

Pre-Verbal Positions in Shuswap Salish

Dwight Gardiner
Simon Fraser University
SCES/SFU

0. Introduction

This paper presents data arising from recent research on Shuswap Salish.¹ It is of particular interest that Shuswap, a surface VSO language displays three pre-verbal positions, each with distinct syntactic properties. This is shown in (1).

- (1) γ -Mary swétú γ -qé?čə-s k-xʷi-st-θ-és²
det-Mary who det-father-3poss irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg
Mary, who does her father like?

I will refer to these positions as the pre-verbal position, the focus position and the left-dislocation position. The preverbal position immediately precedes the predicate. It is discussed in section (1). The focus position is the site of contrastive focus and information-seeking questions. This is discussed in section (2). The left-dislocation position occurs to the extreme left of the construction. It as well as a right-dislocation position is discussed in section (3). Finally in section (4) I discuss the syntactic properties of these positions. In particular I make a number of observations concerning gaps, long distance dependencies, and island effects in order to determine whether these pre-verbal positions involve movement or whether the nominals that occur in them are base-generated. Section (5) concludes the paper.

1. Pre-verbal Position

Word order is extremely free in Shuswap. The basic word order is VSO. This is shown in (2).

- (2) xʷi-st-θ-és γ -Mary γ -qé?čə-s
like-caus-3abs-3erg det-Mary det-father-3poss
Mary likes her father.

All of the other possible word orders are available in Shuswap as shown in (3). They all have the interpretation 'Mary likes her father' although discourse factors will determine which order is preferred³.

- (3) xʷistés γ -Mary γ -qé?čəs (VSO)
xʷistés γ -qé?čəs γ -Mary (VOS)
 γ -Mary xʷistés γ -qé?čəs (SVO)
 γ -qé?čəs xʷistés γ -Mary (OVS)
 γ -Mary γ -qé?čəs xʷistés (SOV)
 γ -qé?čəs γ -Mary xʷistés (OSV)

In (4-5) I show that pre-verbal position is available for both subjects and objects.

- (4) γ -Mary xʷi-st-θ-és γ -qé?čə-s
det-Mary like-caus-3abs-3erg det-father-3poss
Mary likes her father.
(5) γ -qé?čə-s xʷi-st-θ-és γ -Mary
det-father-3poss like-caus-3abs-3erg det-Mary
Mary likes her father.

It is not always clear whether nominals are in pre-verbal or focus position⁴. In (6-7) the constructions have nominals in both positions. The first nominal is in focus position accompanied by a deitic particle⁵. The second nominal in (6) is therefore in pre-verbal position and this nominal is the subject.

- (6) qé?čə-s xɪ? γ -Mary xʷi-st-θ-és
father-3poss deic det-Mary like-caus-3abs-3erg
It's her father that Mary likes?

In (7) the subject is in focus position and the pre-verbal position is occupied by the object.

- (7) Mary xɪ? γ -qé?čə-s xʷi-st-θ-és
Mary deic det-father-3poss like-caus-3abs-3erg
It's Mary there, she likes her father.

Under the assumption that question words occur in focus position, the following constructions establish that pre-verbal position is available to locatives (8), instruments (9) and themes of ditransitives (10).

- (8) stémi nə-čitxʷ k-ník'-n-θ-s
what loc-house irr-cut-tr-3abs-3erg
What did he cut in the house?

(9) stémi tə-səkʷmín k-ník'-n-θ-s
 what obl-knife irr-cut-tr-3abs-3erg
 What did he cut with the knife?

(10) swétý tə-sqéltn k-kəx-t-θ-és
 who obl-salmon irr-give-tr-3abs-3erg
 Who did he give the salmon?

Pre-verbal position appears available for most nominals in Shuswap and does not appear to be involved in the focus system. It is a position that is local and does not have distinct morphological properties such as requiring special verbal marking. This is not the case with the focus position.

