This paper is a comparative look at word order in the Northern Interior Salish languages, Niqapamux s (Thompson), Secwepemctsin (Shuswap), and St'ATIMCETS (Lillooet). We wish to provide data on word order within the NP and the clause in order to establish where alternate word orders are possible. 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 shown in (2).

In (2) the adjective is preposed as shown in (3-4), However the NL head cannot prepose and strand the possessor.

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

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 Niqapamux s data. The late Leslie Jules of Kamloops, Mona Jules of Chu Chu, Basile Deneau and Annie May Jules of Skeetchestn have provided the Secwepemctsin data. Beverley Frank of Sek'wel'was, Rose Whitley of Tin-ket and Gertrude Ned of Caclep have contributed the St'ATIMCETS 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 Secwepemctsin fieldwork has been funded by the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Fund and the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society. Research on St'ATIMCETS has been funded by SSHRC Grant 410-92-1529 to Patricia Shaw.

Abbreviations: NIS Northern Interior Salish, NL Niqapamux s, SE Secwepemctsin, ST St'ATIMCETS, APp Applicative, CAus Causative, COR conjunctive, DEc deictic, DET determiner, ERg ergative, FOC Focus, HAB Habitual, LOC locative, OB object, OBj oblique, PaRT participle, PASS passive, PPOS 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 The standard way to ask the question in NL is: swat q'saqxa? kax q'x'acama

2
(7) swat k AlmostEqual k čítu'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) *+ John cut kan AlmostEqual sqaqxa-s
Det John say 1sSu bark Det dog-3Po
John, I said that his dog barked.

(9) *+ John cut k'í ha pi?stá? us ha zóq' us k sqačza-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. *+ John ha skíxza-s wík-t-s AlmostEqual ta ko?sqáyý'x' Det John Dir mother-3Po see-Tr-3Erg Det man
John's mother saw the man.

Possessors cannot appear to the left of the question stem.

(12) *+ John swat k wík-t-am us AlmostEqual k sqačza-s
Det John who Unr see-Tr-Pass Conj Unr father-3Po
Who saw John's father?

(13) *+ John swat k mi?qá-t-ás AlmostEqual sqaqxa-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.

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

(17) a. ?+ John m-x'eym m-x'eym
Det-John past dog home past dog
b. *+ John m-x'eym x-sqéxes x-sqéxes
Det-John past dog possess last take
John's dog barked.

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

(19) a. svéty k-sqéxes k-x'eym
Whose dog barked.

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) ?+ John m-čút-kn m-x'eym x-sqéxes-s
Det-John past father home possess possess
John, I said that his dog barked.

(22) ?+ John yégewas-(n)-n ex ta x'eym as 1-sqéxes-s
Det-John annoy-Tr-lbl past dog as 1-possess
John, I was annoyed with his dog's barking, that's why I went home.
(23) *x-John m-čut-n-k pnhέ?n k-m-qéča as x-qéča-s
Det-John Pst-say-Qu-2sSu when Unr-Pst-die Conj Det-father-3Po
John, did you say when his father died?

(24) *1-John q'ágEČ-k l-x'yEymas x-qéča-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) svéty l-čut-k k-sx'čynam k-sqéxa-s
Det-John who Det-say-2sSu Unr-s-bark Unr-dog-3Po
Who was it that you said that his dog barked?

(26) svéty l-čut-k k-xyum k-čitxa-s
Det-John 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. x-John m-wíwiktn x-qéčas
Det-John Pst-see-Tr-1sSu Det-father-3Po
I saw John's father.

b. x-John wíwik-t-sm-s x-qéčas
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) *svéty k-wk-t-(s)-s k-qéčas
Who Wh possessor father saw.

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. ník'-n-s x-spéćn x-John x-?-úq^1-s
cut-Tr-3Erg Det-John Det-brother-3Po
John's brother cut the rope.

b. x-John ník'ns x-spéćn x-?-úq^1-s
Dislocated possessors can also occur to the left of the question stem:

(30) x-John svéty k-wík-t-s x-?-úq^1-s
Det-John who Unr-see-Tr-3Erg Det-brother-3Po
That John, who did his brother see?

1.1.3 ST'

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

(31) x-John svéty k-wík-xl-m as ta-qéča-s
Det-John who Ir-see-Appl-Pass Conj Obl-father-3Po
John, who saw his father?

