0. Introduction

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

(1) 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) det-Mary who det-father-3poss 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 preferred.

(3) det-Mary who det-father-3poss like-caus-3abs-3erg det-Mary det-father-3poss Mary likes her father.
(9) sténlí ta-sak’míní k-ník’-n-Ø-s
  what obli-knife irr-cut-tr-3abs-3erg
  What did he cut with the knife?
(10) sótý ta-sqéltn k-kax-t-Ø-és
  who obli-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 obliques. It can be seen that questions are formed with the question stem in initial position (11-12).

(11) sótý k-xí-st-Ø-és
  who irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg
  Whom does he like?
(12) sótý k-xí-st-Ø-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) yexí? xí? yaxéyí x-xí-st-Ø-és
    deic deic deic det-like-caus-3abs-3erg
    She's the one he likes.
(14) nwí?í xí? x-xí-st-Ø-ém
    3emph deic like-caus-3abs-pass
    She's the one that's liked.

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

(15) Mary xí? x-xí-st-Ø-és
    Mary deic like-caus-3abs-3erg
    Mary's the one he likes.
(16) Mary xí? x-xí-st-Ø-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) x-xí-st-Ø-és
    like-caus-3abs-3erg
    He likes her.
(18) x-xí-st-Ø-ém?
    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-a-s/ of the imperfective paradigm. This is shown in a wh-question in (19), a focus construction in (20) and a relative clause in (21).

(19) sótý k-xí-st-Ø-ém (w)és
    who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
    Who likes her?
(20) Mary xí? x-xí-st-Ø-ém (w)és
    Mary deic irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
    Mary likes her?
(21) x-Mary c’únq-s-n-Ø-s x-sqéltn x-xí-st-Ø-ém (w)és
    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 antipassive. However, I would like to claim that with respect to Shuswap the /w-a-s/ construction (19-21) is a focus
passive. (22) is a regular passive whereas (23) is a passive in which the agent is focussed and the predicate takes the clitic /w-as/.

(22) ḥ'ɪ-st-θ-ём ḥa-Mary ɣ-ԛẹʔča-s
like-caus-3abs-intr obl-Mary det-father-3poss
Her father is liked by Mary.

(23) ḥa-Mary ḥ'ɪ-st-θ-ём (w)as ɣ-ԛẹʔča-s
obl-Mary like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl det-father-3poss
It's Mary that her father is liked by.

On the other hand if it is the theme that is focussed in (24) regular verbal morphology is used.

(24) ɣ-ԛẹʔča-s ɣi? ḥ'ɪ-st-θ-ём ḥa-Mary
det-father-3poss deic like-caus-3abs-pass obl-Mary
It's her father that is liked by Mary.

It has been observed (Kroeber 1991) that in some Salish languages when obliques are in initial position they have a tendency to lose their oblique marking. This is consistent with (19) where it is possible to have the oblique marker shown in (25). Similarly in (23) the oblique marker can be omitted (26).

That the overt theme has direct argument marking rather than oblique marking provides evidence that this construction is a passive rather than an antipassive.

(25) ḥa-swɛ̃tɨ k-ɣ'ɪ-st-θ-ём (w)as
obl-who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl
Who (exactly) likes her?

(26) Mary ɣ'ɪ-st-θ-ём (w)as ɣ-ԛẹʔča-s
Mary like-caus-3abs-pass 3incompl det-father-3poss
It's Mary that her father is liked by.

There are other constructions where the target of wh-questions and focus co-occurs with an overt theme (27-28).

(27) swɛ̃tɨ k-ɣ'ɪ-st-θ-ės ɣ-ԛẹʔča-s
who irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg det-father-3poss
Who likes his father?

(28) Mary ɣi? k-ɣ'ɪ-st-θ-ės ɣ-ԛẹʔča-s
Mary deic irr-like-caus-3abs-3erg det-father-3poss
It's Mary who likes her father.

These construction suggest that ergatives can in fact be the target of wh-questions and focus.

