differentiate Nl'e?kemxcin from St’at’imcets, where Condition C is not respected across any clause boundary, including relative clauses (Matthewson et al. 1993:225, Davis 2006) – not necessarily a welcome result. This question thus requires further research.

Previous attempts to elicit Condition C violations across relative clause boundaries (61a, 62a) have resulted in consultants either (i) eliminating the Condition C violation by eliminating pro in the matrix clause (61b), or (ii) eliminating the relative clause altogether (62b).
Another question to be addressed is the types of expressions that can act as antecedents for r-expressions across clause boundaries. Davis (2006) showed that, in St’at’imcets (Lillooet Salish), possible antecedents for a referential expression are pro, an emphatic independent pronoun, or 3plural marking; r-expressions, on the other hand, are not possible antecedents for r-expressions.

In N’te’kepmxcin, we have already seen that pro is a possible antecedent for r-expressions in embedded clauses. The emphatic 3rd person pronoun cnit can also serve as an antecedent, or at least can co-occur with pro as an antecedent in the matrix clause.

Finally, as in St’at’imcets, r-expressions are also rejected as antecedents for r-expressions in N’te’kepmxcin.
Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that Nteʔkepmxcin (the Lytton dialect, in any case) has an underlying VSO word order in transitive clauses. VOS is a possible alternate when pragmatics allow, and is forced if the final overt argument of the verb is the possessor of the first. This is because 3rd person possession marking must be bound by its possessor.

Pre-predicatively, Nteʔkepmxcin gives evidence for two further DP positions (as documented by Gardiner 1993, 1998, for Shuswap). The External Topic can host either subject or object, giving SVO or OVS order. The Internal Topic hosts subjects only (as well as themes in passive constructions), giving us another SVO variant.

Finally, I gave evidence that the co-reference portion of Condition C is respected within the clause in Nteʔkepmxcin: r-expressions can not be bound by pro. Across clause boundaries, however, Condition C may be violated, and we find r-expressions in adjunct or complement clauses bound by pro in a matrix clause. Relative clause boundaries have curiously proven more resilient to Condition C violations, an issue that deserves more investigation.

I have given only scant details on the different roles of these various word orders in discourse, and only impressionistic description of phonetic features associated with various positions. However, having mapped out various possibilities for topicalization and focus, these latter details will hopefully be more readily established — a matter that I presently leave, of course, to future research.
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