

## Comparing Futures: Nsyilxcn *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7*\*

John Lyon  
University of British Columbia – Okanagan  
Simon Fraser University

Marianne Ignace  
Simon Fraser University  
Skeetchestn Indian Band

**Abstract:** This paper is a survey which compares and contrasts the distributions and uses of Nsyilxcn future particle *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7* in their two major syntactic roles: as clefting particles, and as clause-introducing particles. We focus on the comparative syntax of these two particles, rather than on the semantics.

**Keywords:** Nsyilxcn, Secwepemctsin, Okanagan, Shuswap, Southern Interior Salish, Northern Interior Salish, syntax, particles

### 1 Introduction

Nsyilxcn (a.k.a. Okanagan, iso 639-3: oka) is a Southern Interior Salish language spoken in north-central Washington and south-central British Columbia by approximately 132 Elder speakers (FPCC 2018). There are successful language revitalization efforts on both sides of the international border. The language examples in this paper come primarily from two fluent Elders from the Upper Nicola with whom John Lyon has worked since 2009: Lottie Lindley (who passed away in 2016) and Sarah McLeod.

Secwepemctsin (a.k.a. Shuswap, iso 639-3: shs) is a Northern Interior Salish language spoken in south-central British Columbia, directly to the north of Syilx territory, by fewer than 200 Elder speakers (FPCC 2018). There are also successful language revitalization efforts in Secwepemc territory, including the Chief Atahm school program, Mentor-Apprentice Programs, programs that have trained speakers in several communities, and a continuing program for advanced learners in collaboration with the Simon Fraser University Indigenous Languages Program. The language examples in this paper come primarily from Bridget Dan and Cecilia DeRose of Esket with additional examples from Mona Jules, Daniel Calhoun, Ron Ignace, and Garlene Dodson from Skeetchestn.

Though Nsyilxcn and Secwepemctsin come from separate branches of Interior Salish, there are many similarities between the two languages. This comparative study examines the syntactic distributions of Nsyilxcn *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7*, two cognate future tense particles which, with the exception of Kalispel reflex *m*, are not found in other Interior Salish languages. We provide additional examples and insight into syntactic patterns earlier described in Kuipers (1974), Gardiner

---

\*John Lyon wishes to express his deep gratitude to Upper Nicola Elders Lottie Lindley and Sarah McLeod for sharing their stories and knowledge of their language with him, and to Sharon Lindley for helping to facilitate Nsyilxcn language work with members of the UNIB. Both authors also wish to express their deep appreciation and gratitude to Bridget Dan and Cecilia DeRose of Esket, and to Daniel Calhoun, Garlene Dodson, Mona Jules, and Ron Ignace from Skeetchestn for sharing their knowledge of Secwepemctsin and for assisting with the LING 431–432 *Structure of Secwepemctsin* courses taught through Simon Fraser University’s Indigenous Languages Program during Spring-Summer 2021. This work has been financially supported by a partnership grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Marianne Ignace, PI), a SSHRC Insight Grant (Henry Davis, PI), the Jacobs Research Fund, and the Phillips Fund for Native American Research. Any transcription errors, or otherwise, remain the responsibility of the authors.

---

*Papers for the International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages* 56.

D. K. E. Reisinger, Hannah Green, Laura Griffin, Marianne Huijsmans, Gloria Mellesmoen, and Bailey Trotter (eds.). Vancouver, BC: UBCWPL, 2021.

(1993), Lai (1998), Kroeber (1999), and Lyon (2013), as well as describe previously undocumented syntactic patterns. With respect to Lai's (1998) and Gardiner's (1993) Secwepemctsin work in particular, this paper provides important potential dialectal points of contrast between Elder speakers from the northern dialect of Esket with whom we are primarily working, and the Skeetchestn Elders with whom Lai and Gardiner worked.

The syntactic and semantic similarities between *mi* and *me7* will be immediately apparent to any learner or linguist with even a moderate degree of familiarity with the two languages. Their differences are less apparent, however no less important. The primary goal of this paper therefore is to compare and contrast the syntactic distributions of *mi* and *me7* structures (with minor notes on the semantics) in order to lay the foundation for further syntactic and semantic analysis of these particles in their respective languages.

The linguistic similarities between Nsyilxcn *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7* which we examine in this paper seem likely due to areal influence, though this cannot be ascertained for certain without further historical work. Areal influence is not unexpected given the contiguous geographic locations of the two peoples. Factors such as trade, intermarriage, and warfare and peace-treaties between the two peoples supported ongoing language contact, and oral testimony from Elders shows that Syilx-Secwepemc bilingualism was common in both nations into the twentieth century (Ignace & Ignace 2017). A secondary goal of this paper is therefore to set the stage for further research on areal influences across Northern and Southern Interior Salish languages.