2. Focus Position

The focus position is the site of contrastive focus and information-seeking questions. This position distinguishes direct arguments from obliques⁶. It can be seen that questions are formed with the question stem in initial position (11-12).

(11) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-és
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg
 Whom does he like?

(12) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-ém
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass
 Who is liked?

Constructions with either emphatic or deictic pronouns also have the focussed element in this position (13-14).

(13) yəxíʔ xiʔ yəxéy x-xʷi-st-θ-és
 deic deic deic det-like-caus-3abs-3erg
 She's the one he likes.

(14) nwiʔs xiʔ xʷi-st-θ-ém
 3emph deic like-caus-3abs-pass
 She's the one that's liked.

Focussed nominals behave the same way (15-16).

(15) Mary xiʔ xʷi-st-θ-és
 Mary deic like-caus-3abs-3erg
 Mary's the one he likes.

(16) Mary xiʔ xʷi-st-θ-ém
 Mary deic like-caus-3abs-pass
 Mary's the one that is liked?

When it is the absolutive that is questioned or focussed in active or in impersonal passives the verbal morphology is the same as in non-questions (17-18). These constructions constitute complete clauses.

(17) xʷi-st-θ-és
 like-caus-3abs-3erg
 He likes her.

(18) xʷi-st-θ-émʔ
 like-caus-3abs-pass
 She is liked.

It is not possible to directly question, focus or form a relative on the ergative argument in (17). The predicate has passive morphology similar to the impersonal passive in (18) and is then extended with the third person clitic sequence /w-əs/ of the imperfective paradigm.⁸ This is shown in a wh-question in (19), a focus construction in (20) and a relative clause in (21).

(19) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-ém (w)əs
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Who likes her?

(20) Mary xiʔ xʷi-st-θ-ém w)əs
 Mary deic irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Mary likes her?

(21) x-Mary c'úmqs-n-θ-s x-sqélmx x-xʷi-st-θ-ém
 (w)əs
 det-Mary kiss-tr-3abs-3erg det-man det-like-caus-3abs-pass
 3incompl
 Mary kissed the man who likes her?

2.1 A Passive Analysis

The Shuswap wh-question construction is similar to a construction in Mayan that is often referred to as a focus antipassive⁹. However, I would like to claim that with respect to Shuswap the /w-əs/ construction (19-21) is a focus

(34) swétý k-ník'-n-Ø-s ʒ-spéc'n
 Who irr-cut-fc-3abs-3erg det-rope
 Who cut the rope?

(35) swétý næ-čitx^w lu? k-ník'-nt-Ø-m (w)əs
 who loc-house deic det-cut-tr-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Who cut it in the house?

(36) x'hé?n k-ník'-nt-Ø-m (w)əs
 where det-cut-tr-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Where did he cut it?

(37) pnhé?n k-ník'-nt-Ø-m (w)əs
 when det-cut-tr-3abs-pass 3incompl
 When did he cut it?

In section 2.2 I discuss a second strategy for questioning or focussing obliques.

2.2 S-Prefixation: A Second Strategy for Obliques

There is an additional strategy that is available for questioning or focussing obliques. In (38-40) I show a ditransitive, a middle, and an instrumental construction.

(38) m-kəx-t-Ø-és tə-sqléltɲ
 compl-give-tr-3abs-3erg obl-salmon
 He gave her a salmon.

(39) m-k'úl-m-Ø tə-stúkčɲ
 compl-make-mid-3abs obl-dipnet
 He made a dipnet.

(40) m-ník'-n-Ø-s tə-sək^wmíh
 compl-cut-tr-3abs-3erg obl-knife
 He cut it with a knife.

When the target of the wh-question (41-43) is the theme of a ditransitive, the theme of a middle construction, or an instrumental the predicate takes an /s-/ prefix.

(41) stémi k-s-kəx-t-Ø-és
 what irr-s-give-tr-3abs-3erg
 What did he give her?

(42) stémi k-s-k'úl-m-s
 what irr-s-make-mid-3poss
 What did he make?

