The aim of this paper is to provide an analysis of the internal structure of Determiner Phrases in St’at’imcets. We introduce new data on possessives and relative clauses, while building on previous work on St’at’imcets (Davis 1993, Demirdache and Matthewson 1994, Demirdache et al 1994, Davis and Matthewson 1995). We have also benefited from Montier’s (1994) detailed description of attributive constructions in Saanich. This examination of DPs in St’at’imcets should facilitate future comparison with other Salish languages.

We assume a basic X-bar structure, which for DP will look like (1). Details will be filled in as the different components of DP are discussed.

1. Determiners

Determiners are obligatory on all argument phrases in St’at’imcets, including those which do not require a determiner in English (see Matthewson in prep. for discussion). The object in (2a,b) contains the mass noun qwe7 ‘water’, which in English appears without a determiner; in St’at’imcets, the determiner is obligatory.

2. a. qwe7-an-š-n kan [kw’u] [ku] qwe7
   need-tr-1sg.subj [det water] ‘I need water’

   b. * qwe7-an-š-n kan [ku] qwe7
      need-tr-1sg.subj [water] ‘I need water’

In (3a,b) the determiner is obligatory on a generic plural subject, again unlike in English.

3. a. wa7? čaʔ=ʔ-ah-štaʔ [kw’s=ʔ] [m’qalš]
   wa7 ts’aqw-an-š-tas [tɛc-a] [mi’qalš]
   be eat-tr-3pl.erg pl.det sweet-det pl.det bear-det
   ‘Bears eat honey’

   b. * wa7 čaʔ=ʔ-ah-štaʔ [kw’s=ʔ] [m’qalš]
      ts’aqw-an-š-tas [tɛc-a] [mi’qalš]
      be eat-tr-3pl.erg pl.det sweet-det bear-det
      ‘Bears eat honey’

Finally, (4) shows that proper noun arguments (both objects and subjects) require determiners.2

4. a. ?á̲gʔ=an-š-n kan [kʷ=ʔ] Rose
   á’=ʔ=x-en-lhkan [kw-a] Rose
   see-tr-1sg.subj [det-nom Rose] ‘I saw Rose’

   b. * ?á̲gʔ=an-š-n kan [Rose]
      á’=ʔ=x-en-lhkan [Rose]
      see-tr-1sg.subj [Rose] ‘I saw Rose’

   c. ?á̲gʔ=an-č-aʔ [kʷ=ʔ] Rose
      á’=ʔ=x-en-ts-as [kw-a] Rose
      see-tr-1sg.obj-3erg [det-nom Rose] ‘Rose saw me’

   d. * ?á̲gʔ=an-č-aʔ [Rose]
      á’=ʔ=x-en-ts-as [Rose]
      see-tr-1sg.obj-3erg [Rose] ‘Rose saw me’

The distinctions captured in the determiner system are shown in (5), which is a reanalysis of van Eijk’s (1985) categorization of the system.

5. | referential | non-referential |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present</th>
<th>absent</th>
<th>remote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   singular | tl-a | ml-a | kʰu-a |
   plural | l-a | nath-a | kʰu-l-a |
   collective | k1-a |

The major division is that between the referential determiners, all of which contain the enclitic -a, and the non-referrential determiner ku, which lacks -a. Non-referential ku is restricted in its distribution; it may appear only under the scope of ‘non-fact’ modalities (cf. Givón 1978), such as negation, yes-no or wh-questions, epistemic modals or intentional verbs.3 A modal case is illustrated in (6).

6. a. čaʔ=ʔ [kw’u] zúš-xal
   táʔ=ʔas kelt [ku zúš-cal]
   come might [det forbid-intr]
   ‘A policeman might come’

   b. * čaʔ=ʔ [kw’u] zúš-xal
      táʔ=ʔas kelt [ku zúš-cal]
      come might [det forbid-intr]
      ‘A policeman might come’

1 Many thanks to St’at’imcets consultants Alice Adolph, Beverley Frank, Gertrude Nel, Laura Thevarge and Rose Whitley. Thanks to the following people for discussion: Rose-Marie Déchaine, Hamida Demirdache, Dwight Gardiner, Peter Jacobs, M. Dale Kinkade, Jan van Eijk. Errors are the authors’ responsibility. Research on St’at’imcets was supported in part by SSHRC grant #410-92-1629.

2 There is dialectal variance on the marking required for proper noun arguments. The Upper dialect (spoken around Lillooet) requires either kws or ku; the Lower dialect (spoken around Mount Currie) prefers kw.

3 Ku also appears on the ‘objects’ of middle verbs, (those which are formally intransitive but allow an overt object). We analyze these ‘objects’ as undergoing incorporation at Logical Form. See Matthewson (in prep.).
The referential determiners, unlike ku, are unrestricted in their distribution. The proclitic portion (ti-, ni-, etc.) distinguishes number as well as visibility to the speaker.

7. a. The head of the DP, the determiner, selects a projection of any open class lexical item, as shown in (8).

2. Determiners select NPs or clauses

See van Eijk (1985), Matthewson (in prep.) for further details and discussion.

2. Determiners select NPs or clauses

The head of the DP, the determiner, selects a projection of any open class lexical item, as shown in (8).

8. a. čōʔaʔ [ti zūsˈxal-a]
t’s7aʔ [ti zūsˈxal-a]
come [det forbid-intr-det]

b. čōʔaʔ [ni zūsˈxal-a]
t’s7aʔ [ni zūsˈxal-a]
come [det forbid-intr-det]

For evidence that a three-way distinction in lexical categories (noun, verb, adjective) and syntactic categories (NP, VP, AP) is crucial in the syntax in St'át'imcets, see Mathewson and Demirdache (this volume), Davis (1994); this is the first attempt to lay out systematically all the different relative clause types in the language.

3. Relative clauses

So far we have looked at the basic constituents of a DP, the determiner and its complement. In this section we begin discussion of more complex DPs by examining relative clauses. St'át'imcets relative clauses have been discussed by Roberts (1994), Mathewson and Demirdache (this volume), Davis (1994); this is the first attempt to lay out systematically all the different relative clause types in the language.

3.1. The existence of headed relative clauses

Before we begin, we outline our arguments that headed relative clauses exist in St'át'imcets, given that the existence of a relative clause construction is often denied for Salish languages (see references cited in Montler 1994, including Thompson and Thompson (1992) on Thompson, Hess and Hilbert (1980) on Lushootseed; Jan van Eijk (p.c.) also does not believe in the existence of relative clauses in St'át'imcets).