This paper is organized into two major sections corresponding to two distinct uses of *mi* and *me7*: clefting<sup>1</sup> vs. non-clefting (i.e., clause-initial) uses. Clefting uses of Nsyilxcn *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7* are generally distinguishable from clause-initial uses by the non-propositional status of the material which linearly precedes *mi* or *me7* in clefting cases. Section 2 examines future *mi* and *me7* in their functions as adjunct and argument clefting particles, with forays into their analogous non-future structures, pronominal agreement patterns in independent pronoun clefts, apparent vP-related restrictions on clefting uses of *mi*, negation and DP subject positions with respect to *mi* and *me7*, and syntactic reflexes of informational focus in *mi* and *me7* argument clefts. Section 3 explores *mi* and *me7* as they occur in clause-initial positions, including mono-clausal uses, 'linking' uses such as introducing future conditionals and in indicating event subsequence, as well as a minor foray into 'doubling' with Nsyilxcn *mi*. Section 4 summarizes, outlines future research, and concludes.

## 2 Clefting uses of *mi* and *me7*

Future *mi* and *me7* clefts generally fall into two categories: adjunct clefts and argument clefts, which in Secwepemctsin are distinguished by the presence of subjunctive marking in the former, but not the latter (Gardiner 1993; Kroeber 1999). After a basic survey of adjunct (§2.1) and argument (§2.2) clefts, we examine several relevant and interesting syntactic and information structural properties across the two languages: non-future analogues of *mi* / *me7* clefts in the two languages (§2.3), pronominal agreement patterns in argument clefts with focused independent pronouns (§2.4), apparent vP-related restrictions in argument *mi* clefts (§2.5), the position of

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the terms 'cleft' and 'residue' as purely descriptive terms in this paper, without specific theoretical implications: 'Cleft' refers to a syntactic structure with a left-focused constituent. 'Residue' refers to the remaining, non-focused material in the sentence. We also used the term 'focus' somewhat loosely, though in some cases contrastive focus is more clearly playing a role.

negation and DP subjects with respect to *mi* and *me7* in clefts (§2.6), and syntactic reflexes of information focus in argument clefts (§2.7).

## 2.1 Future adjunct clefts

Future particles *mi* and *me7* are commonly used in clefts which involve fronted spatial deictic adverbs (1), temporal adverbs (2), adjunct prepositional phrases (3), or adjunct WH-elements (4). In these cases, Secwepemctsin employs subjunctive subject morphology on the residue predicate, which normally indicates clausal embeddedness. The subjunctive morphology doubles-up with ergative marking on transitive predicates (Gardiner 1993). There is no subjunctive morphology in Nsyilxcn, or any other Southern Interior Salish language, and so the residue predicate is itself generally<sup>2</sup> indistinguishable from a main clause predicate. Many of these observations have been previously made in Gardiner (1993) and Kroeber (1999), though we here provide additional data.<sup>3,4</sup>

- (1) a.   atláʔ mi xʷíçtəmən. **Nsyilxcn**  
           atláʔ       mi       xʷíç-xt-m-n  
           from.here FUT   give-BEN-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG  
           ‘I’ll give you some from this.’  
           (Sarah McLeod, VF, 11/06/09, 2776)
- b.   íklíʔ mi kn kʔawsq̣ʷyíl̥x. **Nsyilxcn**  
           íklíʔ       mi       kn       k-ʔaws-q̣ʷy-íl̥x  
           to.there   FUT   1SG.SUB   RSLT-go-dance-AUT  
           ‘That’s where I’m going to dance.’  
           (Sarah McLeod, VF, 4/14/10, 4463)
- c.   t̥ʔélye me7 w7écucw. **Secwepemctsin**  
           t̥ʔélye   me7   w7éc-ucw  
           to.here.VIS FUT   be-2SG.SBJV  
           ‘You will stay at this place.’  
           (Daniel Calhoun)
- d.   tktnú7 me7 nésucw. **Secwepemctsin**  
           tktnú7               me7   nés-ucw  
           towards.there.VIS FUT   go-2SG.SBJV  
           ‘Go way over there on the other side.’  
           (Garlene Dodson)

<sup>2</sup> Nsyilxcn does employ nominalization in several subordinate clause environments, though temporal and locative adjunct clefting is not one of them.

<sup>3</sup> We use community-recognized orthographies in this paper: APA for Nsyilxcn, and a practical phonemic Latin orthography for Secwepemctsin. See Appendix A for a conversion chart.

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix B for a list of glossing abbreviations and their meanings.