Finally, the use of the clitic strategy is not an isolated phenomenon. It is also triggered when temporal and spatial locatives and strong quantifiers are focussed.

(29) tɛʔɛna meʔ kax-t-sf-n (w)as
from this exp give-tr-2acc-1acc 3incompl
I'll give you some of this from this container.

(30) na-čkɛʔ'a? ɣi? m-nfk'-n-θ-s (w)as
ɣ-spɛrn loc-shed deic compl-cut-tr-3abs-3erg 3incompl
det-rope
It's in the shed that he cut the rope.

(31) la-ʔɛ̃xɛwɛʔəs ɨu? nfk'-n-θ-s (w)as
ɣ-spɛrn yesterday deic cut-tr-3abs-3erg 3incompl
det-rope
It's yesterday that he cut the rope.

(32) ɣɛ̃xɛyɛt meʔ kax-t-sf-n (w)as
ta-spaqpeq
ta-sspaqpeq all exp give-tr-2acc-1nom 3incompl
obl-berries
I'm going to give you all the berries.

That the clitic is triggered in focus constructions with strong quantifiers, temporal or spatial locatives as well as with passive agents suggests that the relevant distinction is between direct arguments and obliques.

To summarize, focus position is available to all nominal arguments. Direct arguments of the predicate (the absolutive in 33 and the ergative in 34) are not marked with special verbal morphology whereas obliques (the passive agent in 35 and spatial and temporal locatives in 36-37) have passive morphology and are extended with the clitic sequence /w-as/.

(33) stɛ̃nɨ na-čɪtx ɨu? k-nfk'-n-θ-s
what loc-house deic det-cut-tr-3abs-3erg
What did he cut in the house?
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-k'ax-t-0-és  
    te-sq'eltn  
    compl-give-tr-3abs-3erg  obl-salmon  
    He gave her a salmon.

(39) m-k'ul-m-0  
    te-stuk'cn  
    compl-make-mid-3abs  obl-dipnet  
    He made a dipnet.

(40) m-ni'k'-n-0-s  
    te-sek'mf'n  
    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) st'ëni  k-s-k'ax-t-0-és  
    what  irr-s-give-tr-3abs-3erg  
    What did he give her?

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

(42) st'ëni  k-s-k'ul-m-s  
    what  irr-s-make-mid-3poss  
    What did he make?

(43) st'ëni  k-s-ni'k'-n-0-s  
    what  irr-s-cut-tr-3abs-3erg  
    What did he cut it with?

(44) te-sq'eltn  lu?  l-s-k'ax-t-0-és  
    obl-salmon  deic  det-s-give-tr-3abs-3erg  
    It's a salmon that he gave her?

(45) te-stuk'cn  lu?  l-m-s-k'ul-m-s  
    obl-dipnet  deic  det-comp-s-make-mid-3poss  
    It's a dipnet that he made.

(46) ya?ëna  sak'mf'n  lu?  s-ni'k'-n-0-s  
    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?  r-s-yëwam-s  
    compl-finish  det-s-fish-mid-3poss  
    He's finished dipnetting.

(48) te?  k-s-c-lx-m-st-0-és  
    not  irr-s-hab-know-mid-caus-3abs-3erg  
    He doesn't know.

(49) xa'?it  me?  s-k'ax-t-s-f-n  
    ta-spaq'ag  
    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-ës/ cliticization and s-prefixation. This is shown in the following chart.
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-centered 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) swét' y k-cn-t-ød-étłn
who irr-punch-tr-3abs-1nom
Who did I punch?

(54) swét' y k-cn-t-ød-éx
who irr-punch-tr-3abs-2nom
Who did you punch?

(55) swét' y k-cn-t-ød-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).
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) swětý k-č(u)-n/ččim-s who 1emph punch-tr/1acc-3erg
Who punched me?

(58) swětý k-č(u)-n/čf-s who 1emph punch-tr/2acc-3erg
Who punched you?

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

(59) swětý k-č(u)-nt-θ-ēm 3incompl
who 1emph punch-tr-3abs-pass
Who punched him?