Our definition of 'relative clause' does not require the presence of a relative pronoun. Instead, we define a relative clause as an instance of restrictive clausal modification of a nominal element. An example of a headed relative clause is given in (10).

10. waʔ [ti smuəʔaʔ-det]

waʔ [ti smuəʔaʔ-det]

Our (partial) analysis of the DPs in (8) is given in (9). We assume that the -a portion of the referential determiner encliticizes to the first element inside the complement of D.

Our (partial) analysis of the DPs in (8) is given in (9). We assume that the -a portion of the referential determiner encliticizes to the first element inside the complement of D.
constructions 'must be used exclusively.

Second, ordinary subordination and from a sequence of two main clauses. The pure subordinate analysis fails because of the two determiners, and also because the conjunctive morphology inside the clausal portion of the relative clause in (10) is not found in main clauses (except in certain clearly 'optative' environments; see van Eijk 1985). The sequence of main clauses in (13) differs in obvious respects to Montier's (1994) evidence for special subject morphology. As shown in (16), the only possible configuration for a two-determiner relative contains an NP, followed by a

Examples of each type are given in (17).

The selection of the first determiner here is made in the same way as determiner-selection for an ordinary argument. As outlined in §1, the non-referential determiner ku may appear only under 'non-fact' modalities. In examples throughout this section we simplify by using the visible, singular, referential determiner ti...; any referential determiner would be substitutable. In the case of the two-determiner relatives, both determiners become ti...a, since the determiners match each other. As shown in (16), the only possible configuration for a two-determiner relative contains an NP, followed by a clause (which we designate, non-theoretically, as 'S'). A clause followed by an NP is impossible (16b), as is either two NPs (16c) or two clauses (16d).

Examples of each type are given in (17).

Third, there is morphological evidence that movement has taken place within the clausal part of the relative, as shown in (14). The morpheme -tali always appears when the ergative argument has been extracted (see Roberts 1994, Davis 1994). This evidence can be compared to Montier's (1994) evidence for special subject morphology inside relative clauses in Saanich. In Saanich, the syntactic function of the head in the restricting clause is indicated by a gap (in morphology). Likewise, the morpheme -tali in St'át'mcets replaces normal subject morphology.5

Other Salishanists have reported on 'gaps' in morphology or special morphology in constructions which involve extraction; see for example Hukari (1995), Gerdes (1988), Kroeber (1991), Jacobs (1988), among others.

Fourth, it can be shown that the clausal portion of the constituents in question is not appositive. Appositive relatives cannot modify proper nouns; similarly, in St'át'mcets, proper nouns cannot be substituted for the head of a relative clause.

The non-appositive nature of relative clauses is also shown by speakers' judgements. For example, when given a sentence containing the relative clause translated as 'John's son who is sensible', one consultant replied that 'it implies he also has a non-sensible son'. Such an implication is a diagnostic for restrictive modification (see e.g. Kamp and Reyle 1993).

3.2. Relative clause types

The first relative clause type we examine contains two identical determiners, as in (10), repeated here.

As shown in (16), the only possible configuration for a two-determiner relative contains an NP, followed by a clause (which we designate, non-theoretically, as 'S'). A clause followed by an NP is impossible (16b), as is either two NPs (16c) or two clauses (16d).

Examples of each type are given in (17).

5 Davis (1994) argues that the morpheme which -tali replaces, namely -as, is not a subject agreement marker. However, the relevant point here is that there is different morphology inside a relative clause from a main clause or an ordinary subordinate clause.
The pattern in (17), which is completely general throughout the language, indicates not only that there is a categorial difference between nouns (such as

The strictly NP-initial nature of the two-determiner relative leads us to call it a head-initial relative clause.

Now we turn to a second type of relative clause, which has an NP in final position and a different determiner in past a determiner. Thus, a

In (15) above it was shown that the head-initial relatives cannot be reanalyzed as sequences of two main clauses. The same is true for the second type of relative clause in (19). This time the evidence is not morphological, but discourse-related. For example, (19a) under the two-main-clause analysis would be as in (20):

Both clauses in (20) would be odd under some or all circumstances. Discourse-initially, a headless relative of the type ti culel is unusual, as the hearer does not know what or who it was who ran away. In addition, intransitive predicates such as ts'qaxa7 are almost impossible as clauses in their own right in St'at'imcets (contrary to claims made for Straits in Jelinek 1995, for example). On the contrary, a deictic entity is almost obligatory in such cases.

Before we continue, a note is necessary regarding determiners. Recall that we have been simplifying the examples by using arguments whose first determiner is referential ti... a. The head-final relatives are of course permissible with initial non-referential ku, as shown in (21) (where ku is licensed by the presence of an intensional verb).

Notice that just in case the first determiner in ku, there can be an identical determiner pattern in a head-initial relative and an NP-final relative (since in the NP-final relative, ku is possible on the head). Thus, (22a) is an NP-final relative where ku appears on the head, and (22b) is a head-initial relative where the determiners match each other. As predicted, (22a) is questionable because NP-final relatives prefer not to have two instances of the same is true for the second type of relative clause in (19). This time the evidence is not morphological, but discourse-related. For example, (19a) under the two-main-clause analysis would be as in (20):

Both clauses in (20) would be odd under some or all circumstances. Discourse-initially, a headless relative of the type ti culel is unusual, as the hearer does not know what or who it was who ran away. In addition, intransitive predicates such as ts'qaxa7 are almost impossible as clauses in their own right in St'at'imcets (contrary to claims made for Straits in Jelinek 1995, for example). On the contrary, a deictic entity is almost obligatory in such cases.

Before we continue, a note is necessary regarding determiners. Recall that we have been simplifying the examples by using arguments whose first determiner is referential ti... a. The head-final relatives are of course permissible with initial non-referential ku, as shown in (21) (where ku is licensed by the presence of an intensional verb).

Notice that just in case the first determiner in ku, there can be an identical determiner pattern in a head-initial relative and an NP-final relative (since in the NP-final relative, ku is possible on the head). Thus, (22a) is an NP-final relative where ku appears on the head, and (22b) is a head-initial relative where the determiners match each other. As predicted, (22a) is questionable because NP-final relatives prefer not to have two instances of ku, while (22b) is fine as a head-initial relative.

