1. Introduction

The suffix -tall is a mysterious yet central part of the syntax of St't'imcets (Lillooet Salish). Moreover, its analysis touches on some of the more intriguing aspects of Salish syntax in general, including the interaction of grammatical and discourse functions, the nature of split ergativity, and the status of extraction phenomena. Up to now, however, little detailed discussion of its syntactic function has taken place in the literature; van Eijk (1985) gives the basic morpho-syntactic facts, while Kroeber (1991), in a short discussion of its status, comments that it is an "...otherwise unattested affix.

This paper has three purposes. The first is to provide a more detailed description of the behaviour of -tall, drawing on the unpublished work of Mathewson (1993) and Roberts (1994). The second is to place the St't'imcets facts in a cross-Salishan perspective, this time relying heavily on the important published and unpublished work of M.D.Kinkade on Upper Chehalis and Columbia (see Kinkade 1988, 1989, 1990). The third is to attempt to provide a preliminary explanation for the facts, in the hope that someone will provide a better one.

2. The grammar of -tall

2.1. Morphology

-tall appears exclusively on transitive predicates (i.e., those with a transivitizing suffix, as in (1))2; it attaches directly to the transivitizer, like object suffixes and reflexive and reciprocal markers, with which it is in complementary distribution (see (2)). Unlike object suffixes, however, -tall only appears in sentences with exclusively third person arguments (see (3); and also unlike object suffixes, it is in complementary distribution with all subject markers, including the third person ergative marker -as (4);3

1. (a) nilh ti ucwalmfcw-a ats'x-en-tali ti sâm7-a
   foc det indian-det see-tr-tali det white-det
   "It's the Indian who saw the white man." (5-7-94 GN)

2 Note that while retaining a reflex of the proto-Salish transitive marker -t, -tall is synchronically monomorphemic; -t has either been deleted or re-analyzed as part of an object suffix throughout the St't'imcets transitive pronominal paradigm. For details see van Eijk (1985, pp. 129-154).

3 Elicited examples are provided with consultant initials and are numbered according to their order in the syntactic database compiled by the Project on Lexical Interfaces with Syntax and Phonology in Northwest Coast Languages at UBC. Where no number is given, the date of elicitation is supplied.

4 The Lillooet practical orthography as devised by Jan van Eijk is employed in all St't'imcets examples; see e.g. van Eijk and Williams (1981) for justification. A key to the alphabet with standard phonemic correspondences is provided in Appendix A.

1 I would like to thank our St't'imcets consultants Rose Whitley, Gertrude Ned, Beverly Frank, Alice Adolph and Laura Thevarge for their time, patience and dedication to their native language, as well as the Upper St't'imc Language, Culture and Education Society for its role in fostering cooperation between linguists and the native community. On the academic side, this work has been supported generously by SSHRC grant # 410-92-1629 to Patricia Shaw; I would like to thank her and the other members of the Project on Lexical Interfaces with Phonology and Syntax in Northwest Coast Languages (Susan Blake, Hamida Demirdache, Lisa Mathewson and Taylor Roberts) as well as the other members of the Salish syntax working group at UBC (Dwight Gardiner, Peter Jacobs, M. Dale Kinkade and Paul Kroeber) for valuable insights and feedback. Thanks also go to the Secwépemc Cultural Education Society/ Simon Fraser University native language teaching program, which has given me the chance to teach in Lillooet and return something to the community which has taught me so much. Kaqkwitwm'cck',sp, m selects w7a.

Moreover, -tall differs from all other agreement morphology in being obligatorily unmarked for number. Unlike the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes, it may not be suffixed with the absolutive plural marker -wh, as shown below in (5), and it has no plural antanimen (*tw)tall equivalent to the third person plural ergative (tw)las, as shown in (6):

5. *nilh i ucwalmfcw-a ats'x-en-tali-wit
   foc pl.det indian-det see-tr-3pl
   "It's the Indians that saw him/her." (5-7-94 GN)

6. *nilh i ucwalmfcw-a ats'x-en-f-tali
   foc pl.det indian-det see-tr-3pl
   "It's the Indians that saw him/her." (5-7-94 GN)

Note that this is a morphological, not a syntactic phenomenon; plural antecedents are quite compatible with -tall.

7. nilh ti stsmay-t-sa
   foc pl.det child-3sg.ross-det see-tr-tali
   "It was his children that ate the berries" (418 GN, RW)

Even from these basic facts, it is clear that -tall cannot be readily assimilated to any of the St't'imcets pronominal paradigms. In fact, its closest morphological counterpart would appear to be the passive morpheme -em, which follows a transivitizer, as shown in (8), and has no formal effect on transitivity,
as shown by incompatibility with the third absolute plural marker in (9). These are both properties of
-tall. However, passive is quite compatible with a first or second person object, as shown in (10);
contrast this with the behaviour of -tall in (3) above.

8. ats'x-en-em t-ta sqqycw-a see-tr-pass obli-det man-det
   "He was seen by the man / The man saw him." (28 RW, GN, BF)

9. * ats'x-en-em-wit t-ta sqqycw-a see-tr-pass-3pl obli-det man-det
   "He was seen by the man." (5-7-94 GN)

10. ats'x-en-ts-f-m ha see-tr-2sg.ob-pass interro
    "Did anyone see you?" (950 BF)

It appears, then, that -tall is morphologically unique. Its syntactic behaviour reinforces this impression,
as we will see.

2.2. Syntax

-tall appears in four syntactic environments. The first is in transitive subject-centred relative clauses,
which in St'd'imcets, as in other Salish languages, consist of an embedded clause introduced by a
determiner:

11. Så'ma7 k'a ku sqwal'en-tåli white appar det tell-tr-tali
    "Apparently it was a white person who told her." (LLS: 70, MLR)

The second case is in transitive subject-centred clefts, introduced by the focus-predicate nilh5:

12. nilh s-Bill te tsuw'en-tali-ha ti sqqycw-a foc nom-B det kick-tr-tali-det det man-det
    "It was Bill who kicked the man." (1838 AA)

The third is in transitive subject-centred WH-questions (see Davis, Gardiner & Matthewson 1993):

13. swat ku tsuw'en-tåli ti sqqycw-a who det kick-tr-tali det man-det
    "Who kicked the man?" (1602 GN, RW)

Finally, -tall appears in environments where the quantifier tåkem "all" has been fronted (together with
a restricting DP) from subject position of a transitive clause:

go def.past deic det coyote-det all pl.det man-redup-det see-tr-tåli
   "The coyote was going along and all the men saw him." (2882 RW)

It is important to note that while -tall never appears except in these environments, it is by no means the
case that it always appears in them. Either to start with, it is never used if the object is first or second
person (recall that it is in complementary distribution with overt object markers, as shown in (3) above).
Moreover, it is optional when the subject is plural and the object is singular, as shown below:

15. nilh i ucwal'mc-w a ats'x-en-ít-as ti sqwâ'h-a foc pl.det indian-det see-tr-3pl-erg det cougar-det
    "It was the Indians who saw the cougar." (5-7-94 GN)

