A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON WORD ORDER IN NORTHERN INTERIOR SALISH

Dwight Gardiner, Simon Fraser University
Lisa Matthewson, University of British Columbia
Henry Davis, University of British Columbia

This paper is a comparative look at word order in the Northern Interior Salish languages, Nlakapamuxcín (Thompson), Secwepemctsín (Shuswap), and St'át'imcets (Lillooet).[1] We wish to provide data on word order within the NP and the clause in order to establish where alternate word orders are possible.[2] We show that the three languages all permit extensive reordering of nominals in post -predicate position but differ in the number of nominals permitted before the predicate. NL and SE permit two or more nominals before the predicate and share a clitic strategy that is associated with focus. ST' on the other hand is far more conservative, permitting a single focused nominal before the predicate. The data suggest interesting parameters that distinguish the three languages in spite of common word order properties.

The languages are head-marking languages with arguments being referenced by affixes and clitics on the predicate. This raises questions regarding the syntactic status of arguments. If the languages are Pronominal Argument languages in the sense of Jelinek (1984) and Baker (1991) it is predicted that nominals when present will be base-generated as adjuncts and may be freely ordered. The question is an important one but beyond the scope of this paper (though see Matthewson, Davis and Gardiner 1993). Future research will have to ascertain whether word order freedom is the result of base-generated adjunction as proposed by Baker, or of syntactic scrambling processes. It is also an important issue for the future to determine the extent that word order is a result of discourse mediated processes.

1.0 Noun Phrases

In this section we discuss the word order properties of possessive, relative clause and adjectival constructions.

1.1 Possessive Constructions

In all three NIS languages it is possible to have the head and possessor freely ordered in possessive constructions. It is also possible to prepose the entire possessive construction as a constituent. NL and SE but not ST' permit the possessor to be discontinous from its head. These are potential cases of possessor extraction. In SE this process is freer than in NL where the ability to extract the possessor is limited to intransitive constructions. The process is further limited by the lexical status of the intransitive predicate. In SE the possessor can also be left-dislocated.

[1] We would like to thank the many speakers who have helped us to understand their languages. Dorothy Ursaki of Spences Bridge has provided the Nlakapamuxcín data. The late Leslie Jules of Kamloops, Mona Jules of Chu Chua, Basile Deneau and Annie May Jules of Skeetchestn have provided the Secwepemctsín data. Beverley Frank of Sek'wel'was, Rose Whitley of T'it'q'et and Gertrude Ned of Caclep have contributed the St'át'imcets data. Much of the material here was originally presented to the Salish Syntax Working Group at UBC; we would like to thank M. Dale Kinkade, Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Peter Jacobs, and other participants for their valuable input. Mistakes, of course, are our own. Research for some of the Secwepemctsín fieldwork has been funded by the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Fund and the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society. Research on St'át'imcets has been funded by SSHRCC Grant 410-92-1629 to Patricia Shaw.

Abbreviations: NIS Northern Interior Salish, NL Nlakapamuxcín, SE Secwepemctsín, ST' St'át'imcets, Appl applicative, Caus caustative, Conj conjunctive, Deic deictic, Det determiner, Erg ergative, Foc focus, Hab habitual, Loc locative, Ob object, Obl oblique, Part particle, Pass passive, Po possessive, Pst past, Qu question, s singular, Su subject, Tr transitive, Unr unrealized.

[2] We limit our discussion, thus ignoring many properties of word order such as determiners which must precede the NP and second position clitics.

1.1.1 NL

In NL the head and the possessor in possessive constructions can be freely ordered.

(1) a. ʕʷáċama ɬ John ɬ sqáqxaʔs
barked Det John Det dog-3Po
John's dog barked.

b. ʕʷáċama ɬ sqáqxaʔs ɬ John

The entire possessive construction can be preposed as shown in (2).

(2) a. ɬ John ɬ sqáqxaʔ-s ʕʷáċama

b. ɬ sqáqxaʔs ɬ John ʕʷáċama

In intransitive constructions the possessor can prepose, stranding the head (3-4). However the head cannot prepose and strand the possessor.

(3) a. ɬ John ʕʷáċama ɬ sqáqxaʔs

b. *ɬ sqáqxaʔs ʕʷáċama ɬ John

(4) ha John x̲zum ha čítxʷ-s
Dir John big Dir house-3Po
John's house is big.

This phenomenon appears to be sensitive to lexical features of the predicate in NL. The predicate ʕʷáċama 'bark' although allowing an NP possessor to be preposed, will not allow a Wh possessor to strand the head. Similarly the predicate qʷčiyx 'leave' doesn't allow a Wh possessor to extract in (6). The predicate x̲zum 'big' on the other hand permits both NP possessors and Wh possessors to be preposed.