(32) a. ta ʔgágaxʷ-a ta škilx̣aʔ-s-a
Det man-Det Det-mother-3Po-Det
The man's mother

b. ta škilx̣aʔ-s-a ta ʔgágaxʷ-a
The man's mother

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

(33) a. niит ta ʔgágaxʷ-s-a š-Mary (ta) xúλal-(a)
Foc Det dog-3Po-Det Nom-Mary Det run away-Det
b. *niит ta ʔgágaxʷ-s-a (ta) xúλal-(a) š-Mary

The following is a transitive construction.

(34) kál-an-as ta ʔgágaxʷ-s-a ta ʔgágaxʷ-a ta k'úk̓ʷpiʔ-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) niит ta ʔgágaxʷ-s-a ta ʔgágaxʷ-a kál-an-as ta k'úk̓ʷpiʔ-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) niит ta ʔgágaxʷ-a kál-an-as ta ʔgágaxʷ-s-a ta k'úk̓ʷpiʔ-a
Foc Det man-Det bite-Tr-3Erg Det dog-3Po-Det Det chief-Det
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.
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 nonexistent 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. ?asxaktána t+ wíktxʷ? t+ ko?sqáýxʷ
    b. *?asxaktána t+ wíktxʷ? + ko?sqáýxʷ

(39) a. ?asxaktána t+ wíktxʷ? t+ ko?sqáýxʷ
    b. *?asxaktána t+ ko?sqáýxʷ t+ 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. t+ ko?sqáýxʷ wíktxʷ? ?asxaktána
    b. *t+ wíktxʷ? t+ ko?sqáýxʷ ?asxaktána

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

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 /s/ for nominals and /t-/ for predicates, followed by an oblique, marked by /ta-/. Order appears to be fixed. Headless relative clauses are introduced simply by the direct determiner. 4

(42) a. t+ ko?sqáýxʷ wíktxʷ? ?asxaktána
    b. *t+ wíktxʷ? t+ ko?sqáýxʷ ?asxaktána

(43) a. ?asxaktána t+ ko?sqáýxʷ
    b. *=t+ ko?sqáýxʷ t+ wíktxʷ

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

(48) a. ?asxaktána t+ ko?sqáýxʷ
    b. *?asxaktána t+ ko?sqáýxʷ

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

(49) a. t+ ko?sqáýxʷ t+ wíktxʷ? ?asxaktána
    b. *t+ ko?sqáýxʷ t+ wíktxʷ ?asxaktána

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 normalized.
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 ćuvn-ąš-a
Det kick-3Erg-Det
The one she kicked

(51) ta šqāyxw-a
Det love-3Erg-Det
The man she loves

(52) ta šqāyxw-a ta ačxan-án-a
Det man-Det Det see-1Su-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 ćwšaš a ta šqāyxw-a

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

(54) a. niñ ta šqāyxw-a ta ačxan-án-a xūlal
Foc Det man-Det Det see-1Su-Det run away
It's the man I saw that ran away.

b. niñta ćwštal-iha šqāyxw ašqan
Foc Det like-tali-Det man see-1Su
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) ačxan-ąš ta šqāyxw-a ta šmualč-a ta nukw?an-tálí-ha
see-3Erg Det man-Det Det help-tali-Det
The woman saw the man who helped her.
(The woman saw the man, the one who helped her.)

(56) *niñta ćwštal-iha ašqan ašqāyx
Foc Det like-tali-Det see-1Su 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 /ta/ 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. nxwálíx ta szum ta halaw
fly Det big Obl eagle
The big eagle flew.

b. ta szum ta halaw nxwálíx

c. *ta halaw nxwálíx ta szum

d. *ta szum nxwálíx ta halaw

1.3.2 SE

SE adjectival constructions take the direct determiner, either /s/-/ or /l-/ . The second member of this construction is marked with the oblique determiner /ta/. 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-ś s x-John l-xyum ta-sak'mín-s
break-Caus-3Erg Det-John Det-big Obl-knife-3Po
John broke his big knife.

b. l-xyum ta-sak'mín-s q'up-st-ś s x-John

= l-xyum q'up-st-ś ta-sak'mín-s s x-John

d. *ta-sak'mín-s q'up-st-ś l-xyum s x-John

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

(59) q'up-st-ś s x-sak'míñs ta-xyum x-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 adjective nor the nominal can be clefted individually (61d-e).
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.as/ 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 */niH/** must be used.