Notice that just in case the first determiner in ku, there can be an identical determiner pattern in a head-initial relative and an NP-final relative (since in the NP-final relative, ku is possible on the head). Thus, (22a) is an NP-final relative where ku appears on the head, and (22b) is a head-initial relative where the determiners match each other. As predicted, (22a) is questionable because NP-final relatives prefer not to have two instances of ku, while (22b) is fine as a head-initial relative.

Notice that just in case the first determiner in ku, there can be an identical determiner pattern in a head-initial relative and an NP-final relative (since in the NP-final relative, ku is possible on the head). Thus, (22a) is an NP-final relative where ku appears on the head, and (22b) is a head-initial relative where the determiners match each other. As predicted, (22a) is questionable because NP-final relatives prefer not to have two instances of ku, while (22b) is fine as a head-initial relative.

Notice that just in case the first determiner in ku, there can be an identical determiner pattern in a head-initial relative and an NP-final relative (since in the NP-final relative, ku is possible on the head). Thus, (22a) is an NP-final relative where ku appears on the head, and (22b) is a head-initial relative where the determiners match each other. As predicted, (22a) is questionable because NP-final relatives prefer not to have two instances of ku, while (22b) is fine as a head-initial relative.
position is the head of the relative clause, and movement takes place within the clausal portion to an operator position. The head is coindexed with the moved operator, as shown in (23).

There are irrelevant differences in detail between (23) and (24), and there are other possible ways of representing the two basic analyses we wish to contrast. The major difference is that (24) contains a null pronoun head, with which an adjoined overt noun phrase is coindexed.

At this stage we do not have convincing arguments for either type of analysis. At first glance, it appears that (24) requires a stipulation that NP must adjoin to DP (rather than DF adjoin to DP, overgenerating impossible relative clauses of the form ti S ti NP; see (16b)). The NP status of the head could follow more convincingly from NP-fnal in (a) than from extraposition in (b). Evidence for this is that relatives like in (26) are far more common, and more acceptable, if DF is replaced by a null pronominal. The problematic pattern mentioned above and returned to now is the questionable grammaticality of (18b):}

18. b. ? ti NP (ku) S

(18b) should be ungrammatical under either analysis of the NP-final relative clause, since S is by hypothesis an impossible RC head, and therefore cannot even be coindexed with a head, since this would create a category clash. The construction is in fact completely ungrammatical when the second element contains an adjectival predicate rather than a verb:

25. a. * ?a2g-an-iklan [ti 9m6gic-a tiiti]

NP

D

D'

CP

tsticw

h...a

IP

Op

ats'xenan ti

(c.f. Mathewson and Demirdache this volume)

Another possible analysis is as a null-headed relative clause, with an adjoined NP coindexed with the null head, as in (24).

There are irrelevant differences in detail between (23) and (24), and there are other possible ways of representing the two basic analyses we wish to contrast. The major difference is that (24) contains a null pronoun head, with which an adjoined overt noun phrase is coindexed. In (23), the noun phrase itself is the head of the relative clause. So, while (24) contains a null-headed relative, (23) converts into a null-headed relative by the replacement of tiicw by a null pronominal.

At this stage we do not have convincing arguments for either type of analysis. At first glance, it appears that (24) requires a stipulation that NP must adjoin to DP (rather than DF adjoin to DP, overgenerating impossible relative clauses of the form ti S ti NP; see (16b)). The NP status of the head could follow more easily from (23); see Mathewson and Demirdache (this volume). On the other hand, the non-referential determiner ku is possible on the final NP of these relative clauses, implying that a DP may in fact be necessary. In that case, either (23) or (24) would require independent reasons for restricting the determiner of this DP to ku (an easy task, in fact, given the obligatorily indefinite status of the head of a relative clause).

We tend towards adopting (24), in part for the simple conceptual reason that it avoids positioning two opposite relative clause structures for a single language (head-initial and head-final). But the jury is still out. It is even possible that both structures are available; for example, one could represent the cases without ku on the NP, the other representing the cases containing ku. To avoid committing ourselves, we refer to this type of relative clause neutrally as 'NP-final'.

The problematic pattern mentioned above and returned to now is the questionable grammaticality of (18b):

18. b. ? ti NP (ku) S

(18b) should be ungrammatical under either analysis of the NP-final relative clause, since S is by hypothesis an impossible RC head, and therefore cannot even be coindexed with a head, since this would create a category clash. The construction is in fact completely ungrammatical when the second element contains an adjectival predicate rather than a verb:

25. a. * ?a2g-an-iklan [ti 9m6gic-a tiiti]

NP

D

D'

CP

tsticw

h...a

IP

Op

ats'xenan ti

(c.f. Mathewson and Demirdache this volume)

Another possible analysis is as a null-headed relative clause, with an adjoined NP coindexed with the null head, as in (24).

There are irrelevant differences in detail between (23) and (24), and there are other possible ways of representing the two basic analyses we wish to contrast. The major difference is that (24) contains a null pronoun head, with which an adjoined overt noun phrase is coindexed. In (23), the noun phrase itself is the head of the relative clause. So, while (24) contains a null-headed relative, (23) converts into a null-headed relative by the replacement of tiicw by a null pronominal.

At this stage we do not have convincing arguments for either type of analysis. At first glance, it appears that (24) requires a stipulation that NP must adjoin to DP (rather than DF adjoin to DP, overgenerating impossible relative clauses of the form ti S ti NP; see (16b)). The NP status of the head could follow more easily from (23); see Mathewson and Demirdache (this volume). On the other hand, the non-referential determiner ku is possible on the final NP of these relative clauses, implying that a DP may in fact be necessary. In that case, either (23) or (24) would require independent reasons for restricting the determiner of this DP to ku (an easy task, in fact, given the obligatorily indefinite status of the head of a relative clause).

We tend towards adopting (24), in part for the simple conceptual reason that it avoids positioning two opposite relative clause structures for a single language (head-initial and head-final). But the jury is still out. It is even possible that both structures are available; for example, one could represent the cases without ku on the NP, the other representing the cases containing ku. To avoid committing ourselves, we refer to this type of relative clause neutrally as 'NP-final'.