(43) stémi k-s-ník'-n-Ø-s
 what irr-s-cut-tr-3abs-3erg
 What did he cut it with?

This is also consistent with the focus constructions in (44-46.)

(44) tə-sqléltɲ lu? l-s-kəx-t-Ø-és
 obl-salmon deic det-s-give-tr-3abs-3erg
 It's a salmon that he gave her?

(45) tə-stúkčɲ lu? l-m-s-k'úl-m-s
 obl-dipnet deic det-comp-s-make-mid-3poss
 It's a dipnet that he made.

(46) yə?éna sək^wmíh lu? s-ník'-n-Ø-s ʒ-spéc'n
 deic knife deic s-cut-tr-3abs-3erg det-rope
 It was the knife that he cut the rope with.

This is also the strategy with adverbial predicates, negatives, and weak quantifiers.

(47) m-wi? ʒ-s-yéw-əm-s
 compl-finish det-s-fish-mid-3poss
 He's finished dipnetting.

(48) tə? k-s-č-lx-m-st-Ø-és
 not irr-s-hab-know-mid-caus-3abs-3erg
 He doesn't know.

(49) x^w?it mɛ? s-kəx-t-sí-n tə-spəqpəq
 many exp s-give-tr-2acc-1nom obl-berries
 I'm going to give you lots of berries.

2.3 Summary

Focus position is characterized by a distinction between direct and oblique arguments. Oblique arguments do not have a unified strategy of verbal marking in wh-quantification and contrastive focus but distribute across /w-əs/ cliticization and s-prefixation. This is shown in the following chart.

	Direct	w-ə-s	s-
Absolutives	+	-	-
Ergatives	+	-	-
Passive agents	-	+	-
Locatives	-	+	-
Quantifiers			
Strong (all)	-	+	-
Instrumentals	-	+	+
Quantifiers			
Weak (many)	-	-	+
Themes			
middles	-	-	+
ditrans	-	-	+
Adverbials	-	-	+

3 Dislocation Constructions

There is evidence of dislocation constructions in Shuswap. I note these constructions but will not have much to say regarding their syntax. The first nominal in (50) is in left-dislocation position.

- (50) ʔ-Mary swétú ʔ-qéʔčə-s k-xʷi-st-θ-és
 det-Mary who det-father-3poss det-like-caus-3abs-3erg
 Mary, who does her father like?

This position appears to be available to all nominals. In (51) a locative is in the left-dislocation position.

- (51) nə-čitxʷ stémi luʔ k-ník'-n-θ-s
 loc-house what deic det-cut-tr-3abs-3erg
 In the house, what did he cut?

Finally, I note that (52) appears to be a right-dislocation construction.

- (52) xʷi-st-θ-és ʔ-qéʔčə-s ʔ-Mary
 like-caus-3abs-3erg det-father-3poss det-Mary
 Mary likes her father.

4 Observations Towards a Syntax of Pre-verbal Positions

In this section I make some preliminary observations with respect to the syntactic properties of pre-verbal position in Shuswap. Do the nominals that occur in these positions display any of the diagnostics of movement? In (4.1) I discuss whether focus position is related to syntactic gaps and draw on some comparative data from Coast Salish Halkomelem. It will be argued that unlike Halkomelem which apparently has syntactic gaps in subject-centered constructions, Shuswap lacks gaps entirely and has a focus passive strategy of cliticization. This clitic strategy is related to a disambiguation strategy, the peripheral gap constraint, in section (4.2). Long distance extraction is discussed in (4.3). I finish with some observations regarding island effects in (4.4) and possessor extraction in (4.5). These constructions provide evidence that Shuswap lacks syntactic movement.

4.1 Gaps

It has long been assumed that the Salish wh-question construction involves the base-generation of the stem in predicate-initial position. This is apparently a cleft construction. Does the cleft involve movement? There appears to be a parametricization in Salish along these lines.