- e. yilén me7 penmíncwes re sílltsu. **Secwepemctsin**  
 yilén me7 pen-mí-n-c-wes re sílltsu  
 over.there.VIS FUT find-APPL-DIR-2SG.ERG-3SBJV DET shoe  
 ‘Over there you will find the shoes.’  
 (Garlene Dodson)
- (2) a. ḡlap mi x<sup>w</sup>uy Alice kł səx<sup>w</sup>mərím. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ḡlap mi x<sup>w</sup>uy Alice kł sx<sup>w</sup>-mrím  
 tomorrow FUT go Alice to OCC-medicine  
 ‘Alice is going to the doctor tomorrow.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 11/06/09, 2611)
- b. ʕapnáʔ mi k<sup>w</sup> səx<sup>w</sup>maʔmáyaʔm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ʕapnáʔ mi k<sup>w</sup> sx<sup>w</sup>-maʔmáyaʔm  
 now FUT 2SG.SUB OCC-teach  
 ‘Today you will be the teacher.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15382)
- c. níńwíʔs mi kn ɬplák. **Nsyilxcn**  
 níńwíʔs mi kn ɬ-plák  
 soon FUT 1SG.SUB return-come.back  
 ‘I’ll come back sometime.’ / ‘I’ll be going back soon.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 7/03/18, 15020)
- d. e nenéńses me7 tspelqíqilcwen.<sup>5</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 e nenéńs-es me7 ts-pelqíq-elc-wen  
 IRR.C later-3SBJV FUT CISL-come.back.1RDP-AUT-1SG.SBJV  
 ‘I’ll come back later.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/09/21)
- e. pintk mi sqłtmíx<sup>w</sup> iʔ ksylmíx<sup>w</sup>aʔx. **Nsyilxcn**  
 pintk mi sqłtmíx<sup>w</sup> iʔ ks-ylmíx<sup>w</sup>-aʔx  
 always FUT man DET PROS-chief-INTR  
 ‘It’s always a man that’s the chief.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 10/28/12, 12349)

---

<sup>5</sup> *e nenéńses* is ambiguously interpretable as both a grammaticized temporal adverb, and as a subordinate clause with syntactically-active subjunctive marking. Under the latter interpretation, main clause indicative subject morphology is also a possibility on the *me7* clause: *e nenéńses me7 tspelqíqilc-ken*. (Cecilia DeRose, 6/16/21). Fronting of the grammaticized interpretation of *e nenéńses* yields a true cleft, whereas the subordinate clause interpretation is an instance of unmarked fronting. This ambiguity exists generally for subjunctive-marked temporal elements introduced by irrealis complementizer *e*.

- f. tekwemtús ri7 me7 sqélemcws re kúkwpí7.<sup>6</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 tekwemtús ri7 me7 sqélemcw-s re kúkwpí7  
 always that.VIS FUT [NMLZ]-man-3POSS DET chief  
 ‘(I prefer)<sup>7</sup> the chief to always be a man.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/09/21)
- g. e pexyéwtés me7 knúcwentsenes.<sup>8</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 e pexyéwt-es me7 knúcw-n-ts-n-es  
 IRR.C next.day-3SBJV FUT help-DIR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG-3SBJV  
 ‘I will help you tomorrow.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21; Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)
- (3) a. k̓l nk̓writk̓w mi kn pulx. **Nsyilxcn**  
 k̓l n-k̓w-r-itk̓w mi kn pulx  
 to LOC-yellow-water FUT 1SG.SUB camp  
 ‘I will camp at Glimpse Lake.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/20/13, 14262)
- b. k̓l s̓n̓k̓s̓áwm̓n mi kw̓u ʔúll̓us. **Nsyilxcn**  
 k̓l s-n-k̓s̓áw-mn mi kw̓u ʔúll̓us  
 to NMLZ-LOC-pray-INST FUT 1PL.SUB gather  
 ‘It’s at the church that we will gather.’  
 (Lyon 2013:346)
- c. ne penkúpe me7 múmtwen. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ne penkúpe me7 múmt-wen  
 at Vancouver FUT sit.1RDP-1SG.SBJV  
 ‘I will live in Vancouver.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)
- d. te ctuméllcw me7 nénswen.<sup>9</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 te c-tum-éllcw me7 néns-wen  
 to LOC-sell-house FUT go.1RDP-1SG.SBJV  
 ‘To the store, I will go.’  
 (Garlene Dodson, Bridget Dan)

<sup>6</sup> Note that the nominal predicate *sqélemcws* has a possessor subject due to nominalization, rather than the expected subjunctive marking. The limits of this pattern require further exploration.

<sup>7</sup> The sense of “preferring” apparently comes about through the use of the future *me7* in this example, since the non-future equivalent *tekwemtús ri7 re sqélemcws re kúkwpí7* ‘A man is always the chief’ (Cecilia DeRose, 6/09/21) does not carry this sense.

<sup>8</sup> As in example (2d), *e pexyéwtés* is ambiguously interpretable as a subordinate clause, and so subjunctive in the *me7* clause is optional here: *e pexyéwtés me7 knúcwentsen* (Bridget Dan, 6/16/21).