The problematic pattern mentioned above and returned to now is the questionable grammaticality of (18b):
28. I am a woman

We claim that although NP can project to the clausal level when not inside DP, the NP heads of relative clauses crucially do not (and may not) project to a clausal level. There is truly a syntactic difference in St'at'imcets between 'the one who left' and 'the man', contrary to claims made by Jelinek (1993, 1994), Jelinek and Demers (1994) for Straits, Kinkade (1983), but agreeing with claims made by Demirdache and Matthewson (1994).

To conclude this section, we present our tentative analysis of each type of relative clause.

29. null-headed:

30. head-initial:

In all cases, only NPs may function as the head of a relative clause. It is this distributional difference between NPs and clauses which leads us to postulate the difference in syntactic status between (9a) and (9b) in the previous section.

4. Possessors

This section investigates the syntactic behaviour of overt possessors. First, we deal with word order.

There is a dialectal difference regarding word order possibilities with overt possessors. Speakers of the Lower dialect allow only a head-initial order (i.e. with the possessor following the possessed nominal). This is illustrated in (32).


Speakers of the Upper dialect, on the other hand, allow possessors either to precede or follow the possessed nominal (see also Gardiner et al 1993). This dialect difference is reflected not only by consistent contrasts between our Upper and Lower consultants, but also by the fact that van Eijk (1985), who worked mainly with Lower speakers, explicitly states that the possessor must follow its possessed NP (see van Eijk 1985:277):

(33) and (34) contain minimal pairs given by Upper speakers, showing the interchangeability of the two constituents.

33. a. nit [ti ?sk?kzala ?i Mary] 56kyx-?i-kan ?5kX-an-an

b. nilh [ti sk?kzala ?i Mary] 56kyx-?i-kan ?5kX-an-an

foci [det mother-3sg.poss-det det man-det] see-tr-1sg.conj

'It was the man's mother that I saw'
certain order, they also necessarily allow certain other orders.

completely with stacked possessors.

variation, however, is not random; we can identify an implicational relation, such that possessors, where the available orders are not free. Here, to complicate matters, we find some variation from an English translation.

Even in the Upper dialect, it can be shown that the head-initial order is basic. Evidence comes from stacke possessor, where the available orders are not free. Here, to complicate matters, we find some variation within one dialect; there appears to be a gradation from least liberal to most liberal speakers. The inter-speaker variation, however, is not random; we can identify an implicational relation, such that if a speaker allows a certain order, they also necessarily allow certain other orders.

The most restrictive pattern from the Upper dialect allows order reversal in ordinary possessors, but disallows it completely with stacked possessors. In (35), given by an Upper speaker, the possessed nominal must come first, and the whole phrase must occur in reversed order from the English translation.

The most liberal Upper speaker we have worked with still does not allow every order in stacked possessors, as shown in (36) (see below for analysis of this speaker’s scrambling facts).

We propose that the base position of possessors is post-nominal, with DP-internal scrambling to pre-nominal position. This is supported by the restriction in one dialect to possessor-final order, plus the fact that no speaker disallows this order, while other orders are disallowed to a greater or lesser degree. We therefore assume a base structure for possessives as in (37) (cf. Baker 1993:219).

Baker (1993) proposes for Mohawk that possessives are internal arguments of N; however, in Mohawk, possessor scrambling is not possible due to independent differences (see Baker 1993:210-226).

4.1. The semantics of possessors

Further support for our proposal that the possessor is an internal argument of N comes from the fact that unlike in English, possessors in St’at’imcets do not saturate the noun phrase of which they are a part. On the contrary, a possessed nominal which lacks a determiner must function as a predicate, not an argument. We assume that saturation can be performed by an element in Spec position or in head position, but not by an internal argument (see Rothstein 1983, Higginbotham 1985). Hence, the fact that possessors do not saturate NPs in St’at’imcets fits with our analysis. The data is shown in (38).

In (38a,b) possessed nominals function as main predicates; their ungrammaticality in argument position is shown in (38c). To function as arguments, possessed NPs require an initial determiner (38d).

We propose that the base position of possessors is post-nominal, with DP-internal scrambling to pre-nominal position. This is supported by the restriction in one dialect to possessor-final order, plus the fact that no speaker disallows this order, while other orders are disallowed to a greater or lesser degree. We therefore assume a base structure for possessives as in (37) (cf. Baker 1993:219).
The possessor in (39) shows that in English, unlike in St'at'imcets, a possessor does not saturate the NP, enabling it to function as an argument.

39. a. * I saw [house]
   b. I saw [Mary's house]

A language which is similar to St'at'imcets in that possessors do not saturate NPs is Italian; Giorgo and Longobardi (1991:157) note that 'articleless singular NPs containing a possessive ... cannot function as arguments'. Giorgo and Longobardi analyze Italian possessors as adjectives.

Further evidence for the internal argument status of possessors in St'at'imcets comes from the absence of any other complements to N. This follows if there is only one theta-role assigned to each syntactic position (cf. Baker 1988, 1993). Mohawk, which also has internal possessors, also lacks other complements to N; see Baker (1993). In English, on the other hand, the possessor occupies Spec, DP and the complement position is available for use in phrases such as 'a picture of John', the destruction of the city.

The possessor in St'at'imcets cannot, unlike in English, receive the agent theta-role (a role typically associated with Specifier positions). This is shown in (40).

40. a. wa? 1t7t-ti [pök-5-a] $[s-Mary]$  
   wa7 l7t-ti [pök-s-a] s-[Mary]
   aux deic [det book-3sg.poss-det nom-Mary]
   'That's Mary's book' (the one she wrote)
   * 'That's Mary's book' (she owns it)
   b. wa? 1t7t-ti [pök-s-a] $[s-Mary]$
   wa7 l7t-ti [pök-tsa-s-a] s-[Mary]
   aux deic [det picture-3sg.poss-det nom-Mary]
   'That's Mary's picture' (she owns it)
   * 'That's Mary's picture' (she is in it)
   ? 'That's Mary's picture' (she took it)

Finally, possessives are ungrammatical in combination with the non-referential determiner ku, as shown in (41). We hypothesize that this follows from the semantics of the determiners; the possessive affixes are referential, and hence clash with ku.