2.1.1 NL

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

(60) a. saq\textsuperscript{~a} ta z\textacute{u}m-a spz\textacute{u}za? fly Det big-Det bird The big bird flew.
b. niH ta z\textacute{u}m-a spz\textacute{u}za? saq\textsuperscript{~a}
c. niH ta z\textacute{u}m-a spz\textacute{u}za? ta saq\textsuperscript{~a}d. *niH ta spz\textacute{u}za? a saq\textsuperscript{~a} gy\textsuperscript{um}

2.0 Clauses

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

(64) a. q\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{~a}c\textsuperscript{~a}c x-n\textsuperscript{\textacute{u}}x*en\textsuperscript{x*}
   leave Det-woman The woman left.
b. x-n\textsuperscript{\textacute{u}}x*en\textsuperscript{x*} q\textsuperscript{a}c\textsuperscript{~a}c

2.1.2 SE

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

(65) a. x\textsuperscript{\textacute{a}}x\textsuperscript{x}\textsuperscript{\textacute{a}}x*en\textsuperscript{x*}
   swim Det-woman The woman swam.
b. x-n\textsuperscript{\textacute{u}}x*en\textsuperscript{x*} x\textsuperscript{\textacute{a}}x\textsuperscript{x}\textsuperscript{\textacute{a}}x*en\textsuperscript{x*}

2.1.3 ST'

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

(68) a. q\textsuperscript{a}c\textsuperscript{~a}c ta s\textacute{u}m\textacute{a}c\textsuperscript{a}
   The woman is going.
b. *ta s\textacute{u}m\textacute{a}c\textsuperscript{a} q\textsuperscript{a}c\textsuperscript{~a}c

It is necessary to form a cleft construction introduced by the particle */niH/**.

(69) niH ta z\textacute{u}m-a spz\textacute{u}za? (ta) saq\textsuperscript{~a}q-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-am t-la ʔoʔsqáyxʷ ʔa sipíl ilo?sqáyxʷ
   eat-Tr-Pass Obl-EP man  Det bread
   The bread was eaten by the man.

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

(71) ʔúpitam 4 sipíl ilo?sqáyxʷ

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

(72) a. ʔa sipíl ilo?sqáyxʷ ʔúpi-t-am t-la ʔoʔsqáyxʷ
   Det bread eat-Tr-Pass Obl-EP man
   The bread was eaten by the man.

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) ʔa ʔa ʔoʔsqáyxʷ ha ʔúpitam us 4 sipíl
   The bread was eaten by the man.

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

(74) a. ʔa ʔoʔsqáyxʷ ʔa sipíl ʔúpitam

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

(75) a. *ʔúpitam us 4 sipíl ʔa ʔa ʔoʔsqáyxʷ
   c. *ʔúpitam us ʔa ʔa ʔoʔsqáyxʷ 4 sipíl

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-malx-nt-ém ʔa-núx*axn* ʔa-nč*sqéx* 1-pxyéwtas
   Pst-kick-Tr-Pass Det-woman Det-horse Det-yesterday
   The horse kicked the woman yesterday.

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. ʔa-núx*axn* m-malxantém ʔa-nč*sqéx* 1-pxyéwtas
   Det-woman m-malx-nt-ém Det-horse Det-yesterday
   Passive agents trigger the clitic /wás/ when they are preposed.

(79) 1-pxyéwtas lu? m-malxantém as 1-núx*axn* 1-pxyéwtas

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

(80) 1-pxyéwtas lu? m-malxantémb ʔa-núx*axn* ʔa-nč*sqéx*

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

(81) a. ʔa-núx*axn* m-malxantémb ʔa-nč*sqéx*

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

[14]
Finally SE permits more than two nominals in pre-predicate position.

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) čūwn-am ti ṣqāy-x-a ti kāk-ha
    kick-Pass Det man-Det Det dog-Det
    The man was kicked by the dog.

(86) c'aqʷən-am ta škʷukʷhyít-a i ṣqʷal-a
    eat-Pass Det child-Det Det berry-Det
    The child was eaten by the berries.

(87) əc'əqʷən-am ti ṣqay-x-a ti əmúčə-a
    see-Pass Det man-Det Det woman-Det
    The man was seen by the woman.