(5) *swat k ʕʷáċama k sqáqxaʔs[3]
Whose dog barked?

(6) *swat k qʷčiyx k sqáqxaʔs
Whose dog left?

[3] The standard way to ask the question in NL is:
swat pəɬsqáqxaʔ kəx ʕʷáċama

(7) swat k x̲zum k čítx^{w}s
Whose house is big?

The distinction appears to be along the lines of individual level versus stage level predicates (Diesing 1992).

Long Distance Extraction is not possible in NL either out of complements (8) or adjuncts (9).

(8) *ɬ John čut kən ʕwáċama ɬ sqáqxa?-s
Det John say 1sSu bark Det dog-3Po
John, I said that his dog barked.

(9) *ɬ John čut k^{w} ṅ ha pi?stá? us ha zóq^{w} us k sqáċza?-s
Det John say 2sSu Qu Dir when Conj Dir die Conj Unr dog-3Po
John, did you say when his father died?

In transitive constructions in NL , the possessor cannot be separated from the head; contrast (10a) with (10b-d) and (11):

(10) a. ɬ John ha skíxza?-s wík-t-s ɬa ƛ̓o?sqáyx^{w}
Det John Dir mother-3Po see-Tr-3Erg Det man
John's mother saw the man.
b. *ɬ John wíkts ha skíxza?s ɬa ƛ̓o?sqáyx^{w}
c. *ɬ John wíkts ɬa ƛ̓o?sqáyx^{w} ha skíxza?s
d. *wíkts ɬ John ɬa ƛ̓o?sqáyx^{w} ha skíxza?s

(11) a. *ɬ John wík-t-na ɬ sqáċza?-s
Det John see-Tr-1sSu Det father-3Po
I saw John's father.
b. ??ɬ John wíkt-səm-s ɬ skíxza?-s
Det John see-tr-1sOb-3Erg Det mother-3Po
John's mother saw me.

Possessors cannot appear to the left of the question stem.

(12) *ɬ John swat k wík-t-əm us k sqáċza?-s
Det John who Unr see-Tr-Pass Conj Unr father-3Po
Who saw John's father?

(13) *ɬ John swat k mi?xa-t-ás ɬ sqáqxa?-s
Det John who Unr kick-Tr-3Erg Det dog-3Po
Who did John's dog bite?

1.1.2 SE

SE permits both head/possessor and possessor/head orders in possessive constructions.

(14) a. m-x^{w}ém ɤ-John ɤ-sqéx̣ə-s
Pst-bark Det-John Det-dog-3Po
John's dog barked.
b. m-x^{w}ém ɤ-sqéx̣əs ɤ-John

(15) x̣yum ɤ-čitx^{w}-s ɤ-John
big Det-house-3Po Det-John
John's house is big.

The entire possessive construction can be preposed as a constituent.

(16) a. ɤ-John ɤ-sqéx̣əs m-x^{w}ém
b. ɤ-sqéx̣əs ɤ-John m-x^{w}ém

As in NL the possessor can prepose stranding the head (17a-18), but the head cannot prepose stranding the possessor (17b).

(17) a. ɤ-John m-x^{w}ém ɤ-sqéx̣əs
b. *ɤ-sqéx̣əs m-x^{w}ém ɤ-John

(18) ɤ-John x̣yum ɤ-čitx^{w}s

SE differs from NL in allowing Wh possessors of all predicates to precede the predicate and be discontinuous from the head.

(19) a. swétu̓ k-sqéx̣əs k-x^{w}ém
b. swétu̓ k-x^{w}ém k-sqéx̣əs
Whose dog barked.

(20) a. swétu̓ k-čitx^{w}s k-x̣yum
b. swétu̓ k-x̣yum k-čitx^{w}s
Whose house is big?

It appears to be possible to extract a possessor out of a complement clause in SE (21-22) but not out of an adjunct clause (23-24).

(21) ?ɤ-John m-čut-kn m-x^{w}ém ɤ-sqéx̣ə-s
Det-John Pst-said-1sSu Pst-bark Det-dog-3Po
John, I said that his dog barked.

(22) ɤ-John yéywəs-(n)-n ex tə x^{w}ém əs l-sqéx̣ə-s
yəɤí? wl plqéq'lx-kn
Det-John annoyed-Tr-1sSu exist obl bark Conj Det-dog-3Po
Deic Part returned-1sSu
John, I was annoyed with his dog's barking, that's why I went home.

(23) *ɤ-John m-čut-n-k pnhé?n k-m-q^{w}čéq əs ɤ-qé?čə-s
Det-John Pst-say-Qu-2sSu when Unr-Pst-die Conj Det-father-3Po
John, did you say when his father died?