Most surprisingly, however, it turns out that subject-centred relative clauses, clefts, questions and
quantifier extractions are all easy to elicit with the third person, since quantifier-as instead of -tall,
as shown in (16) - (19) below, equivalent to the -tall cases in (11) - (14) respectively:

16. ats'x-en-as ta sqqycw-a ta tsuw-en-ås-a s-Mary ta píkw-a see-tr-3erg det man-det det sell-tr-3erg-det nom-Mary det book-det
    "She saw the man that sold Mary the book." (462 GN, RW)

17. nilh ta scwen7tem a sk'çza7-t-te k'b'in-as ta sk'k'w'm-it a foc det indian.doctor-det mother-3sg.poss put.on.lap-tr-3erg det child-det
    "It was the Indian doctor's mother that picked up the child." (1060 RW)

18. swat ku tûp-un-as s-John? who det hit-tr-3erg nom-John
    "Who hit John?" (1139 RW, GN)

19. tåkem i smidåts a ta sqxw-an'-ít-as is sqwêl-a all pl.det woman-det eat-tr-3pl-3erg pl.det berries-det
    "All the women ate the berries." (1775 RW GN)

In order to understand the factors governing this surprising alternation, it is necessary to add a third
dimension of analysis: that of discourse structure, and particularly of topic-maintenance.

2.3. Discourse

The reason that it is very difficult in elicitation contexts to tell whether there is any significant difference
in meaning between subject extraction with -as and -tall is because the alternation is sensitive to the
relative "topicality" of the two arguments, which can often only be established through discourse.
Topicality, of course, can be defined in many ways, and in St'd'imcets, there are at least two separate
but overlapping types of topic. The first, which we will refer to here as discourse topic (d-topic),
roughly corresponds to the protagonist(s) of a given discourse, while the second, which we will call
sentence-topic (s-topic) is what a particular sentence is "about" - i.e., a topic in the topic-comment sense
(see Reinhart 1981). Since most sentences in a given discourse are about the protagonist(s), the two
coincide in the majority of cases; but there are several significant differences between them.

The easiest way to represent a d-topic is in terms of the file-card semantics devised by Heim (1988) and
adopted by Erteschik-Shir (1993) in her extensive account of topic-focus structure. Each new
protagonist in a discourse is given a file-card, which can then be activated and de-activated during the
discourse by topic maintenance and switching devices. It is assumed that first and second persons, being
always present in a discourse, have permanently active file-cards, and thus are immune to d-topic-related
morphology.

The most important syntactic characteristic of an active d-topic file-card is its ability to bind an empty
pronominal, which in St'd'imcets as in other pro-drop languages is essentially anaphoric rather than
deictic, and thus needs a discourse antecedent. This means that, since more than one empty pronoun can
be bound from the discourse, there may be more than one d-topic (and corresponding file-card) available

5At least one of our consultants, BF, regularly produces clefts without nilh. Superficially, these
resemble simple subject-predicate sentences (unusually, since St'd'imcets is otherwise strictly predicate-initial;
see Gardiner, Davis & Matthewson 1993); however, the presence of -tall in transitive subject-
initial sentences indicates that these structures involve extraction from a more basic predicate-initial
word order rather than representing an alternate base order:
(l) ta sqqycw-a ats'x-en-tåli tåkem i sqx7-a
det man-det see-tr-tåli all pl.det dog-det
   "The man saw all the dogs." (824 BF)
to bind them. We will assume here, for concreteness' sake, that each active file-card licenses a referential index, which then binds a null pronominal.

The mapping of d-topic indices onto pronominals in transitive clauses is not random; generally, the primary d-topic (which may be defined as the first d-topic to have been introduced amongst those which are currently active) is mapped onto the subject position, and any subsequently introduced d-topics are then mapped progressively further down the tree. This is illustrated in the following text fragment:

20.(a) Kacéla kw7a ñku7.
   He got to the brow of the hill.
(b) Wa7 lát'7 skits i st'pälwas, i st'p'l'apa.
    There was a pair of underpants lying there, a pair of long-johns.
(c) Ats'xnas, cwepnás ku7 lát'7, ama!
   He saw them there, he picked them up, they were good! (LLS p.65: MLR)
(n: relevant discourse-tracking morphemes are identified in bold-face, a convention I will adopt throughout this paper).

The primary d-topic, as represented by the null subject in sentence (a), is the agent of the transitive sentences in (c). Sentence (b), however, introduces a new referent, which corresponds to the null object in (c). Both referents in (c) are null pronominals; by hypothesis, they must be discourse-bound, implying the existence of both a primary and a secondary d-topic, the first mapped to the subject, the second to object position.

We can capture this behaviour in the file-card semantics model by assuming that file card indices are stacked in a particular order, with the primary d-topic index on the top of the pile; a secondary d-topic index will then only be available if the primary index has already been assigned. Assume further that index assignment is top-down, that is that the primary index will be assigned to the highest available pronominal in a sentence, the secondary index to the next highest, and so on. Finally, assume the process is repeated for each sentence, and the ordering effect falls out straightforwardly.

There are also cases where a primary and not a secondary d-topic is mapped directly onto an object pronominal. One such case occurs when a subject has different number and/or person features from the primary topic. In that case, a null object may easily be bound by the primary d-topic, as illustrated below:

21.(a) qwatsás ku7 ayil lhekkw7ó ni7 ni mño'kwa,
    So the other one left from there,
(b) kahál'uxwa ku7 t'u7,
    then he appeared,
(c) qwaxts'míntas ku7,
    then they noticed him. (LLS p.3; BE)

The primary d-topic here, ni mño'kwa “the other”, introduced in (a) and maintained in (b) via a null subject, is the null direct object of (c), since the subject of (c) is third person plural and thus incompatible with the features of the primary topic.

In fact, it turns out that not only feature-matching but also pragmatic compatibility can affect the d-topic-subject mapping. Thus, in the following elicited examples, real-world knowledge has been manipulated to force a non-compatible mapping; these examples are perfectly grammatical in context.

22.(a) Wa7 ti pápu7-a smàlhats.
    prog det one-det woman.
   “There was this woman.”
(b) Papt wa7 qwalt'út-min-as ti skit'a7-s-a ti kálkwi7-a.
    always prog talk-app-3erg det child-3sg.poss-det det chief-det
   “The chief's son is always proposing to the lady.” (23-6-94 RW)
23.(a) Wa7 lak ti xu'm-a k'è'k-a sk'ik'ta7-s-a ti sqwém-a.
    prog lie det big-det rock-det next-3sg.poss-det det mountain-det
   “The rock was sitting close to the mountain.”
(b) Ats'x-en-as ti sqáycw-a nilh-s dxwál.
    see-tr-3erg det man-det foc-nom go.home
   She said to the crow what to do
   “The man went to see it and he went home.” (23-6-94 RW)

What these cases seem to indicate is that the d-topic-binding of a pronominal is a matter of relative prominence, rather than a fixed relation between syntactic subject and primary d-topic; in other words, a d-topic binds the highest available pronominal argument that matches its syntactic and semantic features.