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. ṭuipís ə̨a skʷukʷmiʔt + spiʔháwt + saqʷiyt
    eat-3Erg Det child Det yesterday Det bread
    The child ate the bread yesterday.

b. ṭuipís ə̨a skʷukʷmiʔt + spiʔháwt + saqʷiyt

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

(90) a. ṭuipís + saqčə-a + John
    eat-3Erg Det woman + Det John
    John was eaten by the woman.

b. ṭuipís + saqčə-a + John

c. ṭuipís + saqčə-a + John

d. + John + saqčə-a + John

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

(91) a. sa skʷukʷmiʔt + spiʔháwt ṭuipís + saqʷiyt
    who Loc-EP house see-tr-3Erg Det bread
    John saw his bread.

b. ṭuipís + saqčə-a + John

(92) a. swat n-ta člíty̱ k wikt-s + John
    who Loc-EP house Unr see-tr-3Erg Det John
    Who did John see in the house?

b. *swat n-ta člíty̱ k wikt-s + John

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

(93) ?a-ʔ spiʔkawt ha ṭuipis + saqčə + sipíl
    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) ta skʷukʷmiʔt + spiʔháwt ṭuipís + saqʷiyt
    The child ate the berries yesterday.
There is a strong dispreference for preposing the absolutive nominal into immediate preverbal position.

1. (95) a. *štā skwūkkmi:t + sāŋtįt ?ūpis + sipnáwt
   b. *štā skwūkkmi:t + sāŋtįt + sipnáwt ?ūpis

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

2. (96) Who did Bill see?

2.3.2 SE

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

3. (97) a. m-≠m-s x-spaqeq x-sk'=imémñlat l-paxýwtaš
   b. m-≠m-s x-spaqeq x-sk'=imémñlat l-paxýwtaš
   c. m-≠m-s x-spaqeq l-paxýwtaš x-sk'=imémñlat
   d. m-≠m-s l-paxýwtaš x-spaqeq x-sk'=imémñlat

(98) a. x'=ist-ēs x-Mery x-qéʔčas x'=istēs
   b. x'=istēs x-qéʔčas x-Mery

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

4. (99) a. l-sk'=imémñlat m-≠m-s x-spaqeq l-paxýwtaš

(100) a. x-Mery x'=istēs x-qéʔčas
   b. x-qéʔčas x'=istēs x-Mery

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

5. (101) l-paxýwtaš lu? m-≠m-s as l-spaqeq x-sk'=imémñlat

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

6. (102) ?stεnĩ na-čltuš k-nǐk'-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.

7. (103) a. x-Mery x-qéʔčas x'=istēs
   b. x-qéʔčas x-Mery x'=istēs

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

(104) a. ?l-paxýwtaš lu? x-spaqeq m-≠m-s as x-sk'=imémñlat
   b. x-sk'=imémñlat l-paxýwtaš lu? x-spaqeq m-≠m-s
   c. l-paxýwtaš lu? x-spaqeq x-sk'=imémñlat m-≠m-s

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

(105) x-Mery swēty x-qéʔča-s k-x'=ist-ēs
   Det-Mery 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 possibility of free order in post-predicate position (108).

(106) čúw-αš ta máw-a ta šmùľač-a
    kick-3Erg Det-Det Det woman-Det
    The woman kicked the cat.

(107) ţc'xan-αš ta šmùľač-a ta šqytx'-a
    see-3Erg Det woman-Det Det man-Det
    The man saw the woman. (preferred)
    The woman saw the man. (disprefereced)

(108) a. c'aqwač-αš l šq'-či-a ta šk'=úmmìt-čnátx'-aş
    eat Det berry-Det Det child-Det yesterday
    The child ate the berries yesterday.

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 Matthews, 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.
b. c’aq’wa’t a sš’ukʷmít-a i šqʷál-a

c. c’aq’wa’t a sš’ukʷmít-a i šqʷál-a

d. c’aq’wa’t i šqʷál-a ta sš’ukʷmít-a

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

(109) ní I ta sš’ukʷmít-a c’aq’wa’t a i šqʷál-a
Foc Det child-Det eat-3Erg Det berry-Det
It was the child that ate the berries.

(110) ní I šqʷál-a c’aq’wa’t a ta sš’ukʷmít-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 undoubtedly lead to further refinements to our observations.
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