(24) *l-John q^{w}əčéč-k l-x^{w}éyməs ɤ-sqéxə-s
Det-John leave-2sSu Det-bark Det-dog-3Po
You left when John's dog barked.

Wh possessors can be extracted out of complements.

(25) swétỳ l-čut-k k-sx^{w}éym k-sqéxə-s
who Det-say-2sSu Unr-s-bark Unr-dog-3Po
Who was it that you said that his dog barked?

(26) swétỳ l-čut-k k-xyum k-čitx^{w}-s
who Det-say-2sSu Unr-big Unr-house-3Po
Who was it that you said had a big house?

SE permits apparent extraction out of transitive constructions, as in (27):

(27) a. ɤ-John m-wíwktn ɤ-qé?čəs
Det-John Pst-see-Tr-1sSu Det-father-3Po
I saw John's father.
b. ɤ-John wíwk-t-sm-s ɤ-qé?čəs
Det-John see-Tr-1sOb-3Erg Det-father-3Po
John's father saw me.

However, in transitives, Wh possessors cannot extract (28). This suggests that the nominal is left-dislocated in (27).

(28) *swétỳ k-wík-t-(s)-s k-qé?čəs
who Unr-see-Tr-2sOb-3Erg Unr-father-3Po
Whose father saw you.

There appear to be no restrictions on the status of the nominal in left-dislocations. The constructions in (27 & 29) involve dislocated nominals that are related to the possessors of either absolutive or ergative constructions.

(29) a. níḵ'-n-s ɤ-spéc'n ɤ-John ɤ-?úq'^{w}i-s
cut-Tr-3Erg Det-rope Det-John Det-brother-3Po
John's brother cut the rope.
b. ɤ-John níḵ'ns ɤ-spéc'n ɤ-?úq'^{w}is

Dislocated possessors can also occur to the left of the question stem:

(30) ɤ-John swétỳ k-wik-t-s ɤ-?úq'^{w}i-s
Det-John who Unr-see-Tr-3Erg Det-brother-3Po
That John, who did his brother see?

(31) ɤ-John swétỳ k-wík-xt-m əs tə-qé?čə-s
Det-John who Irr-see-Appl-Pass Conj Obl-father-3Po
John, who saw his father?

1.1.3 ST'

ST' permits both head/possessor and possessor/head word orders in possessive constructions.

(32) a. ta šqáyx^{w}-a ta škíxza?-š-a
Det man-Det Det-mother-3Po-Det
The man's mother
b. ta škíxza?-š-a ta šqáyx^{w}-a

The possessive construction can be focussed as a constituent; however, the possessor can not be extracted and placed in focus.

(33) a. niɬ ta šqáχa?-š-a š-Mary (ta) xúləl-(a)
Foc Det dog-3Po-Det Nom-Mary Det run away-Det
b. *niɬ ta šqáχa?-š-a (ta) xúləl-(a) š-Mary
c. *niɬ š-Mary (ta) xúləl-(a) ta šqáχa?-š-a

The following is a transitive construction.

(34) ƛ̓ál-an-aš ta šqáχa?-š-a ta šqáyx^{w}-a ta k^{w}úk^{w}pi?-a
bite-Tr-3Erg Det dog-3Po-Det Det man-Det Det chief-Det
The man's dog bit the chief.

As in intransitives, the possessive construction can be focussed as a single constituent , but the possessor cannot be extracted from the head:

(35) niɬ ta šqáχa?-š-a ta šqáyx^{w}-a ƛ'ál-an-aš ta k^{w}úk^{w}pi?-a
Foc Det dog-3Po-Det Det man-Det bite-Tr-3Erg Det-chief-Det
It's the man's dog that bit the chief.

(36) niɬ ta šqáyx^{w}-a ƛ̓ál-an-aš ta šqaχa?-š-a ta kúk^{w}pi?-a
Foc Det man-Det bite-Tr-3Erg Det dog-3Po-Det Det-chief-Det
It's the man that the chief's dog bit.
*It's the man whose dog bit the chief.

It is not possible to extract a Wh possessor in ST': the whole possessive construction must be preposed instead.

(37) a. ?? šwat ku qʷačáč ku škíxza?-š
who Det leave Det mother-3Po
Whose mother left?
b. šwat škíxza? qʷačáč

ST' thus appears to be the most restrictive of the three NIS languages.

1.2 Relative Clauses

The issue of constituency is problematic for relative clauses in NIS, as in Salish languages generally; in particular, it is often difficult to tell the "head" from the "clause", given the weak or non-existent distinction between predicates and nominals in Salish. What follows is therefore speculative at best.