In contrast to the hierarchical structure of d-topic index assignment in transitive clauses, any d-topic may bind a pronominal in intransitive clauses, whether primary or secondary; ambiguity is usually avoided by context. This is best illustrated by presenting a fragment of text, as below:

24.(a) qáwr'alas ayil ti stitsta'sa ku hu7u' syáytens
    She told the crow what to do
(b) lits'caw-as ñku7 dxwál eki sítstkn-a, eki slal't'ímsa.
    when he would get to the underground house, to her parents.
(c) nilh tu'7 stítı'sa ku7 ti tisstı'sa ...
    She said to the crow ...
   (LLS, p. 22, MLR)

As can be seen from the transitive predication in (a), the primary d-topic is the girl, not mentioned here with a lexical NP. However, the crow, object of the predicate in (a), is subject of both the intransitive nominalized predicate saýytens in (a) and the intransitive predicate tåsk in (b). These intransitive predications do not switch topic, as can be seen in (c), where the primary topic is once again the girl.

Note also that a d-topic, once established, can remain "hidden" through a serious of intransitive and sometimes even transitive predications, as illustrated in the text fragment below:

25.(a) Cw7asoz ku7 t'u7 kw cin's lát'7,
    It did not take long,
(b) tsás ku7 t'elh ti skál'dá7a,
    before the owl came,
(c) plan ayil wa7 nxwetswetsklus
    He had already scratches on his eyes
(d) lwás k'a ku7 k'aylikwá ni skila múta7 i qwál'ilha ti nk'w't'sten'as
    because he had been trying to take off the tree-bark and the pitch from his face
At the beginning of this stretch of discourse, the primary d-topic is the girl, who is the main protagonist of the story. The owl, re-introduced in (b), is a secondary d-topic which controls the transitive predicate *skələlə7a* in (d). However, as is clear from context, the subject of the following transitive predicate *npu'ukwaləsəna* in (e) is the primary topic, the girl, who is not even mentioned by a lexical NP in this text fragment. Note that in this case, pragmatics overrides the normal mapping of the primary d-topic onto the transitive subject in (d).

In contrast to the discourse-sensitive properties of a d-topic, the s-topic, as its name is meant to indicate, is much more directly tied to sentence grammar. In fact, it is best understood as a partial deconstruction of the traditional notion of subject (see Li and Thompson 1976, Bresnan and Kanerva 1989 etc.), more particularly in the subject-predicate/topic-comment sense, that is, as the person or thing which a particular predicate is “about”. An s-topic is represented by a syntactic position, in contrast to a d-topic, which is present in the discourse context but not projected syntactically. This position is generally assumed to be canonically linked to a subject; a structural correspondence between the two has often been noted (see eg. Li and Thompson 1976, Delaney 1981). Erteschik-Shir (1993) captures this generalization in the following formula, which she refers to as the Topic Constraint (TC):

\[ \text{TOPJ} \{ \text{SUBJECT} [\text{VP-NP}...]\} \]

The TC, which states that a non-subject cannot be linked to an (s-)topic, is adopted by Roberts (1994) in his extensive investigation of subject and topic in St'at'imcets. A stronger position is taken by Li and Thompson (1976), who claim that a subject is not more than a grammaticalized topic. It is this more extreme position which we will adopt in our treatment of s-topics in St'at'imcets, claiming that they directly project a subject position.

The following table summarizes the differences between d-topic and s-topic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>d-topic</th>
<th>s-topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unique</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td>not necessarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntactically projected</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, with these differences in mind, let us examine how the two types of topic interact. In informal terms, it is easy to see why they might coincide: a sentence, after all, is quite likely to be “about” one of the principle protagonists of the discourse of which it forms a part. However, we have characterized the two types of topic in rather different formal terms: a d-topic is represented in the syntax as the index binding an empty pronominal, while an s-topic is the argument in a topic-subject position. How are we to link them together?

The answer, of course, is that both are anchored in the syntax to a subject position. S-topics are directly represented in a VP-external subject position. D-topics are linked more indirectly: active file cards, ordered from most to least prominent, are mapped onto null pronouns in a top down fashion, beginning with the subject, the highest argument in a tree. Thus, in the canonical case, both d- and s-topics will be mapped onto a subject position.

Non-canonical mappings are obtained whenever either a d-topic is not mapped to an s-topic in subject position (as with object pro), or an s-topic subject has no corresponding d-topic binder (as with a lexical NP subject). In an anti-canonical mapping, normal mapping is reversed, and a d-topic will be linked to a pronounal object while a lexical NP will correspond to the s-topic. This is most easily illustrated by examining the range of possible transitive sentence types, which are schematically represented below:

27. (a) pro [vp V NP]
(b) pro [vp V pro]
(c) NP [vp V pro]
(d) NP [vp V NP]

In (a), a d-topic binds pro in the s-topic VP-external position, satisfying both topic-subject mappings. In (b) this is also the case, but a secondary d-topic also binds a pro inside VP; the latter is therefore bound to a d-topic, but not to an s-topic subject. In (c) a d-topic binds the VP-internal pro, while the s-topic is realized as an overt NP; and finally, in (d), no d-topic is present, while an overt NP realizes the s-topic function.

It should be readily apparent that the optimal discourse-structure is that of the canonical mapping in (a), while the least optimal is the anti-canonical mapping in (c). This gives rise to the well-known Salishan "one-nominal" (ONO) effect (see Gerds 1988), whereby a single overt argument is almost invariably interpreted as object rather than subject.7

If the canonical mapping in (a) is clearly preferred and the anti-canonical one in (c) clearly dispreferred, the non-canonical structures in (b) and (d) have an intermediate status. (b) should be acceptable just in case two d-topics are being referred to, and this is indeed the case; the pro in object position may be bound by a secondary d-topic, since the pro in subject-position is bound by the primary d-topic.

Where two d-topics are cross-referenced across a stretch of discourse, a "parallelism effect" comes into play; see Matthewson (1993) and Roberts (1994) for detailed accounts of this effect in St'at'imcets, and Davis and Saunders (1984 for similar effects in Bella Coola. Matthewson's version of parallelism is given below:

For two items to corefer, they must both fulfill the same discourse function (either topic of the discourse or non-topic). In addition, there is a preference for both coreferential elements to fulfill the topic of the discourse function (Matthewson 1993:20-21).