<sup>9</sup> In this and other cases, subjunctive is required, since *te ctuméllcw* is not interpretable as a subordinate clause unlike adverbials introduced by irrealis *e*. For example: *\*te ctuméllcw me7 néns-ken*.

- (4) a.  $\dot{k}a\dot{?}k\acute{i}n\ mi\ \dot{\lambda}a\dot{q}a\dot{l}q\acute{a}m?$  **Nsyilxcn**  
 $ka\dot{?}k\acute{i}n\ mi\ \dot{\lambda}q\text{-}\acute{a}lq\text{-}m$   
to.where FUT dig-crop-MID  
‘Where is he gonna dig?’  
(Lottie Lindley, VF, 7/25/11, 8170)
- b.  $p\acute{n}\dot{?}k\acute{i}n\ mi\ k^w\ x^wuy\ l\ sm\acute{a}s\acute{q}\acute{a}t\ k\acute{l}\ Vancouver?$  **Nsyilxcn**  
 $p\acute{n}\dot{?}k\acute{i}n\ mi\ k^w\ x^wuy\ l\ s\text{-}m\acute{a}s\text{-}\acute{q}\acute{a}t\ k\acute{l}\ Vancouver$   
when FUT 2SG.SUB go at NMLZ-four-day to Vancouver  
‘When is that on Thursday that you go to Vancouver?’  
(Lottie Lindley, VF, 3/5/11, 7389)
- c.  $tkenh\acute{e}7en\ me7\ pel\acute{q}\acute{i}lcwet?$  **Secwepemctsin**  
 $tkenh\acute{e}7en\ me7\ pel\acute{q}\text{-}\acute{i}lc\text{-}wet$   
towards.where FUT come.back-AUT-1PL.SBJV  
‘Which way do we go to get back home?’  
(Mona Jules)
- d.  $penh\acute{e}7en\ me7\ wi\acute{w}estnes\ re\ kles?^{10}$  **Secwepemctsin**  
 $penh\acute{e}7en\ me7\ wi\acute{w}\text{-}st\text{-}n\text{-}es\ re\ kles$   
when FUT finish.1RDP-CAUS-1SG.ERG-3SBJV DET class  
‘When will I finish class?’  
(Bridget Dan)

These *mi* and *me7* structures commonly occur in embedded environments, possibly as free relatives:

- (5) a.  $lut\ \acute{t}\ cmystin\ p\acute{n}\dot{?}k\acute{i}n\ mi\ x^wuy\ John.$  **Nsyilxcn**  
 $lut\ \acute{t}\ c\text{-}my\text{-}st\text{-}in\ p\acute{n}\dot{?}k\acute{i}n\ mi\ x^wuy\ John$   
NEG NEG.EMPH CUST-know-CAUS-1SG.ERG when FUT go John  
‘I don’t know when John is going.’  
(Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/20/13, 14312)
- b.  $ta7\ k\ st\acute{s}elxemst\acute{e}ten\ penh\acute{e}7e\ me7\ qwets\acute{s}es\ re\ John.$  **Secwepemctsin**  
 $ta7\ k\ s\text{-}t\acute{s}elx\text{-}m\text{-}st\acute{e}t\text{-}en\ penh\acute{e}7e\ me7$   
NEG DET NMLZ-know-MID-CAUS.1RDP-1SG.ERG when FUT  
 $qwets\acute{s}es\text{-}es\ re\ John$   
leave-3SBJV DET John  
‘I don’t know when John will leave.’<sup>11</sup>  
(Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)

<sup>10</sup> As with (3e), subjunctive is required: *\*penh\acute{e}7en me7 wi\acute{w}esten re kles?*

<sup>11</sup> The position of an embedded DP subject in both Nsyilxcn and Secwepemctsin is variable and may either precede or follow the embedded predicate as in the example above, or precede the future particle (the preferred position): *ta7 k st\acute{s}elxemst\acute{e}ten penh\acute{e}7e re John me7 qwets\acute{s}es* ‘I don’t know when John will leave’ (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan). In neither language, however, can it directly follow *me7*: *\*ta7 k st\acute{s}elxemst\acute{e}ten penh\acute{e}7e me7 re John qwets\acute{s}es*. This is discussed further in later sections.