1.2.1 NL

In NL there are both "headed" and "headless" relative clauses. Headed relative clauses consist of a direct argument followed by an oblique, introduced by the determiner /t-/; headless relatives simply consist of a direct argument. The order of direct and oblique arguments can not be reversed:

(38) a. ?asxəks-t-ána ɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ t-ɬ wík-t-xʷ
know-Tr-1sTrSu Det man Obl-Det see-Tr-2sSu
I know the man you saw.
b. *?asxəkstána tɬ wíktxʷ ɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ

(39) a. ?asxəkstána ɬ wíktxʷ tɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ
b. *?asxəkstána tɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ ɬ wíktxʷ

It is possible to prepose the headed RC construction as a constituent in NL, as long as the direct argument precedes the oblique argument:

(40) a. ɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ tɬ wíktxʷ ?asxəkstána
b. *tɬ wíktxʷ ɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ ?asxəkstána

(41) a. ɬ wíktxʷ tɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ ?asxəkstána
b. *tɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ ɬ wíktxʷ ?asxəkstána

There are constructions in NL where the head and the clause are discontinuous.

(42) a. ɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ ?asxəkstána tɬ wíktxʷ
b. *tɬ wíktxʷ ?asxəkstána ɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ

(43) a. ?ɬ wíktxʷ ?asxəkstána tɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ
b. *tɬ ƛo?sqáyxʷ ?asxəkstána ɬ wíktxʷ

1.2.2 SE

SE also has "headed" and "headless" relative clauses. Headed relative clauses, as in NL, consist of a direct argument , marked by / ɣ/ for nominals and /l-/ for predicates[4] , followed by an oblique, marked by /tə-/; order appears to be fixed. Headless relative clauses are introduced simply by the direct determiner.

(44) a. č-lχm-st-é[t]n ɣ-sqélmxʷ tə-wik-t-x
Hab-know-Caus-1sSu Det-man Obl-see-Tr-2sSu
I know the man you saw.
b. *člχmstétn tə-wiktx ɣ-sqélmxʷ

(45) a. člχmstétn l-wiktx tə-sqélmxʷ
b. *člχmstétn tə-sqélmxʷ l-wiktx

It is possible to prepose the relative clause as a constituent in SE.

(46) a. ɣ-sqélmxʷ tə-wiktx člχmstétn
b. *tə-wiktx ɣ-sqélmxʷ člχmstétn

(47) a. l-wiktx tə-sqélmxʷ člχmstétn
b. *tə-sqélmxʷ l-wiktx člχmstétn

"Discontinuous" relative clause constructions provide interesting evidence for a predicate-nominal distinction in SE. Nominal heads may not be separated from adjunct clauses: both constructions in (48) get interpreted as factuals (see fn.4).

(48) a. *ɣ-sqélmxʷ člχmstétn tə-wiktx
b. *tə-wiktx člχmstétn ɣ-sqélmxʷ

On the other hand, predicative heads may be separated from an adjunct nominal:

(49) a. l-wiktx člχmstétn tə-sqélmxʷ
b. *tə-sqélmxʷ člχmstétn l-wiktx

[4] Many of the SE relative clause constructions can also be interpreted as factuals, meaning 'I know that you saw the man.' This situation does not arise in NL or ST' as factuals clauses are nominalized.

1.2.3 ST'

Like NL and SE, ST' has both headed and headless relatives; however, there appear to be two different headed relatives, one "head-initial", one "head-final". A headless relative is shown in (50), a head-final relative in (51), and a head-initial relative in (52):

(50) ta čuẇn-áš-a
Det kick-3Erg-Det
The one she kicked

(51) ta x̲ʷíš-aš-a šqáyxʷ
Det love-3Erg-Det man
The man she loves

(52) ta šqáyxʷ-a ta ac̓x̲ən-án-a
Det man-Det Det see-1sSu-Det
The man I saw (= the man, the one I saw)

Head-final relatives differ in a number of significant ways from head-initial constructions. The "head" is determiner-less (53), and cannot be separated from the clause (see 56 below); in these respects, such constructions resemble "adjectival " constructions rather than ordinary relative clauses; see 1.3 below:

(53) * ta x̲ʷíšaš-a ta šqáyxʷ-a

Both head-initial and head-final relative clauses can be focussed as a unit:

(54) a. niɬ ta šqáyxʷ-a ta ac̓x̲ən-án-a xúləl
Foc Det man-Det Det see-1sSu-Det run away
I t's the man I saw that ran away.

b. niɬ ta x̲ʷíštali-ha šqáyxʷ ác̓x̲ənan
Foc Det like-tali-Det man see-1sSu
It's the man who loves her I saw.

However, the "head" may be separated from the clause in head-initial (55) but not head-final (56) relatives:

(55) ác̓x̲ən-aš ta sqáyxʷ-a ta šmúɬač-a ta nuk̓ʷʔan-táli-ha
see-3Erg Det man-Det Det woman-Det Det help-tali-Det
The woman saw the man who helped her.
(=The woman saw the man, the one who helped her.)