The following example from Roberts (1994) illustrates the effect:

28. (a) Pz-nə-twal' wi s-Bill mətsə7 s-John, Wa7 wi7 cmən'-twal'-wit. meet-tr-recip pl nom-B and nom-J pro emph enemy-recip=3pl
"Bill and John met each other. They're enemies."
(b) fəsə-x-en as nihə s-qv1-qv1-ts-mən'-as
"he saw him", and then [he swore at him/"he swore at him"]
"he saw him", and then [he swore at him/"he swore at him"]

(1995 AA, GN, RW)

It seems clear that parallelism is related to d-topics rather than s-topics. To start with, it operates across as well as within sentences: in the example above, (b) could be split into two separate sentences without altering parallelism; see Roberts (1994) for further justification. Moreover, it is crucially linked to binding of pro, which we have claimed is mediated by d-topics; this is explicitly mentioned in Matthewson's version of the Parallelism Constraint. Now, as already noted, d-topic file-cards are not randomly assigned to pronouns, but are mapped onto the syntax in a particular order, with the

7 Roberts (1994) provides a similar analysis of this effect in St'at'imcets, to which the present account is indebted, although his version differs from the one given here in that it appeals to the canonical realization of overt NPs in focus as well as topic positions.
primary d-topic index assigned to the highest pronominal, the secondary d-topic index assigned to the next, and so on. It seems that parallelism can be reduced to this independently needed mapping relation, since the same mapping will obtain in each sentence, barring a topic-switch; the parallelism effect is then simply the result of the same mapping procedure applying iteratively to sentences in a discourse.

While the cases in (27b) are non-canonical because they contain a d-topic which is not linked to an s-topic, those in (27d) exhibit the opposite effect, with two overt NPs (by hypothesis, not d-topics). It has often been noted that sentences with more than one overt NP are very rare in Salishan discourse, though they are relatively easy to elicit and in St'át'imcs at least perfectly grammatical in isolation. This follows from the fact that they completely lack a d-topic, and therefore can only be used in highly restricted discourse circumstances. Such circumstances obtain precisely when the primary d-topic is for some reason neither the subject nor the object of a given predication. This is best illustrated by some textual examples:

29.(a) Wa7 we7 tnas ti cwíktensá.
    She was holding her knife,

(b) nilh ku7 tu7 i7 sc6diels ti sám7a.
    then the white man ran away.

(c) Ats'xenas ku7 tu7 i7 ti cwíkt'na ti sám7a -
    The white man saw the knife -

(d) xsum7ú!
    it was huge!

30.(a) Qapt's ku7 ayh.
    Spring arrived,

(b) lít7as'sa ti s'kwái'lt'sa ti mfxála, the bear opened the cave,

(c) cwíts'cit'áms ku7 ti tèxw7tássa,
    he was given his bow,

(d) nilh tu7 szúnhuts'm' emmem.
    and he was bid farewell.

In the first case, (29), the primary d-topic (identified as the referent of the empty subject pronounal in (a)) is the bearer of the knife. The intransitive predication in (b) introduces a secondary d-topic, the white man, who is also the (overt) subject of the transitive clause in (c). Were the subject not mentioned explicitly, the rule mapping a primary topic to the highest pro would immediately interpret the subject as the knife-bearer; hence two overt NPs are necessary.

In the second case, in (30), the primary d-topic is the hunter, as evidenced by the passives in (c) and (d). The bear (a secondary d-topic) must therefore be explicitly mentioned in the transitive predication in (b), since a pro-subject would be automatically interpreted as the hunter.

Let us now turn to a consideration of the effect of -tál on information structure. Perhaps the best way of showing its discourse-function is simply to examine a relevant stretch of narrative: the following text-fragment also contains a variety of other discourse tracking mechanisms, for comparison:

31.(a) Wa7 ku7 láti7 tu7 pi pé7 sámhi7ats.
    There was once a woman.

(b) Cwí7a7oz kwenswá zvésááten íhenka7mcé7as k'a ti7 ku sámhi7ats,
    I don't know which people that woman came from,

(c) íhenka7m'sas k'a ti7 ih7qás.
    where it was she came from.

(d) nilh ku7 tu7 swá7a i tu7 qwa7 ut'míní7íil;
    So there were those who proposed to her;

(e) tsícw ku7 ayhít tu7 sáq7 yu7 sqá7 cwí7ut'míní7em.
    one man came, and proposed to her.

(f) Cwí7ay tu7 ku7 xá7 mí7í7í7as i sáq7yqeycxá.
    She didn't want the men.

(g) Tsícw ku7 ti nükwa.
    Another came,

(h) Cwí7ay tu7 ku7 xá7 mí7í7í7as.
    she didn't want him.

The existential intransitive clause in (a) (which marks the beginning of the story) has an overt nominal, ti sámhi7atsa, "the woman" which becomes the primary d-topic. (b) is a transitive clause with a first person subject (irrelevant to d-topic tracking), and a propositional complement, which itself contains an intransitive predicate with an overt nominal, further identifying the primary d-topic, which then binds the subject of the "amplificatory" clause in (c). (d) is an intransitive clause which introduces a new secondary topic, itself a subject-centred relative clause containing -tál, whose nominal corresponds to the primary d-topic, the woman. (e) is an intransitive clause, introducing another secondary d-topic, followed by a passive, whose single null argument (the patient) once again corresponds to the primary d-topic. (f) is a typical transitive, with a null nominal subject, the primary d-topic, and an overt object, introducing a new (plural) referent. The intransitive clause in (g) introduces another non-topic object, and (h) illustrates a transitive predicate with no overt arguments, again with the null subject interpreted as primary d-topic, but this time with a null object also functioning as secondary topic.

From even this brief examination, it is clear that -tál has an effect on the mapping of discourse functions into the syntax. Whereas the canonical mapping, as we have seen, involves a d-topical null pronoun in subject position and an overt non-topical NP in object position, -tál allows a pro in object position to be bound by the primary d-topic, and a trace in subject position to be indirectly bound by a secondary d-topic. In this respect, its discourse function parallels that of passive (see (31e) above), and indeed sometimes the two can be found in the same sentence in virtually identical contexts:8

32. T'qmíní7em ayt ci7 tu7 qí7mín7íl;
    She was visited (lit; come for) then by the one who visited her

While examples such as those above (and many similar) provide clear evidence that -tál has an effect on the mapping of discourse functions into the syntax. Whereas the canonical mapping, as we have seen, involves a d-topical null pronoun in subject position and an overt non-topical NP in object position, -tál allows a pro in object position to be bound by the primary d-topic, and a trace in subject position to be indirectly bound by a secondary d-topic. In this respect, its discourse function parallels that of passive (see (31e) above), and indeed sometimes the two can be found in the same sentence in virtually identical contexts:8

8 In fact, passive is very commonly used as a means of topicalizing an object in many Salish languages, both those with and without a separate topical object marker, as pointed out by Kinkade (1988, 1989, 1990); see also Kroober (1987).
used or not. Supporting evidence for this conjecture is provided by an analysis of the relevant extraction contexts in LLS. I identified eighteen subject extraction cases, all with -tal, and fourteen cases of object extraction, all with -as. (See appendix B for a complete list of these examples). In other words, where discourse context is supplied -as and -tal are indeed in complementary distribution.

3. What does -tal mark?

With the basic facts in place, I will now turn to a consideration of possible analyses for -tal, drawing for cross-Salish comparison particularly on the work of Kinkade (1989, 1990). In section 3.1, I will show that -tal cannot be treated simply as an agreement marker; in 3.2, I will argue that though clearly diachronically related to the "Topical Object" markers described by Kinkade in several Salishan languages, -tal cannot be identified with any of them, either; in 3.3 I will turn to an alternative based on ergative extraction, which I will also reject, as well as an analysis based on passive in 3.4. In section 4, I will then propose an account of the behavior of -tal which avoids some of the problems encountered in section 3.