41. a. $[s-Mary]$ ti [s-714an-5-a]
   xat’-mín-ílkhan [s-Mary di s-7ihen-s-a]  
   hard-appl-1sg.subj [nom-Mary det nom-eat-3sg.poss-det]
   'I want Mary’s food'
   b. $[s-Mary]$ ku [s-714an-5]
   xat’-mín-ílkhan [s-Mary ku s-7ihen-s]  
   hard-appl-1sg.subj [nom-Mary det nom-eat]
   'I want Mary’s food'

4.2 Possessor scrambling

We now turn to the finer details of the scrambling operation in St’at’imcets. This is a complex area which has not been studied before (nor has it, to our knowledge, been looked at in detail in any other Salish language). Further investigation is required on possessor scrambling, especially in the areas where there are speaker variation; we present only preliminary results. Scrambling is strictly DP-internal; possessors may not escape DP under any circumstances, as shown in (42) (cf. Davis et al. 1993, Gardiner et al. 1993). (42a) shows the ungrammaticality of focussing of a possessor, (42b) shows questioning a possessor, (42c) shows relativizing a possessor, and (42d) shows separation of the possessor from its possessed NP by an adverbial phrase.

42. a. níh [s-Mary] kí-an-as [s-John ti ságak-7-s-a]  
   nílín [s-Mary] t’al-okin-as [s-John ti ságak-7-s-a]
   foc [nom-Mary] bite-tr-3erg [nom-John det dog-3sg.poss-det]
   * It was Mary that John’s dog bit; * It was Mary that bit John’s dog
   * It was Mary’s dog that bit John; * It was Mary’s dog that John bit
   b. * swat ku [s-gík-ax-aw] [ku ságak-7-s-a]
   * swat ku att’sx-en-ácw [ku ságak-7-s-a]
   * swat ku att’sx-en-ácw [ku ságak-7-s-a]
   * swat ku att’sx-en-ácw [ku ságak-7-s-a]
   who det see-tr-2sg.conj det mother-3sg.poss  
   * Whose mother did you see?

c. * ta smu-tac-a ta [ság-an-á-tí] ságak-7-s-a
   ta smu-tac-a ta [ság-an-á-tí] ságak-7-s-a
   * ta smu-tac-a ta [ság-an-á-tí] ságak-7-s-a
   * ta smu-tac-a ta [ság-an-á-tí] ságak-7-s-a
   det woman-det det see-tr-1sg.conj det mother-3sg.poss
   * the woman whose mother I saw

d. * ta xat’-mín-ílkhan [s-Mary] ?ínist’k-a5 [na k’é-5-a]
   * ta xat’-mín-ílkhan [s-Mary] inátcwas [na k’doh-s-a]
   * ta xat’-mín-ílkhan [s-Mary] inátcwas [na k’doh-s-a]
   * ta xat’-mín-ílkhan [s-Mary] inátcwas [na k’doh-s-a]
   buy-appl-1sg.subj [nom-Mary] yesterday det car-3sg.poss-det
   * I bought Mary’s car yesterday

Where is the landing site for possessor scrambling? Evidence suggests that possessors scramble (in the Upper St’at’imcets) to either side of DP. Notice in (43) that a possessor may scramble to either side of tákem.9

43. a. p’án-ílkhan tákem s-John ti [s-nak ‘nák-s-a]
   p’nák-ílkhan tákem s-John i snek’wánk’w7-s-a
   meet(dir)-1sg.subj all nom-John pl.det  
   friend(redup)-3sg.poss-det
   'I met all John’s relatives'
   b. * p’án-ílkhan s-John tákem ti [s-nak ‘nák-s-a]
   * p’nák-ílkhan s-John tákem ti snek’wánk’w7-s-a
   meet(dir)-1sg.subj all nom-John all pl.det friend(redup)-3sg.poss-det
   * I met all John’s relatives'

This implies that possessors, like universal quantifiers, may adjoin to DP.

Now let us look at the interaction of possessives with demonstrative pronouns, which we will argue in the next section occupy Spec, DP. Notice in (43) that when a demonstrative pronoun is present, a possessor may only scramble to precede it, not to follow it.

9 See Demirdache et al (1994) for much of the argumentation. While these authors place strong quantifiers in Spec, DP, Davis and Manthwson (1995), Manthwson (in prep.) give evidence that the quantifiers must be adjoined rather than in Spec position.

10 The pair in (43) was provided by our most liberal speaker with regard to possessor scrambling. Further research is required with other speakers. The same is true of the data in (44).
43. a. taxw$p-m1n-lkan [ti? ti kgh-s-a s-Mary]
tecwp-mfn-lhkan ti7 ti kdoh-s-a s-Mary
buy-appl-1sg subj [dem det car-3sg.poss-det non-Mary]
*I bought that car of Mary's*

b. * taxw$p-m1n-lkan [ti? s-Mary ti
tecwp-mfn-lhkan ti7 ti kdoh-s-a s-Mary
dem nom-Mary det car-3sg.poss-det]
*I bought that car of Mary's*

c. taxw$p-m1n-lkan [s-Mary ti7 ti kgh-s-a
.tecwp-mfn-lhkan [s-Mary
buy-appl-1sg subj [nom-Mary dem det car-3sg.poss-det]
*I bought that car of Mary's*

The data in (44) imply two things: first, that the demonstrative is in a different position from the quantifiers (we claim that the former is in Spec, DP and the latter adjoins to DP), and second, that possessives may not scramble to follow Spec, DP, but must adjoin to DP.

Next observe that a possessor may scramble inside an an NP-final relative clause.

45. pzn-an-lkan [ti idk-lexlex-a s-John $kdza7-s]
.pzn-lkan [ti lexlex-a s-John skdza7-s]
meet-1sg subj [det smart-det nom-John child-3sg.poss]
*I met John's sensible son'

According to the structures given in (23) or (24) for the NP-final RCs, the only available landing site between the clausal part of the relative and the final NP is adjoined to NP. It seems we have to alter our analysis of scrambling to say that a scrambled possessor may adjoin either to DP or to NP.

There is a problem with this analysis, however. If possessors can scramble to Spec, NP, we mistakenly generate many impossible orders, as shown in (46).

46. base order:
[ti tsitcw-s-a ti kukwp7-a]
det house-3sg.poss-det det chief-det
*the chief's house'

The scrambling operation in (46) generates the ungrammatical * ti ti kukwp7-a tsitcw-sa. One way out of this difficulty would be to invent a (not implausible) filter against sequences of two determiners, such as * ti ti. However, this seems to miss the point, and may not solve the entire overgeneration problem. Alternatively, we could say that scrambling is always to adjoin to DP, and that the NP-final relatives are in fact DP-final (cf. discussion in §3). This option runs into the problem that scrambling is possible within possessive phrases which are in predicate position; by hypothesis, DP in St'at'imcets does not appear in predicate position, while NP does (see Matthewson and Demirdache this volume, Matthewson in prep.). We adopt the hypothesis that scrambling is always to adjoin to DP, leaving the predicate-scrambling problem and the NP-final relative problem unsolved for now. Further elicitation from a wider range of speakers may shed light on the correct analysis.