- c. ...p  $\lambda a \lambda a \lambda \acute{u} s \acute{a} m$  laʔkín mi  $\acute{x} s t m i n t p$  iʔ ksck<sup>w</sup>ú<sup>l</sup>əmp. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ...p  $\lambda a \lambda a \lambda \acute{u} s \acute{a} m$  laʔkín mi  $\acute{x} s t \text{-} m i \text{-} n t \text{-} p$   
 2PL.SUB look.for-face-MID at.where FUT good-APPL-DIR-2PL.ERG  
 iʔ k[ʰ]-s-c-k<sup>w</sup>ú<sup>l</sup>-mp  
 DET IRR.POSS-NMLZ-CUST-work-2PL.POSS  
 ‘...You will look for a place to settle where you will be satisfied to work.’  
 (A. Mattina 1985, stanza 17)
- d. petítnesmen thé<sup>7</sup>en me<sup>7</sup> penmíntmes. **Secwepemctsin**  
 petítnes-m-en thé<sup>7</sup>en me<sup>7</sup> pen-mí-nt-m-es  
 think.1RDP-APPL-[DIR]-1SG.ERG to.where FUT find-APPL-DIR-1PL.ERG-3SBV  
 ‘I’m thinking about where we are going to find him.’  
 (Garlene Dodson)

Some evidence which is at least consistent with a free relative analysis, as opposed to the embedded cleft analysis argued for in Gardiner (1993) for non-future Secwepemctsin clefts, come from Nsyilxcn, where *mi* is sometimes judged grammatical as a relativizer in non-cleft environments (6a). That said, it is dispreferred to prospective *ks-* in relative clauses (6b).

- (6) a. wikən iʔ sqəltmíx<sup>w</sup> mi caʔntín. **Nsyilxcn**  
 wik-n iʔ sqəltmíx<sup>w</sup> mi caʔ-nt-ín  
 see-[DIR]-1SG.ERG DET man FUT hit-DIR-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I saw the man that I’m going to hit.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 2/18/13, 13099)
- b. wikən iʔ sqəltmíx<sup>w</sup> iʔ kscaʔntín.<sup>12</sup> **Nsyilxcn**  
 wik-n iʔ sqəltmíx<sup>w</sup> iʔ ks-caʔ-nt-ín  
 see-[DIR]-1SG.ERG DET man DET PROS-hit-DIR-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I saw the man that I’m going to hit.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 2/18/13, 13098)

On the other hand, in Secwepemctsin, oblique *te* and irrealis oblique *tek* are used as default relativizers. Unlike in clefting environments, *me<sup>7</sup>* always occurs alongside the oblique marker in future relatives (7), which rather supports the embedded cleft analysis for examples like (5).<sup>13</sup>

- (7) a. me<sup>7</sup> qílqelt k silltsu<sup>7</sup>úwí tek me<sup>7</sup> 7skúlem. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me<sup>7</sup> qílqelt k silltsu<sup>7</sup>úwí tek me<sup>7</sup> 7-s-kúl-em  
 FUT beautiful DET.IRR shoe-true OBL.IRR FUT 2SG.POSS-NMLZ-make-MID  
 ‘The moccasins you are going to make will be beautiful.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, Garlene Dodson)

<sup>12</sup> The co-occurrence of prospective *ks-* and 1<sup>st</sup> person ergative *-(i)n* is unexpected here, since normally 1<sup>st</sup> person possessive *i(n)-* is used with *ks-*.

<sup>13</sup> Thanks to Hannah Green for providing these examples.

- b. h́eqen re John me7 wikts k kenkékne<sup>m</sup> tek me7 il<sup>len</sup> tek swewll. **Secwepemctsin**  
 h́eqen re John me7 wik-t-s k kenkékne<sup>m</sup>  
 maybe DET John FUT see-DIR-3ERG DET black.bear  
 \*(tek) me7 il<sup>len</sup> tek swewll  
 OBL.IRR FUT eat OBL.IRR fish  
 ‘Maybe John will see a bear that is going to eat a fish.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose)

Passive agents (8), instruments (9), and objects of benefactives (10) are introduced by the oblique marker *t* in Nsyilxcn,<sup>14</sup> and *te(k)* in Secwepemctsin (Kuipers 1974; Gardiner 1993).

- (8) a. iʔ snkl̥caʔsqáǰaʔ wíkəntəm t x́ixutəm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 iʔ snkl̥caʔsqáǰaʔ wík-nt-m t x́ixutm  
 DET horse see-DIR-PASS OBL little.girl  
 ‘The little girl saw the horse.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 1/20/12, 9879)

- b. m-súkwentem re petsptsékll te snewt. **Secwepemctsin**  
 m-súkw-nt-m re pets-ptsékll te snewt  
 PST-blow-DIR-PASS DET PL.RDP-leaf OBL wind  
 ‘The wind blew the leaves.’  
 (Bridget Dan, VF, 3/17/21)

- (9) a. ʔilən iʔ lasúp (iʔ) t lúmən. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ʔil-n iʔ lasúp (iʔ) t lúmən  
 eat-[DIR]-1SG.ERG DET soup DET OBL spoon  
 ‘I ate the soup with a spoon.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/22/10, 6672)

- b. m-7illens re lekemín te setcimen. **Secwepemctsin**  
 m-7illen-s re lekemín te setcimen  
 PST-eat-[DIR]-3ERG DET flour.soup OBL spoon  
 ‘He ate the soup with a spoon.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/14/21)

- (10) a. k̥wúlxtən t yámǰwaʔ. **Nsyilxcn**  
 k̥wúl-xt-n t yámǰwaʔ  
 make-BEN-1SG.ERG OBL cedar.bark.basket  
 ‘I made a basket for him/her.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 2217, 9/14/09)

<sup>14</sup> Nsyilxcn passive agents and instruments may be introduced by an optional, additional *iʔ* determiner for specific referents of common nouns. This is not possible for benefactive objects, at least in the Upper Nicola.