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

(60) nččwa? č(u)-nt-th-ēm 3incompl
1emph punch-tr-3abs-pass
I'm the one who he punched.

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

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

(60) wět k*-e ni 1emph lam-at-ėn? subj
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) newa ni 1emph lam-θ-ema-ʔe.n?
2emph aux look-tr-2obj-1subj
It's you that I looked at.

(62) ?ēnʔa ni qʷ“aq”-oθ-āmʔis-as
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) tswět kʷsa ni? kʷ“ć’-at təm smēysʔ who det aux butcher-tr det deer
Who (feminine) butchered the deer.

(64) nēl le stēnʔ ni qʷ“āqʷ”-at (“qʷ“āqʷ”-at-ʔes)
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) ?ēnʔa ni qʷ“āqʷ”-at (“qʷ“āqʷ”-at-ʔe.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 lám-at-am ?e-ʔe nʔa smēyaʔ spēʔəθ
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) *tswět ni qʷ“āqʷ”-n-ām kʷʔa 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.
It's Mary that her father is liked by.

Who (exactly) likes her?

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) xìl 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) mëc xìl nej
Who saw cl/he
Who did he see?

(73) hë' ix xìl nej
cleft cl/she saw cl/he
It's her that he saw.

(74) woh'tej ix xìl nej
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 /'nli/.

(75) mëc xìl'nì lx
Who saw-suffix cl/her
Who saw her?

(76) hë' nej xìl'nì lx
cleft cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
It's he who saw her.

(77) woh'tej nej xìl'nì lx
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) swë'ty k-xìl-st-Ø-ës 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 xìl xìl-st-Ø-ës
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) swéty k-xmono-st-o-énm
who irr-like-caus-3abs-pass
Who likes her?

(81) Mary x'í? x'mono-st-o-énm
Mary deic irr-like-caus-3abs-pass
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) swéty k-x'mono-st-o-én
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 k-x'mono-st-o-én
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) swéty k-x'mono-st-o-én
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) swéty lu? l-?-s-cut x-Paul k-s-wk-t-o-s
ex ta-s-kûl-m-o (w)as ta-stûcnk
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) swéty lu? l-?-s-cut x-Paul k-s-wk-t-o-s
ex ta-s-kûl-m-s If-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-îx-am-st-o-é|tln
xí? pnhé|n x-Sam
1-m-kûl-n-o-s
(w)as x-stûcnk
hab-know-tr-caus-3abs-1nom
compl-make-tr-3abs-3erg
I know when Sam made a dipnet.
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-nka lu? x-udx"?i-3poss k-wikt-Ø-s Mary
John-evid deic det-sibling-poss 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) swet-nka lu? x-udx"?i-3poss k-wikt-Ø-s 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.
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The following abbreviations have been used: abs (absolutive), ace (accusative), aux (auxiliary), caus (causative), cl (classifier), compl (completive), deic (deictic), det (determiner), emph (emphatic pronoun), erg (ergative), exp
These constructions can also mean 'Her father likes Mary' with disjoint reference. This meaning is not possible with coreference.

These constructions have a coreferential reading. When disjoint reference is intended Shuswap uses an applicative construction with the possessor raising to object.

\[
\begin{align*}
x\text{-Mary} & \quad t\text{-q}c\text{-s} \\
& \quad \text{Mary likes-appl-3abs-pass 3incompl} \\
& \quad \text{Mary likes her father.}
\end{align*}
\]

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

The 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.

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{cn-t-s} & \text{-caucc-pass} \\
\text{punch-tr-1acc-pass} \\
\text{I was punched.} \\
\text{cn-t-sf-t} \\
\text{punch-tr-2acc-pass} \\
\text{You were punched.}
\end{align*}
\]

The following is the singular paradigm for imperfectives:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{w-n} & \quad \text{I am going.} \\
\text{w-axux} & \quad \text{You are going.} \\
\text{w-es} & \quad \text{He is going.}
\end{align*}
\]

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.

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

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