Our analysis fares better with the stacked possessor facts introduced above, repeated here.

36. taxw$p-m1n-lkan [ni $luw-$-$ $Mary
.tecwp-mfn-lhkan [ni tsitcw-s-a s-Mary na $nukwa7-s-a]
buy-appl-1sg subj [det house-3sg.poss-det nom-Mary det friend-3sg.poss-det]
*I bought Mary's friend's house'

a. tecwpmnlnakan ti tsitcwwa sMary na smuk'wa7sa
d. tecwpmnlnakan ni tsitcwwa na smuk'wa7sa sMary
b. tecwpmnlnakan ni tsitcwwa na smuk'wa7sa sMary
c. tecwpmnlnakan ni tsitcwwa na smuk'wa7sa sMary
e. tecwpmnlnakan ni tsitcwwa na smuk'wa7sa sMary
The base order is (36b), shown in (47), and the predictions of our analysis for each order are given underneath.

47.
The final component of DP is the demonstrative pronouns, which are given in (48) (van Eijk 1985:198).

48. Demonstrative pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>visible</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>medio-proximal</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>medio-proximal</th>
<th>distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>¿ʔa</td>
<td>tiʔ</td>
<td>tʔu</td>
<td>kʔʔa</td>
<td>nʔ</td>
<td>kʔuʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>?iʔiʔ</td>
<td>?iʔiʔ</td>
<td>?iʔiʔ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First we show that the demonstratives act syntactically unlike any other elements in the language. Following that, we argue that the demonstratives occupy a position that is different from any other. As was noted above, this pattern was given by the most liberal speaker we have come across so far. It is important to stress that although there is speaker variation, the results are neither random (indicating breakdown of the system under English influence, for example) nor directly influenced by English (since English does not allow scrambling of this sort). On the contrary, the variations are systematic, such that the patterns allowed by the least liberal speakers are always a proper subset of those allowed by a more liberal speaker.

5. Demonstrative pronouns

The final component of DP is the demonstrative pronouns, which are given in (48) (van Eijk 1985:198).

49. a. *tiʔ-ikhakw
   tiʔ-lhkacw
   that-2sg.subj
   'You are that one'

   b. tiʔ | ti amh-a
   tiʔ | ti amh-a
   that det good-det
   'That good one'; * 'The good one is that'

50. a. ʔʔʔ-ikan
    leʔʔ-ikan
    here-1sg.subj
    'I am here'

   (van Eijk 1985:206)

   b. lʔʔʔʔ | ?l pūn-ʔan
   lʔʔʔʔ | pūn-ʔan
   then when find(tr)-1sg.conj
   'That is when I found it' (When I found it was then) (van Eijk 1985:206)

Demonstrative pronouns may appear in positions which are normally occupied by overt DPs. In (51a), tiʔ (singular, visible, medio-proximal) appears in argument position, and in (52a) in focus position. In each case, tiʔ apparently substitutes for a lexical DP (cf. (51b), (52b)).

51. a. *ʔʔʔa tiʔ
    ʔʔʔa tiʔ
good that
   'That's good!'

   b. *ʔʔʔa [ti sʔákkst-5w-a]
    ʔʔʔa [ti sʔákkst-xw-a]
good [det nom-work-3sg.poss-det]
   'Your work is good'

52. a. nʔh tiʔ ti ʔaq̲ʔ-ʔan-ʔn-a
    nʔh tiʔ ti as’tx’-en-ʔn-a
    foc det dem det see-dir-1sg.conj-det
   'It was that one that I saw'

   b. nʔh [ti smúʔaʔ-ʔa] ti ʔaq̲ʔ-ʔan-ʔn-a
    nʔh ti smúʔaʔ-ʔa ti as’tx’-en-ʔn-a
    foc det woman-det det see-dir-1sg.conj-det
   'It was the woman that I saw'

The demonstratives may form a constituent with a following DP, as in (53), and may also detach from their DP, encliticizing to second position, as shown in (54).

53. a. nʔh [tiʔ kʔu smúʔaʔ-ʔa] gzán-tali ta sáʔayʔ-ʔa
    nʔh [tiʔ ku smúʔaʔ] gzán-tali ta sáʔayʔ-ʔa
    foc [det det woman] meet(dir)-detop det man-det
   'That was that woman that met the man'

   b. nʔh-s dʔaq̲ʔ-ʔn-s [tiʔ ti sáʔayʔ-ʔa]
    nʔh-s qwatsafs-s [tiʔ ti sáʔayʔ-ʔa]
    foc-nom leave-3sg.poss dem det man-det
   'And then the man left'

   (van Eijk and Williams 1981:58)

54. a. nʔh kʔuʔ kuʔ liʔ liʔ sʔákkst-ʔiʔ-ʔs tiʔ sʔánʔ-ʔa
    nʔh kuʔ tʔuʔ liʔ sʔúʔ-ʔiʔ-ʔs tiʔ sʔánʔ-ʔa
    foc quot part dem nom-run-away-his det white.man-det
   'So then (as I was told) the white man ran away'  
   Then when find(tr)-1sg.conj
   'She was gonna go fix her husband'

   (van Eijk and Williams 1981:24)

---

12 Parts of this section were first discussed in Davis and Matthewson (1995).
c. nɪʔ 11ʔ kátaʔ sáqvt 1eʔ? Lillooet-a k usu smúʔáč
nilh 477 kelaʔ 1sčʔúh lnʔá Lillooet-a ku smúʔahats
foc dem first half here Lillooet-det det woman
'She was the first half-breed woman in Lillooet' (van Eijk and Williams 1981:70)

Demonstratives are semantically pronominal in the sense that they are variables at Logical Form. Thus, a sentence containing a bare demonstrative requires either prior mention of the element being discussed, or pointing by the speaker. To the discourse-initial utterance of (55a,b), without pointing, consultants reply with Swat? Starn?' ('Who?' 'What?'), and state that a previous context is required.