- b. m-kectés lu7 te sqlélten. **Secwepemctsin**  
 m-kect-és lu7 te sqlélten  
 PST-give.BEN-3ERG that.ABS OBL salmon  
 ‘He/she gave him/her a salmon.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)

Passive agents can undergo adjunct clefting in non-future contexts using Secwepemctsin determiners *re* and *le* (Gardiner 1993; Lai 1998)<sup>15</sup> and Nsyilxcn *ki?* (the non-future counterpart to *mi* in adjunct clefts) as clefting particles, however, it is less acceptable in either language to cleft passive agents as oblique adjuncts in future contexts with *mi* or *me7*, for reasons which are currently unclear. Pragmatics may be at play here, as well as the absence of any consistent strategy for extracting oblique-marked constituents in Interior Salish (Kroeber 1999).

- (11) a. te kenkékne<sup>m</sup> lu7 re kélentemes.<sup>16</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 te kenkékne<sup>m</sup> lu7 re kél-nt-m-es  
 OBL black.bear that.ABS DET chase-DIR-PASS-3SBJV  
 ‘He was chased by the bear.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)

- b. <sup>?</sup> te kenkékne<sup>m</sup> me7 kélentemes.<sup>17</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
<sup>?</sup> te kenkékne<sup>m</sup> me7 kél-nt-m-es  
 OBL bear FUT chase-DIR-PASS-3SBJV  
 ‘He will get chased by the bear.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)  
*Comment: “Sounds a bit strange.”*

- (12) a. te núnxwenxw re m-wíktmes re scw-píxem.<sup>18</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 te núnxwenxw re m-wík-t-m-es re scw-píxem  
 OBL woman.DIM.RDP DET PST-see-DIR-PASS-3SBJV DET OCC-hunt  
 ‘The hunter was seen by the little girl.’  
 (Bridget Dan, VF, 3/17/21)

<sup>15</sup> Lai (1998:313) and Gardiner (1993:46), who worked primarily with Mona Jules from Skeetchestn, include examples involving clefted independent pronoun passive agents: e.g. *te ntsétswe7 re wíktmes* ‘I’m the one that saw him’ and *te7 newi7 re wíktmes* ‘You’re the one that saw him.’ Independent pronoun passive agents may be clefted as adjuncts with *me7*, however the determiner *re* shows up on the fronted constituent rather than an oblique marker. See below for further discussion. Gardiner (1993:74) additionally includes the following contrastive examples: *re John lu7 le m-wíktem* ‘It’s John that was seen.’ and *(te) John lu7 le m-wíktemes* ‘It’s John that she was seen by.’

<sup>16</sup> Cf. non-clefted passive: *kélentem lu7 te kenkékne<sup>m</sup>* ‘He was chased by a bear’ (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/2/21).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. non-clefted passive: *me7 kélentem te kenkékne<sup>m</sup>* ‘He will be chased by a bear’ (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/2/21).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. non-clefted passive: *m-wíktem re scw-píxem te núnxwenxw* ‘The little girl saw the hunter’ (Bridget Dan, VF 3/17/21).

- b. <sup>?</sup> te núnxwenxw me7 wíktmes re scw-píxem.<sup>19</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
<sup>?</sup> te núnxwenxw me7 wík-t-m-es re scw-píxem  
 OBL woman.DIM.RDP FUT see-DIR-PASS-3SBJV DET OCC-hunt  
 ‘The hunter will be seen by the little girl.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 6/16/21)

- (13) a. t skəḿxíst ki? qíx<sup>w</sup>əntəm, lut t̄ swaŕ.  
 t skḿxíst ki? qíx<sup>w</sup>-nt-m, lut t̄ swaŕ  
 OBL black.bear NON.FUT chase-DIR-PASS NEG NEG.EMPH cougar  
 ‘It was the bear that chased him, not the cougar.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15557)
- b. \*t skəḿxíst mi qíx<sup>w</sup>əntəm, lut t̄ swaŕ.<sup>20</sup> **Nsyilxcn**  
 \*t skḿxíst mi qíx<sup>w</sup>-nt-m lut t̄ swaŕ  
 OBL bear FUT chase-DIR-PASS NEG NEG.EMPH cougar  
 ‘The bear is going to chase him, not the cougar.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15558)

Instruments in Nsyilxcn are introduced by (*i?*) *t*, and are clefted with *ki?* (14). Examples are currently lacking on future *mi* clefting of instruments. In Secwepemctsin, non-future instrument clefts are possible, and future instrument clefts appear at least marginally more acceptable than the future passive agent clefts discussed above (15).