Shuswap question constructions that are object-centered¹⁰ have the wh-stem related to the object in the dependent clause. For third person this will be the absolutive argument as shown in (53-55).

- (53) swétú k-čn-t-θ-é[t]n
 who irr-punch-tr-3abs-1nom
 Who did I punch?

- (54) swétú k-čn-t-θ-éx
 who irr-punch-tr-3abs-2nom
 Who did you punch?

- (55) swétú k-čn-t-θ-és
 who irr-punch-tr-3abs-3nom
 Who did he punch?

Although it is not clear that the absolutive is marked for agreement in the wh-constructions in (53-55), when first or second person accusative arguments are focussed using an emphatic pronoun, the predicate is marked for agreement (56).

(56) nčéčwə? čn-čé[č]m-s
 1emph punch-tr/1acc-3erg
 I'm the one who he punched.

In subject-centered wh-constructions the wh-stem is related to the subject of the dependent clause. This is the ergative argument, and as can be seen in (57-58), ergatives are marked for agreement on the predicate.

(57) swétý k-č(u)-n/čé[č]m-s
 who irr-punch-tr/1acc-3erg
 Who punched me?

(58) swétý k-č(u)-n/čí-s
 who irr-punch-tr/2acc-3erg
 Who punched you?

Third person involves the focus passive strategy of cliticization (59).

(59) swétý k-č(u)-nt-Ø-ém (w)əs
 who irr-punch-tr-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Who punched him?

It is also possible to focus non-third person emphatic pronouns using this strategy (60).

(60) nčéčwə? č(u)-nt-Ø-ém (w)əs
 1emph punch-tr-3abs-pass 3incompl
 I'm who punched him.

Shuswap lacks gaps in dependent clauses although there appears to be some variation in Salish.

The Coast Salish language Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988) displays similar behaviour with wh-questions in object-centered constructions. The absolutive is not marked for agreement (60).

(60) wét kʷə ni ləm-ət-?é.n?
 who det aux see-tr-1ssub
 What did I see?

Focus constructions in (61-62) show that when the accusative is focussed in object-centered constructions, the predicate is marked for agreement.

(61) nəwə ni ləm-θ-amə-?e.n?
 2emph aux look-tr-2obj-1subj
 It's you that I looked at.

(62) ?é.n?θə ni qʷàqʷ-əθ-ám?š-əs
 1emph aux club-tr-1obj-3subj
 It's me who he clubbed.

On the other hand in subject-centered constructions there do appear to be gaps. Notice the lack of ergative marking for third person in (63-64).

(63) ʔwét kʷsə ni? kʷíc'-ət t^θə smáyaθ
 who det aux butcher-tr det deer
 Who (feminine) butchered the deer.

(64) níʔ ʔə sténi? ni qʷáqʷ-ət (*qʷáqʷ-ət-əs)
 3emph det woman aux club-tr
 It's the woman who clubbed it.

Nominative marking is also impossible in the focus construction in (65).

(65) ?é.n?θə ni qʷàqʷ-ət (*qʷàqʷ-ət-?é.n?)
 1emph aux club-tr
 I'm the one who clubbed it.

Interestingly from the comparative picture Halkomelem also forbids first and second person passive agents.

(66) *ni ləm-ət-əm ?ə-x' ?é.n?θə t^θə spé?əθ
 aux look-tr-intr obl-det 1emph det bear
 (The bear was looked at by me.)

Questions formed on third person passives agents are apparently also forbidden.

(67) *ʔwét ni qʷàqʷ-n-ám kʷθə Bob
 who aux club-l.c.tr-intr det Bob
 (Who was Bob punched by?)

It is reasonable to relate the presence of gaps in these Halkomelem constructions to the restrictions on passives.

In Shuswap it is possible to question or focus passive agents and as can be seen in (68-70) the strategy is linked to cliticization.

(68) tə-Mary xʷi-st-θ-ém (w)əs
 ʒə-qé?čə-s
 obl-Mary like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
 det-father-her
 It's Mary that her father is liked by.