55. a. ?1i1-am tiʔ? ſt'-em ti7 sing-intr dem 'S/he is singing'

b. ?1i1-am niʔ? ſt'-em ni7 sing-intr dem 'S/he is singing'

Although demonstratives are similar to pronouns in this respect, their syntactic behaviour differs from pronominal person markers. For example, clitic subject pronouns either encliticize to the first predicative element in a clause, or precede it, as shown in (56a,b). They may not follow sentence-level particles such as t'uʔ, as shown in (56c).

56. a. wáʔ-kan kuʔ tayt
waʔ-lhkan t'uʔ tayt
prog-1sg.subj still hungry
'I am still hungry'

b. kan tayt
kan tayt
1sg.subj hungry
'I am hungry'

c. * waʔ? kuʔ skán tayt
waʔ t'uʔ lḥkan tayt
prog-1sg.subj still hungry
'I am still hungry'

Demonstratives, on the other hand, may appear following such particles.

57. nɪʔ 11ʔ s-x"uul-s ti sámʔ-ʔa
nilh kuʔ t'uʔ 477 sčuč̱č̱ stti ti sámʔ-ʔa
foc quot still dem non-run.away-3sg.poss det white.man-det
'So then (as I was told) the white man ran away'

The demonstratives also act unlike independent pronouns, which are predicative.

58. a. snúwa [ti ?ačʔ-an-šn-ʔa]
snúwa [ti ats'x-en-šn-ʔa]
2sg.emph [det see-dir-1sg.conj-det]
'You're the one I saw' ('the one I saw is you')

Finally, demonstrative pronouns are not determiners, for some obvious reasons. First, while two determiners cannot co-occur, demonstratives easily co-occur with determiners. Second, determiners are proclitics and cannot appear without an accompanying nominal, unlike demonstratives. And third, determiners, unlike demonstratives, cannot be discontinuous from their complements.

So far we have seen that demonstratives may form a constituent with a lexical DP, cliticize away from their DP, or substitute for a DP. We have not yet discovered which syntactic position they occupy, although it is somewhere on the left edge of DP, preceding the determiner. To ascertain the exact position of the demonstratives we examine the interaction of demonstratives with strong quantifiers, which also appear on the left edge of DP.

Demonstratives may only appear following a quantifier, as shown in (59).

59. a. lán-tkan tu waʔ pág"-aʔ5 [tákem ?1ʔ] ?1 pág"-aʔ
lán-lhkan tu waʔ págw-ens [tákem iz' i pákwa-]
already-1 det be look-tr [all dem pl.det book-det]
'I already looked at all these books'

b. * lán-tkan tu waʔ pág"-aʔ5 [?1ʔ tákem ?1 pág"-aʔ
* lán-lhkan tu waʔ págwens [l' tákem i pákwa-]
already-1 det be look-tr [dem all pl.det book-det]
'I already looked at all these books'

The facts so far are amenable to several quite different analyses, outlined in (60). According to (60a), the demonstrative occupies Spec, DP. In (60b), a DP is adjoined to the demonstrative, which is a pro-DP. A 'combined version' of the two analyses has the demonstrative occupying Spec, DP, as well as rightward adjunction, as in (60c). In each case, we assume that a quantifier would be left-adjointed to the highest DP, as it ranges over the entire DP.

60. [tiʔ? ti ?ačʔ-an-šn-ʔa]
[táʔ ti ats'x-en-šn-ʔa]
[det see-dir-1sg.conj-det]
'that one that I saw'

a. DP

b. DP
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We offer several arguments for a difference in structure between (61a) and (61b), and propose that (61a) corresponds to (60a) and (60c) are available.

5.1. Two structures for demonstratives: ti...a vs. ku

Either a referential or a non-referential determiner can follow a demonstrative, as shown in (61).13

5.1.1. Determiner choice in arguments

If (61a) and (61b) both had the structure in (60a), where the determiner heads DP, (61b) would pose a problem. It would constitute the only environment in the language where a non-referential ku is licensed, and in fact seems to clash with, the strict permissable, as head of a DP in argument position, underneath a 'fact' modality (see §1). The presence of ti7 is unlikely to license, and hence, an adjoined analysis of (61b) presents far less of a problem than the (60a) analysis.

5.1.2. Determiner choice in adjuncts

Conversely, it is unlikely that both (61a) and (61b) have the adjoined structure, since most adjuncts in the language take only the non-referential determiner ku. Hence, the referential ti...a is unlikely to appear in either the structure in (60b) or 60c). This is shown in (62) for an adverbial phrase, which can only appear with ku.14

5.1.3. Categorial asymmetries

When demonstratives are present, there are some interesting asymmetries in the possible categories of phrases which may follow ku. Note first that under normal circumstances in which a non-referential ku is licensed, any open-class item (N, V, or A) can follow ku. With non-nouns, a prior context is preferred, as in (63).%note

However, in the presence of a demonstrative, only nouns may follow ku, as shown in (64). Even the presence of a prior context or pointing cannot save (64b,c).15

62. a. x̱aʔg uʔ̓ x̱aʔx̱im̥-aʔ̓ ṯaʔ̓ ku? [ku] ṯaʔ̓ ṯaʔ̓ x̱im̥-aʔ̓
   cwʔaʔz kw̱-s sṯaʔ̓x̱im̥-ets [ku ṯaʔ̓ ṯaʔ̓ x̱im̥-ets]
   neg det-nom sṯaʔ̓x̱im̥-ets
   's/he doesn't speak Sṯaʔx̱im̥ properly'
   b. * x̱aʔg uʔ̓ x̱aʔx̱im̥-aʔ̓ [ti ṯaʔ̓ ṯaʔ̓ x̱im̥-aʔ̓]
   * cwʔaʔz kw̱-s sṯaʔ̓x̱im̥-ets [ti ṯaʔ̓ ṯaʔ̓ x̱im̥-ets]
   * neg det-nom sṯaʔ̓x̱im̥-ets
   's/he doesn't speak Sṯaʔx̱im̥ properly'

5.1.3. Categorial asymmetries

When demonstratives are present, there are some interesting asymmetries in the possible categories of phrases which may follow ku. Note first that under normal circumstances in which a non-referential ku is licensed, any open-class item (N, V, or A) can follow ku. With non-nouns, a prior context is preferred, as in (63).