3.1 -tal as agreement

Perhaps the simplest hypothesis concerning -tal is that it is simply part of the agreement paradigm of the language. A number of morphological, syntactic, and discourse arguments weigh against such an analysis, however. There are two agreement possibilities: third person subject and third person object. If -tal is an object marker, then it should cooccur with subject markers, which it does not (see (4) above); on the other hand, if it is a subject marker, then it should co-occur with object markers, which is also not the case (as shown in (3)). A third analysis, which would group it with the "special" object markers -turt (reflexive) and -twal (reciprocal) is also precluded, on the grounds that both of these are intrasitivizing suffixes (see (2) above) whereas -tal has no effect on transitivity. If -tal is an agreement marker, then, it behaves like no other agreement marker in the language.

Another morphological argument is provided by feature composition. To put it bluntly, -tal is featureless. In general, third persons (as the "other" person category) are unmarked in Salish (this being particularly apparent with the zero-marking of third person absolutives), but -tal is striking in that it is also obligatorily unmarked for number, as shown in examples (5-7) in 2.1 above.

A simple agreement analysis also fails to account for the most salient syntactic effect of -tal: it provides no explanation for why subject extraction is forced. And finally, it provides no insight into the discourse effects described in 2.3 above. In short, an agreement analysis fails to address any of the characteristic properties of -tal, and thus can offer no real insight into its behavior.

3.2 -tal as topical object marker

The term "topical object" is taken from Kinkade (1989), who describes such markers as "...special object inflections used to keep track of a topic when it is not an agent/subject, and specifically when it is the patient (or the like) of a transitive construction (which in its default role would be a direct object)."

Kinkade identifies topical object markers in four branches of Salishan: Tsamosan (Upper Chehalis, Cowitz, Quinault); Tillamook; Central Coast (Lushootseed); and Southern Interior (Columbian). All are clearly historically related, and reconstructible as Proto-Salish *-wall:

(33) Upper Chehalis: -wal/wall
Cowitz: -wal/wall
Quinault: -ull
Tillamook: -gul/gul
Lushootseed: -g'ull
Columbian: -wé/wú
Proto-Salish: *-wall

It is clear that -tal is related to these forms; the initial -a- is simply a fossilized transitive marker, and the only real puzzle is the disappearance in St'át'imcets of Proto-Salish *-w-, which is still present in the reciprocal suffixes -twal- and -twaxw (the latter residual). This is noted by Kroeber (1991), who rejects the affiliation of -tal with the topical object markers on this basis; their resemblance in form and function, however, seems too obvious to be an accident.

I thus conclude that -tal is historically derived from the Proto-Salish topical object marker. However, synchronically, it shows some highly significant differences. Most importantly, authentic topical object markers really do mark objects, as pointed out by Kinkade:

"Topical object constructions have the topical object suffix immediately following the transitivizing suffix, but in turn are followed by a subject suffix or clitic. In Lushootseed and Tillamook, and in the perfective aspect forms of Upper Chehalis and Cowitz, and in Columbian, however, all third person transitive constructions do have a subject suffix (which would not be present in a passive). Since the only thing that would ever be present between a transitivizing suffix and a subject suffix is an object suffix, the topical object suffixes must also be object markers." (Kinkade 1989, p.12).

However, as pointed out above, -tal shows none of the characteristics of an object suffix. Like Columbian and the Tsamosan imperfectives, St'át'imcets has an overt transitivizing suffix (-as); however, -as is in complementary distribution with -tal, indicating that the latter cannot be an object suffix. So, even if it induces a topical object effect, -tal cannot be a topical object marker.

There are also obvious syntactic differences between topical object markers and -tal. The former do not induce extraction, and can cooccur with both subject (agent) and object (patient) arguments, as reported by Kinkade:

"Most commonly, Salishan languages allow only one lexical argument as a direct adjunct in a clause; in an intransitive clause this will be the subject, in a transitive clause it will be the object. With a topical object suffix, however, the lexical argument may be either subject or object, but is more commonly subject..." (Kinkade 1989, p.22).

However, as we have already seen, -tal is incompatible with an overt post-predicative subject, since the latter must be extracted.

In fact, further differences between the topical object marker and -tal emerge when we examine the "topical object effect" itself in more detail. Recall that d-topics are represented in the syntax by null pronominals, whose reference is filled in by indices associated with active file cards. This gives rise to a typical "null subject" pattern in transitives, where an overt argument is generally interpreted as object, in line with the ONO. Now, if -tal were to induce a topical object effect, we might expect exactly the reverse pattern, with objects generally being null. This, however, is not the case; overt lexical objects
appear to be freely available in both elicited and textual contexts. Some examples of the latter are presented below:

34. wa?7 k'a kwelh wa?7 iqminálti i nts'má'7a
some people must be coming for my children
(LLS p. 36, MLR)

35. Ts'cwh ku7 t'i7 ayih p'an't mótà? e7ó éki ucwálmícwà ti7 ti prianatìlì a tewe'tuw7a'ìsa píxem'wi7
The man who had met the boys where they were hunting went back to the people.
(LLS p. 41, MLR)

36. Put ha kélh tàkemlíkálh nas szacentáli ku pépí7 t'i7 ts'i7?
Do we really have to go all to pack one deer?
(LLS, p. 60, BE)

In these examples, there is no obvious correlation between object and topicality; indeed, in (36) the object is indefinite, precluding such an analysis altogether.

Now, it might be argued that this lack of topicality is connected to the fact that extraction is induced by -tall, but not by topical object markers. However, in object extraction cases with -as, the subject is almost invariably null, just as in non-extraction cases, and unlike in cases of extraction with -tall... The single textual case of an overt subject in an object extraction case is given below:

37. stá'n'as k'a málh kwa ilalmin'sa ti sk'ukwm'nìta
whatever it might have been that the child was crying over
(LLS p. 19, MLR)

Here, the extracted object is indefinite, allowing the overt post-predicative DP to function as s-topic. What the rarity of overt subjects in object extraction indicates is that the d-topic is strongly correlated with subject - displaying, in fact, a "topical subject" effect; however, -tall does not induce a corresponding topical effect.

We conclude that though clearly diachronically related to topical object markers, -tall cannot be one. It is time to explore other possibilities.

3.3. -tall as ergative extraction marker

One promising alternative is that -tall is linked directly to the extraction of an ergative argument. As demonstrated by e.g. Campana (1992), Murasugi (1992) and many others, it is consistently harder in many languages to extract an ergative than an absolutive argument; whereas the latter can generally be extracted directly, the former must rely on special morphology to license an empty category in transitive subject position. Such mechanisms appear to be widespread in Salish (see Kroeber 1991 for an overview) and certainly exist (though in somewhat different form) in both Northern Interior neighbours of St't'imcets, Shuswap (Secwépemc̓tín) and Thompson (Nlaka'pamux̓c̓tín), as documented by Gardiner (1993) and Kroeber (1992) respectively; see also Davis, Gardiner and Matthewson (1993). It seems quite plausible, then, that -tall should play a similar role. Moreover, such an analysis immediately accounts for why -tall should only appear in extraction environments, why it should appear only with third persons (since ergativity is confined to third person in Salish), and why it should be in complementary distribution with the ergative marker (since it marks an ergative gap).