(69) tə-swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-ém (w)əs
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Who (exactly) likes her?

(70) nčéčwə? č(u)-nt-θ-ém (w)əs
 1emph punch-tr-3abs-pass 3incompl
 I'm who punched him.

In Shuswap the lack of gaps is related to the ability to focus passive agents via cliticization.

4.2 Peripheral Gaps

It was argued that the clitic strategy licenced focus and wh-quantification of a particular class of obliques including passive agents. Why the passive is resorted to and must be resorted to in certain constructions needs an explanation.

Jacaltec (Craig 1976) a Mayan language has a similar construction in which extracted subjects behave differently than objects. This is apparently a disambiguation strategy in Jacaltec. Transitive clause structure is shown in (71).

(71) xil naj ix
 saw cl/he cl/her
 He saw her.

In (72-74) third person pronominal objects are extracted in question, cleft, and relative clause constructions and there is no mark on the verb.

(72) mac xil naj
 Who saw cl/he
 Who did he see?

(73) ha' ix xil naj
 cleft cl/she saw cl/he
 It's her that he saw.

(74) wohtaj ix xil naj
 I know cl/her saw cl/he
 I know the woman that he saw.

In (75-77), the reference to subjects requires additional marking on the verb, taking the suffix /-ni/.

(75) mac x'il-ni ix
 Who saw-suffix cl/her
 Who saw her?

(76) ha' naj x'il-ni ix
 cleft cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
 It's he who saw her.

(77) wohtaj naj x'il-ni ix
 I know cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
 I know the man who saw her.

Woolford (1991) argues that this is the result of a peripheral gap constraint in which the first of two adjacent nominals cannot be extracted.

In Shuswap this prediction is initially supported. I assume that the basic word order in Shuswap is VSO and that pronominal arguments are represented as 'pro'. This is shown in (78).

(78) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-és pro pro
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg 3 3
 Whom does he like?
 *Who likes him?

The peripheral gap constraint predicts that the wh-stem can only be related to the absolutive argument in (78) and this is the case. This is also supported in (79) where the nominal in focus position is related to the absolutive argument and not the ergative argument.

(79) Mary ʒi? xʷi-st-θ-és
 Mary deic like-caus-3abs-3erg
 Mary's the one that is liked?
 *Mary likes him.

The peripheral gap constraint also predicts that the ergative argument cannot be extracted at all or that there be an alternate strategy. As can be seen in (80-81) Shuswap uses the focus passive.

(80) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-ém (w)əs
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Who likes her?

(81) Mary xi? xʷi-st-θ-ém (w)əs
 Mary deic irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
 Mary likes her?

When there is an overt nominal argument no disambiguation strategy is forced given that the two arguments do not share the same features. The construction in (82) is truly ambiguous.

(82) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-és x-Mary
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg det-Mary
 Who likes Mary?
 Who does Mary like?

When there is a nominal argument in pre-verbal position the construction is also ambiguous (83).

(83) x-John xʷi-st-θ-és x-Mary
 det-John like-caus-3abs-3erg det-Mary
 John likes Mary.
 Mary likes John.

This last construction constitutes a problem for the peripheral gap constraint. It may be possible to argue that the nominal in pre-verbal position is a base-generated adjunct and is therefore not an argument of the predicate. A more radical approach would be to claim that Shuswap is a pronominal argument language (Baker 1991, Jelinek 1984) and that all nominals are adjuncts. The following construction (84) suggests that at least some nominals are capable of being arguments.

(84) swétý k-xʷi-st-θ-és x-Mary
 who irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg det-Mary
 Who likes Mary?
 Who does Mary like?

The claim that the final nominal in (84) is a base-generated adjunct would lead to the prediction that the focus strategy would be used and this is not supported.

One further line of research that is appealing is to propose that an animacy hierarchy is involved. This approach is more appealing than one based on linear precedence. I leave this for future research.