(56) *niɬ ta x̲ʷíštali-ha ác̓x̲ənan šqáyxʷ
Foc Det like-tali-Det see-1sSu man
It's the man who loves her I saw.

1.3 Adjectival Constructions

NIS adjectival constructions resemble relative clauses; nevertheless, there are differences in extraction possibilities which indicate that the two cannot be treated identically:

1.3.1 NL

NL adjectival constructions place the determiner /ɬa/ on the adjectival and an oblique /ta/ on the nominal. The adjectival constructions can apparently prepose as a unit but neither the adjective nor the nominal can prepose, stranding the other element; compare (42-43) above.

(57) a. nxʷálix ɬa x̲zum ta halá̓ẇ
fly Det big Obl eagle
The big eagle flew.
b. ɬa x̲zum ta halá̓ẇ nxʷálix
c. *ta halá̓ẇ nxʷálix ɬa x̲zum
d. *ɬa x̲zum nxʷálix ta halá̓ẇ

1.3.2 SE

SE adjectival constructions take the direct determiner, either /ɤ-/ or /l-/. The second member of this construction is marked with the oblique determiner /tə-/. The construction resembles a relative clause. It is possible to prepose the entire adjectival construction but not the adjectival or the nominal individually; (compare 48-49 above).

(58) a. q'up-st-ɛ́s ɤ-John l-x̲yum tə-sək'mín̓-s
break-Caus-3Erg Det-John Det-big Obl-knife-3Po
John broke his big knife.
b. l-x̲yum tə-sək'mín̓-s q'up-st-ɛ́s ɤ-John
c. *l-x̲yum q'up-st-ɛ́s tə-sək'mín̓-s ɤ-John
d. *tə-sək'mín̓-s q'up-st-ɛ́s l-x̲yum ɤ-John

There is evidence that the nominal can precede the adjectival. It then takes the oblique determiner.

(59) q'up-st-ɛ́s ɤ-sək'mín̓s tə-x̲yum ɤ-John
John broke his big knife.

1.3.3 ST'

ST' adjectival constructions behave similarly to the NL/SE pattern. The adjective construction can be clefted as a unit (60b-c), but neither the adjectival nor the nominal can be clefted individually (61d-e).

(60) a. saq̓ʷ ta x̲zúm-a spzúza?
fly Det big-Det bird
The big bird flew.
b. ni+ ta x̲zúma spzúza? saq̓ʷ
c. ni+ ta x̲zúma spzúza? ta saq̓ʷa
d. *ni+ ta x̲zúma saq̓ʷ spzúza?
e. *ni+ ta spzúz?a saq̓ʷ x̲zum

2.0 Clauses

In this section we determine the word order properties of nominals within the clause. It is shown that all three languages have free word order for nominals in post-predicate position. In pre-predicate position NL and SE permit multiple nominals, whereas ST' only permits a single nominal to appear focussed in a pre-predicate position. In transitive clauses both NL and SE employ a clitic, /us/ or /(w)əs/ respectively, to permit the focussing of adjuncts.

2.1 Intransitives

NL and SE permit the single argument of intransitive clauses to be preposed; however, in ST', in order for a nominal to precede the predicate, a cleft construction introduced by the particle /ni+/ must be used.

2.1.1 NL

Intransitive constructions are predicate-initial in NL. It is possible to prepose the single argument.

(61) a. qʷčíyx + smú+eč
leave EP woman
The woman left.
b. + smú+eč qʷčíyx ƛəm̓[4]
The woman has left.

(62) +a smú+eč nqáyx ʔuʔéx
EP woman swim Part
The woman is swimming/can swim.

(63) +a xzúm ta haláẇ nxʷálix
EP big Obl eagle fly
The big eagle flew.

2.1.2 SE

SE permits the single argument of intranstive constructions to be freely preposed.

(64) a. qʷəčéč ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ
leave Det-woman
The woman left.
b. ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ qʷəčéč

(65) a. ƛ'xʷésxnm̓ ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ
swim Det-woman
The woman swam.
b. ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ ƛ'xʷésxnm̓

(66) a. ex ɣ-ƛ'xʷésxnm̓ əs ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ
exist Det-swim Conj Det-woman
The woman is swimming.
b. ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ ex ɣ-ƛ'xʷésxnm̓ əs
c. wʔex ɣ-núx̣ʷənx̣ʷ ɣ-ƛ'xʷésxnm̓ əs

(67) a. m-ƛ'uxt l-x̲yum tə-spəlq̓ʷéqs
Pst-fly Det-big Obl-eagle
The big eagle flew.
b. l-x̲yum tə-spəlq̓ʷéqs m-ƛ'uxt

2.1.3 ST'

ST' doesn't permit direct preposing of the single arguments of intransitives.