Nevertheless, there are some major problems with this analysis. The most obvious is that, as we have seen, -tall is frequently replaced in elicited ergative extractions by -as. I have suggested above that the reason for this is that a proper discourse context is necessary for the appearance of -tall (as opposed to the default -as marker); but there is no reason, if -tall is simply a marker of extraction, why this should be the case. At best, an ad-hoc additional condition on discourse factors would have to be appended to the analysis.

In addition, for one of our consultants, both -tall and -as are optional in cases of subject extraction with an inanimate object.9 Examples are given below:

38. swat ku tsw'én ti k'èh-a
who det kick-tr det rock-det
"Who kicked the rock?"
(1503 GN)

39. s'tx'en-1lkan ti káo-ha ken'n-alqw-mfn ti k'èh-a
see-tr-1sg-subj det car-det bump-mass-appl det rock-det
"I saw the car bumped the rock." / * I saw the car that the rock bumped.
(2924 GN)

40. nilh ti káo-ha ken'n-alqw-mfn ti sqšc7w-a
foc det car-det bump-mass-appl det man-det
"It's the car that bumped into the man."
(2931 GN)

Such examples compound the problem of the apparent optionality of -tall in subject extraction contexts, arguing against an account based simply on the inaccessibility of an ergative gap to its antecedent.

3.4. -tall as passive

In contrast to the last hypothesis, a passive analysis for -tall looks at least initially to be highly unpromising. St't'imcets, like all Salish languages, has a more-or-less readily identifiable passive construction (examples of which are given in (8-10) above). Though rather different from the English passive (in particular, in retaining accusative case), the St't'imcets passive shows some familiar diagnostic properties: in particular, it demotes the agent to oblique status, as can be seen from the presence of a somewhat evanescent oblique marker (shown in (41) below), as well as a word order restriction between the (direct) patient and the (oblique) agent (shown in (42)):10

41. ts'7as ku7 ayih zwátemén éki ucwálmícwà tsxwá7ax kwa Išc7wsas eti sqx7as7sa.
"It came to be known then by the people that he did not bring it to his father."
(LLS p. 45, MLR)

42. s'tx'en-em ti sqšc7w-a ti smíllhats-a
see-tr-pass det man-det
"The man was seen by the woman. / * The woman was seen by the man.
(79 RW, GN)

None of these properties characterize either ordinary transitive clauses or clauses with -tall. On the other hand, the extraction-inducing property of -tall is not shared by either active transitives or passives. It appears, then that the -tall and passive constructions have a very different aetiology.

Nonetheless, there are some striking functional parallels between the two. To start with, they are used almost interchangeably in discourse, as shown in (31) above. This is not surprising, if both are ways of maintaining topic continuity (see footnote 7), but the parallels seem to be deeper than simply functional, since -tall shows morphological similarities to the passive marker -em, as shown in section 2.1, as well as syntactic resemblances: both passive and -tall have a detransitivizing effect, though they achieve it in rather different ways. Informally, passive demotes the agent argument to adjunct status, leaving the

9 In fact, there is rather complex but systematic variation between our consultants in their use of -tall , -as, and zero-marking in ergative extraction contexts. For all speakers, -tall is grammatical with subject extraction. For more liberal speakers, -as is also possible when discourse conditions allow it. Our most liberal speaker, GN, also allows zero-marking. There thus appears to be an implicative relationship between these three possibilities.

10 This word order restriction is rather more complex than a simple adjunct-argument distinction, because as pointed out in Gardiner, Matthewson and Davis (1993), order of adjuncts and arguments in ordinary transitive clauses is free.
At the risk...

The question then arises as to exactly what the relation is between the two constructions. Is it merely functional convergence that has endowed them with parallel properties, or is there some deeper connection? In the next section, I will attempt to provide an answer to this question.

4. -tall as a discourse-passive

At the risk of burgeoning terminology, I wish to suggest in this section that -tall really is a type of passive, but one that operates on a different order of relations than the more familiar thematic passive. To be more precise, whereas ordinary passive de-thematizes a subject (in the sense of depriving it of its thematic role), discourse passive de-topicalizes a subject. The two operations are structurally as well as functionally parallel because both affect a subject; they are differentiated, however, by the type of subject which is affected.

This implies the existence of two subject positions, a lower thematic projection and a higher topical one. In fact, we have already seen the "topical subject" position in St'át'imcets; it is none other than the s-topic described in section 2.3. Let us then assume roughly the following structure:

43. IP
   Spec T
   I
   VP
   Spec T'
   V
   NP

We assume that thematically selected arguments of the main predicate are generated in VP-internal positions (see Davis 1993a,b, Matthews 1993, Roberts 1994). The subject will then raise from Spec, VP to Spec, TP, the position of an s-topical subject. The ergative marker -as will be generated in the head of the TP projection. Auxiliaries will be generated in the I position, above TP; Spec, IP will ultimately be filled by the s-topical subject. Following Chomsky (1992), we will assume movement takes place at an abstract level of Logical Form to satisfy conditions on the identification of arguments by agreement.

The abstract topic position hypothesized here seems to have an overt counterpart in Secwepemctsin (Shuswap), as investigated by Gardiner (1993), who identifies a position below the focus projection and above the thematic projection, whose function is that of an internal topic; see also Aissen (1992). This suggests an LF/S-Structure movement parameter separating St'át'imcets from Secwepemctsin, which goes part way towards an explanation of the rather striking word-order differences between the two languages.

The "topical passive" analysis of -tall immediately accounts for a number of properties of the construction, including the "topical object effect" (which, as I argued above, is actually a "non-topical subject" effect), as well as its restriction to transitives (for precisely parallel reasons to thematic passive) and third persons (which are the only persons relevant to d-topic binding in the first place). One crucial property of -tall, however, remains problematic: there is in this account still no explanation for why it should always induce extraction.