4.3 Long Distance Dependencies

Shuswap exhibits a range of constructions that involve long distance dependencies that bear on the issue of movement. These constructions are similar to ones found in Chamorro which Chung (1982) calls Wh-Agreement. In these constructions a nominal in pre-verbal position is related to a clause across a number of intermediate clauses. The intermediate clauses optionally involve s-prefixation. In (85-86) the wh-stem is related to the agent of a middle and the theme of a middle respectively.

(85) swétý lu? l-?-s-čut x-Paul k-s-wik-t-θ-s
 ex tə-s-k'úl-m-θ (w)əs tə-stúkčn
 who deic det-2poss-s-say det-Paul irr-s-see-tr-3abs-3erg
 exist obl-s-make-mid-3abs 3incompl det-dipnet
 Who was it you said Paul saw making a dipnet?

(86) stémi lu? l-?-s-čut x-Paul k-s-wik-t-θ-s
 ex tə-s-k'úl-m-s x-Sam
 who deic det-2poss-s-say det-Paul irr-s-see-tr-3abs-3erg
 exist obl-s-make-mid-3poss det-Sam
 What did you say Paul saw Sam making?

Wh-agreement may be taken as evidence of successive cyclic movement of the wh-stem. Alternate accounts are also available however that do not involve movement. The wh-stem may be base generated in predicate initial position and form a government chain (Cinque, 1990) with the clause that it is related to through antecedent government.

4.4 Island Effects

The presence of island constructions is generally taken as evidence of movement. (87) has a wh-adjunct clause and as can be seen by (88) it is not possible to relate the wh-stem with the adjunct.

(87) č-lx-am-st-θ-é{t}n xi? pnhé?n x-Sam
 l-m-k'úl-n-θ-s (w)əs x-stúkčn
 hab-know-intr-caus-3abs-1nom deic when det-Sam det-
 compl-make-tr-3abs-3erg 3incompl det-dipnet
 I know when Sam made a dipnet.

(88) *stémi č-lx-am-st-θ-é(t)n xi? pnhé?n
 x-Sam k-m-k'ú1-n-θ-s (w)əs when
 what hab-know-intr-caus-3abs-1nom deic when
 det-Sam irr-compl-make-tr-3abs-3erg 3incompl
 (*What was it I know when Sam made?)

The ungrammaticality of (88) may constitute important evidence that movement is implicated, although again there are alternate accounts. One line of argument would be that Shuswap does not accept multiple quantifiers and that no adjunct/argument asymmetry is involved in the ungrammaticality of (88).

4.5 Possessor Extraction

The potential lack of asymmetries with arguments/adjuncts observed in section (4.4) also may be observed with respect to the lack of subject/object asymmetries in possessor extraction. It is possible to extract possessors from either subject or object arguments.

(89) John-nkə lu? x-úq'í?-s k-wikt-θ-s x-Mary
 John-evid deic det-sibling-3poss irr-see-3abs-3erg det-Mary
 It must have been John's brother who punched Mary.
 It must have been John's brother who Mary punched.

(90) swét-nkə lu? x-úq'í?-s k-wikt-θ-s x-Mary
 who-evid deic det-sibling-poss irr-see-3abs-3erg det-Mary
 I wonder who's brother punched Mary.
 I wonder who's brother Mary punched.

Both (89-90) are ambiguous in that the possessor in focus position may be related to either the subject or object arguments. This follows from the ability of the predicate to govern both of these positions. Further, these constructions indicate that there is variation from Halkomelem where apparently only absolutive possessors can be extracted (Gerds 1988).

5.0 Conclusion

In this paper I have presented evidence that there are three pre-verbal positions that are available in the grammar of Shuswap and that these have distinct syntactic properties. The left dislocation position and the pre-verbal position are available to all nominals without special verbal morphology whereas focus position distinguishes direct arguments from obliques. Obliques may be focussed using either the clitic strategy or s-prefixation depending on the type of oblique. Finally I have made a number of observations regarding the syntactic

properties of these positions, looking in particular at the status of focus position. The apparent lack of syntactic gaps, island effects and structural asymmetries suggests that an account that base-generates elements in this position is the preferred one.