(68) a. qʷačáč ta šmú+ač-a
b. *ta šmú+ač-a qʷačáč
The woman is going.

It is necessary to form a cleft construction introduced by the particle /ni+/.

(69) ni+ ta x̲zúm-a špzúza? (ta) šáq̓ʷ-a
Foc Det big-Det bird fly
It's the big bird that flew.

2.2. Passives

The three languages differ in the word order properties of the passive construction. In NL there is a preference for the passive agent to be adjacent to the predicate. SE permits either the passive agent or the theme to be adjacent to the predicate. In ST' the passive theme must be adjacent. This adjacency condition may correlate in ST' with the loss of the oblique determiner. NL and SE have a common clitic strategy to focus the passive agent.

2.2.1 NL

NL passive constructions have a preference for the passive agent to be adjacent to the predicate.

(70) a. ʔúpi-t-əm t-ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ɬa siplíl
eat-Tr-Pass Obl-EP man Det bread
The bread was eaten by the man.
b. ?? ʔúpitəm ɬa šiplíl tɬa ƛ̓oʔšqáyxʷ

It is possible to have the passive agent non-adjacent when accompanied by the focussing particle /ʔa/.

(71) ʔúpitəm ɬ siplíl ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ

Absolutive nominals can prepose in NL directly, whereas the passive agent cannot.

(72) a. ɬa siplíl ʔúpi-t-əm t-ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ
Det bread eat-Tr-Pass Obl-Det man
The bread was eaten by the man.
b. *tɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ʔúpitəm ɬa siplíl

There is special morphology associated with the focussing of the passive agent. The clitic /us/ appears on the predicate when the passive agent has been preposed.

(73) ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ha ʔúpitəm us ɬ siplíl
The bread was eaten by the man.

Notice that whenever the passive agent is focussed the clitic must appear.

(74) a. *ɬa siplíl tɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ʔúpitəm
b. *tɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ɬa siplíl ʔúpitəm

The clitic is not triggered by the passive theme, nor does it appear when no argument has been preposed.

(75) a. *ʔúpitəm us ɬ siplíl ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ
b. *ʔúpitəm us ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ɬ siplíl
c. *ɬ siplíl ha ʔúpitəm us ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ

More than one argument can be preposed; however, there are restrictions. The passive theme can neither take a focus particle nor be in immediate preverbal position.

(76) a. *ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ɬ siplíl ha ʔúpitəm us
b. *tɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ʔá ɬa siplíl ha ʔúpitəmus
c. ɬ siplíl ʔá ɬa ƛ̓oʔsqáyxʷ ha ʔúpitəm us

2.2.2 SE

SE passives have free word order in post predicate position. There is no adjacency restriction for either the passive theme or agent.

(77) a. m-məlx-nt-ém ɣ-núχʷənχʷ tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ l-pəχyéwtəs
Pst-kick-Tr-Pass Det-woman Det-horse Det-yesterday
The horse kicked the woman yesterday.
b. m-məlxəntém tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ ɣ-núχʷənχʷ l-pəχyéwtəs
c. m-məlxəntém ɣ-núχʷənχʷ l-pəχyéwtəs tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ
d. m-məlxəntém l-pəχyéwtəs ɣ-núχʷənχʷ tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ

Passive themes can be preposed directly or occur as a focus cleft construction. In either case there is no special morphology on the predicate.

(78) a. ɣ-núχʷənχʷ m-məlxəntém tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ l-pəχyéwtəs
b. yəɣiʔ l-núχʷənχʷ məlxəntém tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ l-pəχyéwtəs

Passive agents trigger the clitic /(w)əs/ when they are preposed.

(79) l-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ luʔ l-məlxəntém əs l-núχʷənχʷ l-pəχyéwtəs

Temporal locatives also trigger the clitic /(w)əs/. Gardiner (to appear) argues that the clitic is associated with the focussing of adjuncts.

(80) l-pəχyéwtəs luʔ m-məlxəntém əs ɣ-núχʷənχʷ tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ

More than one argument can be preposed. Adjuncts and themes can occur in either order (81-82).

(81) a. ɣ-núχʷənχʷ tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ m-məlxəntéməs l-pəχyéwtəs
b. tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ ɣ-núχʷənχʷ məlxəntéməs l-pəχyéwtəs

(82) l-pəχyéwtəs ɣ-núχʷənχʷ məlxəntéməs tə-nč'əʔsqéχəʔ

Whenever an adjunct is preposed the clitic must be triggered on the predicate. This is shown by (83) which is ungrammatical.

(83) *ɣ-núχʷənχʷ tə-nč'ə?sqéχə? m-məlxəntém l-pəχyéwtəs

Finally SE permits more than two nominals in pre-predicate position.