One way to address this issue is to ask why it is that extraction has a de-topicalizing effect. There are in fact two possible answers to this question. First of all, it might be argued that extraction is invariably a focusing operation in St'át'imcets, and focus is incompatible with d-topic binding. Of the four relevant extraction environments (WH-questions, focus clefs, relative clauses, and quantified argument fronting), the first two are canonical focusing devices; the extracted argument of a relative clause can also be plausibly argued to be focused, and there is some interesting evidence (see Demirdache et al, this volume) that quantified argument extraction, as opposed to bare quantifier fronting, can also play a focusing role. If this is indeed the case, then -tall might be argued to be a focusing device, rather than a de-topicalizing one; however, such an analysis leads to the same problems as the ergative extraction marker analysis, in that it fails to account for cases where extraction to a focus position does not trigger -tall. Rather, the relation must be an indirect one, where the de-topicalizing effect of -tall forces extraction.11

Another way of looking at this problem is to examine the nature of the empty category left behind after extraction. In all the cases under consideration, the gap is bound by a quantificational element, and thus counts as a "true" (non-pronominal) variable (see Cinque (1990) for the distinction).12 Now, as we have seen, d-topics bind null pronominals. But pro may not be a true variable, as has been noted frequently in the literature; see in particular Baker (1991, 1993). It follows that in a subject-extraction context, the subject may not be d-topic bound; hence, extraction correlates with a de-topicalizing effect. Note that since an overt NP in argument can never be bound by a d-topic (since it has its own d-topic binding in the first place), -tall will only be found in extraction contexts in the first place.

This analysis also accounts for the mysterious non-occurrence of -tall in elicited extraction contexts. There is nothing to stop extraction taking place without formally detopicalizing the subject; if a discourse context is missing, no d-topic will be present anyway, and therefore detopicalizing the subject will be unnecessary (and in fact, pragmatically rather odd). This is exactly what happens in elicitation contexts, where sentences containing initial -tall are frequently judged odd:

44. ?ni til ti sàgáchua a ti at's-en-tali ha s-John ti-un-tali
   foc det man-det det see-tr-tali-det nom-J
   hit-tr-tali "It's the man that saw John; that hit him;"
   (357 GN, RW)

On the other hand, their acceptability is greatly improved if an initial ergative -as is supplied instead of -tall:

45. ni til ti sàgáchua a stàt's-en-as s-John ti-un-tali
   foc det man-det see-tr-3erg nom-J
   hit-tr-tali "It's the man that John saw that hit him;"
   (350 GN, RW)

This follows straightforwardly if a topic has been introduced. We now have the beginnings of an account of what -tall does. Its effect is to delink the d-topic from the (s-topic) subject position, forcing extraction as a means of licensing the empty category which results.

11 One way of rescuing the focus-analysis of -tall would be to claim that focus, just like topic, is dependent on a prior set of discourse presuppositions. Then the cases of ergative extraction with -as in elicited examples would fall out from the lack of a discourse context for focus, rather than topic.

12 Roberts (1994, chapter 2) argues that absolute extraction cases involve a true gap rather than a zero pronominal. This is also true of ergative extraction in Coast languages; see Gerdes (1988) on Halkomelem, Jacobs (1989) on Squamish, and Crozier (1991) for a general overview. Roberts assumes resumptive pronominal morphology in ergative extraction cases in St'át'imcets; however, if -as and -tall are not pronominal markers in the same sense as ordinary agreement, there seems to be no reason why a gap should not be present in ergative, as well as absolute, extraction cases, as is obviously the case for ergative extractions with zero morphology.
The primary d-topic is then free to link to an object pro in -tal constructions, though as we have seen this topical object effect is not a necessary consequence of detopicalizing the subject.

4.1. Split ergativity and the s-topic position

It remains to elucidate the relationship between -tal and the ergative marker -as. The latter, we will assume, is linked to the s-topic subject position, which is generated in all transitive clauses with a third person subject, regardless of whether there is a d-topic present in the discourse. This explains the presence of -as in sentences with first or second person object pronouns, which, as we have seen, are irrelevant to d-topic maintenance, as well as in sentences with two overt lexical NPs, neither of which by definition is linked to a d-topic. Following Roberts (1994), we further assume -as assigns ergative case, which is linked to the s-topic position; absolutive case, on the other hand, is assigned in VP.

This does not, however, explain the absence of -as in intransitives, which by hypothesis must lack an s-topic position. This amounts to the claim that intransitives have a completely different informational structure from transitives - they lack the "aboutness" relation encoded by the s-topic. While this may appear counter-intuitive (how can a sentence be about nothing?) it is probably easier to understand if the relevant notion of aboutness is taken to be a relation between two NPs within an S rather than a relation between the S and a discourse antecedent (which is the domain of d-topicalization). Note that there is nothing to prevent intransitive arguments from being d-topic bound; as we have seen, absolutive empty pronominals are readily d-linked.

This approach to intransitives allows us a rather simple account of the distribution of ergative -as: it marks s-topic subject. This in turn yields a structural parameter (presence versus absence of a syntactic projection corresponding to the s-topic subject) which underlies the ergative/absolutive versus nominative/accusative case parameter in St'at'imcets.

One further complication is presented by first and second person pronouns, which, in the pronominal split characteristic of most Salishan languages, appear as subjects of both transitive and intransitive clauses with first and second persons on the one hand and third persons on the other. Morphologically, one and two subjects are clitics, while the third ergative is a suffix, as demonstrated, for example, by the ability of the former but not the latter to encilitize to the first of a string of pre-verbal auxiliaries (see Davis 1993a). Moreover, unlike ergatives or absolutes, first and second persons are fully inflected for number throughout the pronominal paradigm (see van Eijk 1985:172-189 for details). Syntactically, first and second person arguments, unlike third persons, never appear in argument positions; independent deictic pronominals may only be used either predicatively or as adjuncts, in which case they take third person agreement:

46. (a) nilh) snówí ti ats'x-en-ts-4s-a
   (foc) 2sg.emph det see-tr-1sg.obj-3erg-det
   "It was you that saw me."  (60 GN)

(b) * snówí ti ats'x-en-ts-4cw-a
   2sg.emph det see-tr-1sg.ob-2sg.conj-det
   "It was you that saw me."  (1403 GN, RW)

This suggests that first or second person clitics function as "true" pronominal arguments in the sense of Jelinek (1984), rather than as agreement markers, in the sense of Baker (1991, 1993); they directly saturate the predicate to which they are attached, rather than indirectly, through an empty pronoun. On the other hand, as argued in Matthewson et al. (1993) and Davis (1993b), third person arguments are generated in argument position in St'at'imcets, and thus cannot be linked to pronominal arguments in either the Jelinek or Baker sense.

What all this means is that since first and second person clitics are Jelinek-type pronominal arguments, they do not project argument positions into the syntax at all. There is thus no s-topical subject present in clauses with first and second subject pronouns, which accordingly show a straight nominative accusative case-marking pattern.

5. Conclusion

Let us now summarize the preceding analysis. I have analyzed ergative -as as the marker or an s-topical subject position, to which the thematic subject moves at LF. This position is available only in transitives, and only with third person subjects, because intransitives and 1st and 2nd person arguments have no bearing on s-topicality. -tal is a type of discourse passive, which detopicalizes the s-topic subject by delinking it from a d-topic. The effect of this operation is to force extraction, since the only empty category which can be linked to a non-topical antecedent is a true (operator-bound) variable. A full NP is excluded from the subject position of a -tal clause simply because an R-expression can never be linked to a d-topic in the first place, and thus detopicalization will never apply. Likewise, -tal is only found in third person predications because it is only in this environment that there are two possible d-topic binders, one of which can be de-topicalized to alter the prominence relations between them.