References

- Baker, Mark. 1991. On Some Subject/Object Non-Assymetries in Mohawk. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 537-577.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra. 1982. Unbounded Dependencies in Chamorro grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 39-77.
- Craig, Collette G. 1976. "Properties of Basic and Derived Subjects in Jacalteco" in *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press.
- Davies, William and L.E. Sam-Cholop. 1990. "K'iche' and the Structure of Antipassive," *Language* 66, 522-549.
- Gardiner, Dwight and R. Saunders. 1992. "Split Ergativity in Shuswap Salish," *Amerindia* 16.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. "Empty Categories, Case and Configurationality" *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2, 39-76.
- Kuipers, Aert. 1974. *The Shuswap Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1991. "VP-Internal Subjects," *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 503-540.

¹Shuswap is spoken on the Interior Plateau of British Columbia and is the northernmost member of the Interior Salish language family. It is a predicate-initial language with a system of pronominal person marking on the predicate. Shuswap is spoken with several minor dialectal differences. The data in this paper is representative of the Deadman's Creek/Kamloops area. I would like to thank the many speakers who have helped me to understand their language, in particular, Leslie Jules of Kamloops, Mona Jules of Chu Chua, and Basile Deneau of Skeetchestn. I would also like to thank Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Henry Davis, Mandy Jimmie, and M. Dale Kinkade for participating in a working group on the syntax of Shuswap and for helpful comments on a presentation of this data. Ross Saunders has also provided considerable advice and support. Any errors however, remain with the author. Research for some of this work has been funded by the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Fund, and the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society.

²The following abbreviations have been used: abs (absolutive), acc (accusative), aux (auxiliary), caus (causative), cl (classifier), compl (completive), deic (deictic), det (determiner), emph (emphatic pronoun), erg (ergative), exp

(expectational), hab (habitual), incompl (incompletive), intr (intransitive), irr (irrealis), inv (invisible), l.c. tr (limited control transitive), loc (locative), mid (middle), nom (nominative), obj (object), obl (oblique), pass (passive), poss (possessive), qu (question), [...] (reduplication), ssubj (singular subject), tr (transitive).

³These constructions can also mean 'Her father likes Mary' with disjoint reference. This meaning is not possible with coreference.

⁴(4-5) have a coreferential reading. When disjoint reference is intended Shuswap uses an applicative construction with the possessor raising to object.

ʔ-Mary xʷi-xít-θ-m (w)əs
 tə-qéʔčə-s
 Mary likes-appl-3abs-pass 3incompl
 obl-father-3
 Mary_i likes her_j father.

⁵I assume that focus constructions like (6) as well as wh-questions are clefts. The deictic particle that follows them is optional.

⁶The distinction between direct argument and oblique can be best seen in the verbal morphology. Direct arguments trigger agreement morphology or are clitics. Obliques are not marked for agreement on the predicate. Direct argument nominals are typically marked by proclitics linked to the verbal morphology. Obliques carry a set of inherent case markers that indicate their semantic relation to the clause.

⁷I posit a third person absolutive following the causative on the basis of first and second person:

čn-t-sé[č]l-m
 punch-tr-1acc-pass
 I was punched.
 čn-t-sí-t
 punch-tr-2acc-pass
 You were punched.

⁸The following is the singular paradigm for imperfectives:

xʔε[ʔ]k w-n I am going.
 xʔεk w-əxux You are going.
 xʔεk w-əs He is going.

The /w-/ remains with elements that can be labialized, otherwise it drops. In the neighboring Thompson language third person is pronounced [us]. See Gardiner and Saunders (1992) for discussion of this form.

⁹See Davies and Sam-Cholop (1990) for discussion and references.

¹⁰The terms subject-centered and object-centered are from Kuipers (1974).