- (14) a. i? t níkmən ki? níks. **Nsyilxcn**  
 i? t ník-mn ki? ník-s  
 DET OBL cut-INST NON.FUT cut-[DIR]-3ERG  
 ‘What he cut it with is a knife.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/06/09, 2710)
- b. i? t łumən ki? łaps i? sup, lut t̄ łak<sup>w</sup>cíntən. **Nsyilxcn**  
 i? t łumn ki? łap-s i? sup  
 DET OBL spoon NON.FUT eat.soup-[DIR]-3ERG DET soup  
 lut t̄ łak<sup>w</sup>-cín-tn  
 NEG NEG.EMPH pierce-mouth-INST  
 ‘It was the spoon that he ate the soup with, not a fork.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 11/06/09, 2797)

<sup>19</sup> Cf. non-clefted passive: *me7 wíktm re scw-píxem te núnxwenxw* ‘The little girl will see the hunter’ (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF 6/16/21).

<sup>20</sup> In the Colville dialect of Nsyilxcn, oblique marking signals an ergative argument generally, and these are clefted by *mi*. These may be analyzed as argument clefts (see Section 2.3). For example: *wáy t incà? mi nq<sup>w</sup>ənmíntsən* ‘I will pity you.’ (A. Mattina 1985, stanza 838).

- (15) a. te stécímen lu7 (re) m-7íllenses re lekemín. **Secwepemctsin**  
 te stécímen lu7 re m-7íllen-s-es re lekemín  
 OBL spoon that.ABS DET PST-eat-[DIR]-3ERG-3SBJV DET flour.soup  
 ‘He ate the soup with a spoon.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)  
 Comment: “But you automatically know it will be a spoon.”
- b. ? te stécímen me7 7íllenses re lekemín. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ? te stécímen me7 7íllen-s-es re lekemín  
 OBL spoon FUT eat-[DIR]-3ERG-3SBJV DET flour.soup  
 ‘He will eat the soup with a spoon.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/16/21)  
 Comment: “I suppose if you want to be specific.”
- c. ? te pétse me7 é7ellqwen tek skwenkwínem. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ? te pétse me7 é7ellq-wen tek skwenkwínem  
 OBL digging.stick FUT dig.crop.1RDP-1SG.SBJV OBL.IRR indian.potatoes  
 ‘I will dig the Indian potatoes with a digging stick.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/16/21)  
 Comment: “I suppose...”

Question/answer contexts which were designed to improve the felicity of future oblique clefts in Secwepemctsin do not appear to work. Example (17a) was volunteered as an answer to (16), however, clefted (17b) was judged marginal at best, as can be seen by Bridget and Cecilia’s comment.

- (16) kem es tqellqs tek peták? **Secwepemctsin**  
 kénem e s-tq-ellq-s tek peták  
 do.how IRR.C NMLZ-dig-crop-3POSS OBL.IRR potatoes  
 ‘How is she going to dig potatoes?’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 7/14/21)
- (17) a. me7 tpeñmíns k lepélt e tqéllqes tek peták. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 tpeñ-mín-s k lepélt  
 FUT use-APPL-[DIR]-3ERG DET.IRR shovel  
 e tq-éllq-es tek peták  
 IRR.C dig-crop-3SBJV OBL.IRR potatoes  
 ‘She’s going to use a shovel to dig potatoes.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 7/14/21)
- b. ? te lepélt me7 tqéllqes tek peták. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ? te lepélt me7 tq-éllq-es tek peták  
 OBL shovel FUT dig-crop-3SBJV OBL.IRR potatoes  
 ‘A shovel is what she’ll use to dig potatoes with.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21)  
 Comment: “It’s okay, but Elders wouldn’t say it that way.”

Benefactive objects can be clefted in both languages as adjuncts in non-future contexts. For Nsyilxcn, unlike passive agents and instruments, the fronted object is not obliquemarked.<sup>21</sup> In Secwepemctsin, oblique marking does surface on the fronted benefactive object, and nominalization is required on the residue predicate, rather than subjunctive morphology.

(18) a. iʔ ntytyíx kiʔ xʷíçəxtəm. Nsyilxcn  
 iʔ ntytyíx kiʔ xʷíç-xt-m  
 DET salmon NON.FUT give-BEN-PASS  
 ‘It’s a salmon that he gave her.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 11/06/09, 2810)

b. te sqlélten lu7 re m-skectés.<sup>22</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 te sqlélten lu7 re m-s-kect-és  
 OBL salmon that.ABS DET PST-NMLZ-give.BEN-3ERG  
 ‘It’s a salmon that he gave her.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/9/21)

Oblique objects of middles can be clefted so long as they are introduced by a focused demonstrative, as in (19a–b) (see Section 2.7 for further examples). They cannot be clefting in the absence of such a demonstrative (19c) (see Gardiner 1993:148 for related examples). Note that the predicate must be nominalized in these cases.