(84) a. l-pəχyéwtəs ɣ-núχʷənχʷ tə-nč'ə?sqéχə? məlxəntéməs
b. ɣ-núχʷənχʷ l-pəχyéwtəs tə-nč'ə?sqéχə? məlxəntéməs

2.2.3 ST'

In ST' passives the nominal which immediately follows the predicate is the underlying object. The passive agent lacks an oblique determiner.

(85) čúẇn-əm ti šqáyxʷ-a ti k̓áx̌-ha
kick-Pass Det man-Det Det rock-Det
The man was kicked by the rock
*The rock was kicked by the man.

(86) c'áqʷan-əm ta šk̓ʷúk̓ʷm̓it-a i šq̓ʷál-a
eat-Pass Det child-Det Det berry-Det
The child was eaten by the berries.
*The berries were eaten by the child.

(87) ác'χən-əm ti šqayxʷ-a ti šmúɬač-a
see-Pass Det man-Det Det woman-Det
The man was seen by the woman.
*The woman was seen by the man.

2.3 Transitives

All three NIS languages have free word order in post-predicate position; however, they differ in the number of arguments that can be preposed. ST' permits only a single argument to appear before the predicate and only in a focus cleft construction. NL and SE permit two or more arguments to precede the predicate. Adjunct nominals can appear before the predicate when the predicate has a clitic.

2.3.1 NL

In post-predicate position word order is free in NL.

(88) a. ?úpi-s ɬ sq̓ʷíyt ɬ spi?háwt ɬa sk̓ʷúk̓ʷmi?t
eat-3Erg Det berry Det yesterday Det child
The child ate the berries yesterday.

b. ?úpis ɬa sk̓ʷúk̓ʷmi?t ɬ spi?háwt ɬ sq̓ʷíyt
c. ?úpis ɬ sq̓ʷíyt ɬa sk̓ʷúk̓ʷmi?t ɬ spi?háwt

(89) a. wík-t-s ɬ sqáčza?-s ɬ John
see-Tr-3Erg Det father-3Po Det John
John saw his father.
b. wíkts ɬ John ɬ sqáčza?s

It is possible to directly prepose an ergative argument in NL.

(90) a. ɬ John wíkts ɬ sqáčza?s
b. ?ɬ sqáčza?s wíkts ɬ John
c. ɬ John ɬ sqáčza?s wíkts
d. ɬ sqáčza?s ɬ John wíkts
John saw his father.

Temporal and spatial locatives can also prepose. In immediate preverbal position they don't trigger the clitic /us/.

(91) ɬa sk̓ʷúk̓ʷmi?t ɬ spi?háwt ?úpi-s ɬ sq̓ʷíyt
The child ate the berrries yesterday.

(92) a. swát n-ɬa čítxʷ k wík-t-s ɬ John
who Loc-EP house Unr see-tr-3Erg Det John
Who did John see in the house?
b. *swat nɬa čítxʷ k wíkts us ɬ John

However when the temporal is focussed it does trigger /us/.

(93) ?a-x̌ spi?xáwt ha ?úpis us ɬa smúɬač ɬ siplíl
Foc yesterday Dir eat Conj Det woman Det bread
It was yesterday that the woman ate the bread.

The ergative argument can prepose along with the temporal locatives in immediate preverbal position.

(94) ɬa sk̓ʷúk̓ʷmi?t ɬ spi?háwt ?úpis ɬ sq̓ʷíyt
The child ate the berries yesterday.

There is a strong dispreference for preposing the absolutive nominal into immediate preverbal position.

(95) a. *ɬa sḵʷúḵʷmiʔt ɬ sq̓ʷíyt ʔúpis ɬ spiʔháwt
b. *ɬa sḵʷúḵʷmiʔt ɬ sq̓ʷíyt ɬ spiʔháwt ʔúpis

NL does permit nominals to occur to the left of the Wh question stem.

(96) ɬ Bill swat k wíkts
Who did Bill see?

2.3.2 SE

SE permits any order of nominals in post-predicate position.

(97) a. m-íɬn-s ɣ-spəqpéq ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət l-pəχyéwtəs
Pst-eat-Tr-3Erg Det-berries Det-child Det-yesterday
The child ate the berries yesterday.
b. m-íɬns ɣ-spəqpéq ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət l-pəχyéwtəs
c. m-íɬns ɣ-spəqpéq l-pəχyéwtəs ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət
d. m-íɬns l-pəχyéwtəs ɣ-spəqpéq ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət

(98) a. χʷi-st-és ɣ-Mary ɣ-qéʔčə-s[5]
like-Caus-3Erg Det-Mary Det-father-3Po
Mary likes her father.
b. χʷistés ɣ-qéʔčəs ɣ-Mary

It is possible to prepose either the absolutive or ergative arguments in SE.[6] In fact, SVO order is preferred in direct elicitation contexts, whereas in texts VSO is the preferred order.