I hope to have shown that the analysis of one small morpheme can lead to insights into the interrelation of morphology, syntax and discourse in Salish languages. Whatever the correct analysis of -tal might turn out to be, its description entails a detailed investigation of some of the most fascinating and enigmatic areas of Salish linguistics.

---

13 It seems clear that the s-topic of intransitives need not be the surface subject, as argued for example by Kratzer (1989) and Erteschick-Shir (1993), who assume that the s-topic of unaccusatives is actually an event variable, and of existential intransitives is an abstract location in space or time.

14 Philips (to appear) demonstrates a split system in Yamas with precisely the same properties.
### Appendix A

**Key to Stät’lmects (van Eijk) orthography**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Phonetic script</th>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Phonetic script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q’w</td>
<td>q’w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p’</td>
<td>â</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>xw</td>
<td>x’w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m’</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r’</td>
<td>y’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts’</td>
<td>ċ</td>
<td>g’</td>
<td>g’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>gw</td>
<td>ñ’w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g’w</td>
<td>ñw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n’</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t’</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lh</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>w’</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l’</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>y’</td>
<td>y’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>z’</td>
<td>z’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kw</td>
<td>k’w</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kw’</td>
<td>k’w</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cw</td>
<td>xw</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q’</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qw</td>
<td>q’w</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ɨ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abbreviations used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appl</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def.past</td>
<td>definite past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deic</td>
<td>deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erg</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foc</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prog</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recip</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redup</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj</td>
<td>subject (indicative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Extraction Structures in Lilooet Legends and Stories (van Elk and Williams 1981)

p.3
line 3: tâkem t'u7 swat wa7 kwêntensâlitâ kwenswa n'k'âyap
everybody knows that I am a coyote

p.6
line 2: Tsukw t'u7 i sq'wâxtsa wa7 smul.
Only his legs were in the water.

line 5: Ati7 sylh gwelônsa lhwas kamulmûnlâ li qu7a, gwelônsa. Plan múta7 úqwa7.
It was his stomach that was in the water, his stomach. He drank again.

line 7: T'ak t'u7, nîlh t'u7 sîts7as kwêntsâsta lhtsciwâlmenas ti qí7a.
So he carried on going, until the water nearly got up to his face.

p.7
line 1: lhq'iq'at t'u7 ti wa7 zwâtenan
the bit I know is short

line 6: stân' kelh lâti7 kwa zûqswâcMW li tekwátswa ?
what are you gonna kill with that bow of yours?

p.9
line 1: stâm'as k'a nukun' ku száltenusu ?
what on earth have you done?

line 5: lts7a k'a nukun' lh gôy'tan
I must have gone and fallen asleep

line 7: taukw t'u7 ti wa7 zwâtenan
that's all I know of it

p.10
line 3: kânem ses xzu7 i n'kwêntsâstenswa ?
why are your eyes big?

p.12
line 2: kânem su xilhnum'c êts7a ?
why did you do this to me?

line 4: kânem múta7 sacw gu'y7 ?
why were you sleeping?

p.15
line 4: i wa7 estsmâ'î
the ones who had children
line 6: i wa7 estûwa7
the ones who owned them

line 12: nîlh cawilh k'a i stsmâ'tikâlha sq'welcitimulhas
it's turned out that it's our cubs that she's cooked for us

line 13: i wa7 skwilh sëkzwêkwez7i
the ones that were left of the little children

p.19
line 5: stâm'as k'a malh kwâi alamûnas ti sk'ôk'wmi7a
whatever the child might have been crying about

line 6: ihelts7u nîlhâ7cna ihelts74 tîlbcwîwit i ucâwalmîcwa
from the ladder that the people enter from

p.20
line 12: stâm'as k'a wi7 múta7 kwêlha wa7 mek'ílôya7 cew7'aoz kwênswa zezwân.
whatever mek'ílôya7 might be, I have no idea.

p.23
line 3: lki wa7 estâfchw
to the ones who had houses

p.24
line 7: tâkem t'u7 kdti7 wa7 t'u7 t'iqas
all that stuff that he brought

p.26
line 7: tâkem ku7 t'u7 np'ukwałâsnas
everything that she poured into his eye

line 15: nîlhs lâti7 ti sâw'ta kwii' fnâl'ap
let it be the slave that you get ready

p.28
line 3: i takemâ t'u7 np'ukwâlôsnas ti skalûl7a
everything that she had poured into the owl's eyes

p.30:
line 3: ti wa7 hal'âchtitas
the one they had showed it to
line 9: ti s'men'lhatsa, ti qex7itsa'7sa lhecwnas the girl who had put on her dogskin

p.41
line 1: Tsicw ku7 ti7 ayih p'an't mûta7 et'76 éki ucwalmicwa ti7 ti p'ûntalîha i tewtw'wa ltsa pfxem'wit So the one who had met the boys when they were hunting returned to the people

p.52
line 9: p'an't ayih mûta7 lheli7'di culemlintaliha tú7a ti twû'wa so the ones who had run away from the boy went back

p.54
line 6: nilh s7âts'xenas ti q'wexq'wtxqwa mxalh wa7 smûtsao7q kâti7 nklûtsa so he saw a black bear who was sitting in front of him

line 10: ... ti wa7 szayenstûmînas i k'sâytkenswa ... what your relatives are doing to you

line 12 ... stân'as kw stûntîsin ... whatever I tell you

p.55
line 9: ... lbstun'as ti wa7 spînusems ... whatever he was thinking

p.57
line 3: Nilh mûta7 ti sùp'sa ti mâxalha wa kanûk'wa'7ståli kwâs wa7 neqûâlt. It was the breath of the bear which made it warm inside.

line 9: nilh ti7 wa7 szayenîwne nabil'wit. Nilh ti7 wa7 szayenîwne x7âtsin t'unam'tên. So he licked it. That's what they did for four months

p.59
line 3: peplâ7îl ti7 ti stûfîcalâ just one deer that he brought back

p.60
line 3: Put ha kelh tâkemlhîkalâe na szâcentaili ku péple7 ti77 ts'î77 ? Do we really all have to go just to pack one deer?

p.66
line 1: nilh tu7 spzâns k'a lhwûtâts k'a kàti7 ku pûzâns so then he met whoever he met around there

line 4: cw7âoz kw szwatentîswa lhwûtâts iz' ku ûstàli they didn't know who had thrown them out

line 6: K'a wâ7a cwich ti7 sqwenûxw ti ûstàli i st'ëpâlîswa So then the one who had thrown the underpants out got sick
they didn't know what happened to him, that he got sick

the one that came to peek inside the pithouse.

Already everybody had died who was in the pithouse

Â

it was a white person who told her

My mother told me this when I was a child.

whatever it was that he was wearing

... the Shuswap who was selling things

So there was this Indian chief who they were always talking about ...

... the one who cut the shoemaker's throat

Whenever I need money

I'm the only one who went there.

... he told me that it was him that cut the shoemaker's throat

There was this old woman who was always carrying a basket on her back
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