63. x̱aʔṯ uʔ̓? [ti ẕum-ḵa 1-ṯaʔ̓ x̱aʔx̱im̥-aʔ̓.
   Cwʔaʔz ṯaʔ̓? i ẕum-ḵa 1-ti saṯ-x̱um.
   many still pl.det spring-salmon-det
   in-det saṯ-winter-det
   There's a lot of spring salmon in the Fraser.

64. a. ṯaʔx̱-min’-kan ku? [ku x̱uʔ̓ x̱uʔ̓ x̱al-ṯa]
   tecwp-min’-ikan [ti7 ku koah]
   buy-appl-lsg.subj [dem det car]
   'I bought that car'
   b. * ṯaʔx̱-min’-kan [ti7 ku x̱al-ṯa]
   * tecwp-min’-ikan [ti7 ku x̱al-ṯa]
   * buy-appl-lsg.subj [dem det big]
   'I bought that big one'
   c. * ṯaʔx̱-min’-kan [ti7 ku ḵaʔ ḵaʔ-ḵaʔ]
   * tecwp-min’-ikan [ti7 ku ṯaʔ̓ ḵaʔ]
   buy-appl-lsg.subj [dem det go deic]
   'I bought that one that's going by there'

This categorial asymmetry does not hold with the referential determiners; any category can follow ti...a, whether or not a demonstrative is present.

Sometimes the preposition is droppable, which means that there are some adjuncts which do allow referential determiners. One of our consultants even accepts (62b). The status of determiners in adverbials and adjuncts is a topic requiring further investigation.

13 Referential determiners are possible inside locative adjuncts, but usually only in the presence of a preposition, as in (i).

14 The semantic difference between (61a) and (61b) is extremely subtle.

15 There are some interesting interactions with aspect and auxiliaries; some of the cases that are ruled out with ku, as in (64), become good if the auxiliary waʔ (which represents progressive or habitual) is inserted. We have no explanation for these cases at this stage.
While we do not have an explanation as yet for why the restriction to nouns suddenly appears in (64), we do take the contrast between (64) and (65) as possible evidence for a structural asymmetry between the referential and the non-referential cases. In addition, the contrast between (63) and (64) could indicate that when a demonstrative is present, the non-referential determiner ku does not occupy the same position as it does in an ordinary DP (i.e. head of DP).

5.1.4. Word order

There is some word order evidence that the adjoined analysis is not available for the referential cases. Notice in (68) that the quantifier must precede the demonstrative, not follow it.

68. a. paq-alkst-min t'akan ?i' ti n-š-xām-a pukw
   paqw-alkst-min t'aken iz i n-s-kwam-a pukw
   'I already read all the books I got'

   b. * paq-alkst-min t'akan ?i' ti n-š-xām-a pukw
   paqw-alkst-min t'aken iz i n-s-kwam-a pukw
   'I already read all the books I got'

If the structure in either (65b) or (66c) were correct, we would expect (68b) to be possible, since there would be nothing to stop the right-adjoined DP itself containing a quantifier. As far as examples corresponding to (68) with ku go, we are limited in testing these by the fact that ku is generally incompatible with quantification anyway.

We have seen several asymmetries both between the referential and non-referential determiners when they co-occur with demonstratives, and between the behaviour of ku when it appears in an ordinary DP and when it co-occurs with a demonstrative. On the basis of this, we claim that the cases where a demonstrative co-occurs with ku have an adjoined structure, while in the referential cases, the demonstrative occupies Spec, DP and the demonstrative head the phrase. For concreteness, we assume (60c) rather than (60b); this enables us to claim that the demonstrative always occupies Spec, DP. However, we have no evidence as yet to distinguish between (60b) and (60c).

We also assume that from their base structures, the demonstratives can undergo optional movement at F(honetic) F(orm) to a prosodically defined second position, deriving the data in (54).

When the demonstrative appears by itself without accompanying DP-internal material, we have to postulate that the residue of the DP is null, as shown in (69). Whether the D' has any internal structure is another question we leave for future research.

69. košas-zānuw ka [ti7 ti wə?] (16) kalhas-zānuw k'a [ti7 ti wə? fi7] three-year appar [demon det prog cry]
   'The one who was crying was maybe three years old'

However, in (71) we see that a demonstrative may also be followed by a determiner which selects an NP. No matter what sort of DP the demonstrative replaced, this would be an impossible relative clause (see (16)). However, the Spec, DP analysis correctly predicts both (70) and (71); it is irrelevant to the Specifier position what category the determiner selects.

In addition, a demonstrative can occupy a position which is impossible for any full DP, but consistent with a Spec, DP position, as shown by the contrast in (72). Relative clauses may not "iterate" (in (72a), there are three determiners and their complements inside the RC. In (72b), on the other hand, the demonstrative can be followed by a string of two DPs. This is further evidence that the demonstrative does not replace a DP within a relative clause, and once again, the Specifier analysis predicts that (72b) should be possible.15

   * nih [ti] sāqu-cw-a ti zwat-en-š-a ti q'ewe-fic-a wa? qil
   * foc [det man det know-dir-1sg.cj-det det dance-body-det] be mad
   'It's the man that I know that is dancing that is angry'

15 Demonstratives may also appear inside relative clauses, as in (i). These facts also follow from our analysis, but for reasons of space we do not give the whole paradigm.

i. nih [ti7 ti sāqu-y'ama ti zwat-an-š-a wa? qil]
   nih [ti7 ti sāqu-cw-a ti zwat-en-š-a wa7 qil]
   foc [det dem det man det know-dir-1sg.cj-det] be mad
   'It's that man that I know who's angry'
Our proposal that ku introduces an adjoined phrase when a demonstrative is present makes various predictions about relative clauses containing ku which we have not yet tested.

6. Conclusion

The structure we propose for DPs in St'at'imcets is given in (73). If a demonstrative is present, this structure represents only the case with a referential determiner (see (60c) for the non-referential case). For the relative clause structures we refer the reader back to (29-31).

73.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{quantifier} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{demonstrative} \\
D' \\
D \\
D \text{ Spec} \\
N \\
N' \\
\text{possessor}
\end{array}
\]

While many questions are still remaining, we hope to have familiarized readers with all the components of DP in St'at'imcets, along with their syntactic behaviour. We also hope that the data presented, particularly the new data on relative clauses and possessors, will invite future theoretical analysis, as well as comparison with similar structures in other Salish languages.
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