(99) a. l-sk'ʷiméṁlət m-íɬns ɣ-spəqpéq l-pəχyéwtəs

(100) a. ɣ-Mary χʷistés ɣ-qéʔčəs
b. ɣ-qéʔčəs χʷistés ɣ-Mary

Temporal locatives trigger the /(w)əs/ clitic when they are preposed.

(101) l-pəχyéwtəs luʔ m-íɬns əs l-spəqpéq ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət

[5] Due to conditions on the interpretation of coreference the only possible reading for this construction, irrespective of word order is 'Mary likes her father.' See Matthewson, Davis and Gardiner (1993).
[6] There is a preference for preposing the ergative. It is possible to prepose the absolutive; however , without a context this can lead to confusion.

There is evidence that , as in NL, spatial locatives can occur in immediate preverbal position without triggering the clitic.

(102) stéṁi nə-čitxʷ k-ník'-n-s
what Loc-house Det-cut-Tr-3Erg
What did he cut in the house?

SE permits two or more nominals in preverbal position. The ergative and absolutive arguments can be preposed in either order.

(103) a. ɣ-Mary ɣ-qéʔčəs χʷistés
b. ɣ-qéʔčəs ɣ-Mary χʷistés

Preposed arguments can combine with temporal locatives, producing the following preverbal combinations.

(104) a. ʔl-pəχyéwtəs luʔ ɣ-spəqpéq m-íɬns əs ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət
b. ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət l-pəχyéwtəs luʔ ɣ-spəqpéq m-íɬns əs
c. l-pəχyéwtəs luʔ ɣ-spəqpéq ɣ-sk'ʷiméṁlət m-íɬns əs

SE permits nominals to the left of the question stem. Their position and interpretation suggests that they are left-dislocated elements.

(105) ɣ-Mary swétɣ̓ ɣ-qéʔčə-s k-χʷi-st-és
Det-Mary who Det-father-3Po Unr-like-caus-3Erg
Mary, who does her father like?

2.3.3 ST'

ST' has a preference for VOS word order in elicitation situations (106-107) but VSO order is possible (and apparently preferred in texts). It shares with NL and SE the possibilty of free order in post-predicate position (108).

(106) čúẇn-aš ta máw-a ta šmúɬač-a
kick-3Erg Det cat-Det Det woman-Det
The woman kicked the cat.

(107) ác'χən-aš ta šmúɬač-a ta šqáyxʷ-a
see-3erg Det woman-Det Det man-Det
The man saw the woman. (preferred)
The woman saw the man. (dispreferred)

(108) a. c'áqʷan-aš i šq̓ʷál-a ta šḵʷúḵʷṁit-a nátxʷaš
eat Det berry-Det Det child-Det yesterday
The child ate the berries yesterday.

b. c'áqʷan-aš ta šk̓ʷúk̓ʷm̓it-a i šq̓ʷál-a inátxʷaš

c. c'áqʷan-aš ta šk̓ʷúk̓ʷm̓it-a inátxʷaš i šq̓ʷál-a

d. c'áqʷan-aš inátxʷaš i šq̓ʷál-a ta šk̓ʷúk̓ʷm̓it-a

ST' permits a single constituent to be placed in focus as shown in (109-110).

(109) niɬ ta šk̓ʷúk̓ʷm̓it-ac̓áqʷan-aš i šq̓ʷál-a
Foc Det child-Det eat-3Erg Det berry-Det
It was the child that ate the berries.

(110) niɬ i šq̓ʷál-a c̓áqʷan-aš ta šk̓ʷúk̓ʷm̓it-a
Foc Det berry-Det eat-3Erg Det child-Det
It was the berries that the child ate.

3.0 Conclusion

Although it is premature to be explicit about the word order parameters that exist in the syntax of NIS it is clear that there is significant variation. NL and SE exhibit many common properties such as possessor extraction, multiple pre-predicate nominals and the clitic strategy. Nevertheless the two languages differ in significant ways. ST' shares many common NIS word order properties but is extremely conservative, disallowing possessor extraction and permitting only focus cleft strategies for placing nominals before the predicate. This may be indicative of Coast Salish influence. Future research will undoubtably lead to further refinements to our observations.

References

Baker, Mark. 1991. 'On Some Subject/Object Non-Asymmetries in Mohawk'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 537-577.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.

Gardiner, Dwight. In preparation. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. 'Empty Categories, Case and Configurationality'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2, 39-76.

Matthewson Lisa, Henry Davis and Dwight Gardiner. 1993. 'Coreference in Northern Interior Salish.' ms., University of B.C. and Simon Fraser University.