(19) a. yerí7 te qmut me7 nskúklem. Secwepemctsin  
 yerí7 te qmut me7 n-s-kúkl-em  
 that.VIS OBL hat FUT my-NMLZ-make-INTR  
 ‘That is the hat I’ll make.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/21/21)

b. yerí7 te sqéxe lu7 le7 swikem. Secwepemctsin  
 yerí7 te sqéxe lu7 le 7-s-wík-em  
 that OBL dog that.ABS DET.ABS 2SG.POSS-NMLZ-see-MID  
 ‘That’s the dog that you saw.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan)

c. \*tek/\*te/\*re qmut me7 nskúklem.<sup>23</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 \*tek/\*te/\*re qmut me7 n-s-kúkl-em.  
 OBL.IRR/OBL/DET hat FUT 1SG.POSS-NMLZ-make.1RDP  
 ‘It’s a hat that I will make.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21)

<sup>21</sup> Secwepemctsin follows a similar pattern in introducing clefted independent pronoun passive agents with determiners. The presence of Nsyilxcn *kiʔ* in (18a) however unambiguously indicates adjunct clefting.

<sup>22</sup> Bridget and Cecilia judged the following variants as ungrammatical: (i) with subjunctive marking rather than nominalization *\*te sqlélten lu7 re m-kectés*; and (ii) without nominalization *\*te sqlélten lu7 re m-kectés*.

<sup>23</sup> Compare with non-clefted: *me7 kúklem-ken tek qmut* ‘I will make a hat’ (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 7/14/21).

In summary, locative and temporal adjuncts may easily undergo clefting with *mi* or *me7*, however, oblique nominals introduced by *t* or *te* are more resistant to future clefting, which is somewhat surprising given that non-future clefting of passive agents and instruments using Nsyilxcn *ki?* or Secwepemctsin determiner *re* (Gardiner 1993) is well-documented.

## 2.2 Future Argument Clefts

In addition to clefting adjuncts, *mi* and *me7* both cleft argument DPs. In Nsyilxcn, arguments clefted with *mi* are judged felicitous in contexts involving contrastive focus and are typically judged infelicitous otherwise.<sup>24</sup> Such DPs include proper names, DPs headed by the determiners, independent pronouns, and argument-denoting demonstratives.

Example (20) shows cases of clefted, proper name subjects and objects. Note that while *i?* determiners are absent before proper names in Nsyilxcn unless they are in predicate position (Lyon 2013), *re* or *le* determiners are required before proper names in all argument positions in Secwepemctsin (though they phonetically reduce in the Skeetchestn dialect).<sup>25</sup> Note also that subjunctive marking is ungrammatical in Secwepemctsin argument clefts (Kroeber 1999).

- (20) a. Peter mi knxítsəlx. Nsyilxcn  
 Peter mi knxít-səlx  
 Peter FUT help.BEN-3PL.ERG  
 ‘They will help Peter.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15673)
- b. re Peter me7 kwnúcwens-ekwe.<sup>26</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 re Peter me7 kwnúcw-en-s-ekwe  
 DET Peter FUT help-TR-3ERG-REP  
 ‘Peter is going to help them/him.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/2/21)
- c. John mi x<sup>w</sup>uy. Nsyilxcn  
 John mi x<sup>w</sup>uy  
 John FUT go  
 ‘John will go.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, Sarah McLeod VF, 6/01/12, 11532)

<sup>24</sup> This is discussed in more detail below. Focus-related pragmatic restrictions are less apparent for Secwepemctsin future argument clefts.

<sup>25</sup> Lai (1998) worked with Elders of southern dialects, where determiners before independent pronouns are commonly absent. They argue against phonetic reduction of determiners, and in favour of two distinct underlying systems for northern versus southern dialects, however, we have found that Elders such as Mona Jules from Skeetchestn restore determiners in careful speech. Bridget Dan and Cecilia Rose from Esket always require determiners before singular independent pronouns.

<sup>26</sup> *me7 knúcwentem re Peter* ‘They will help Peter’ was volunteered (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/14/21), and *re Peter me7 kwenúcwentem* was marginally accepted as a variant.

- d. re John me7 qwetséts. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re John me7 qwetséts  
 DET John FUT leave  
 ‘John will leave.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 6/16/21)
- e. Alice mi x<sup>w</sup>uy k̄l s̄ax<sup>w</sup>m̄arím. **Nsyilxcn**  
 Alice mi x<sup>w</sup>uy k̄l sx<sup>w</sup>-mrím  
 Alice FUT go to OCC-medicine  
 ‘Alice is the one who will go to the doctor.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15196)  
*Comment: “If there were two people and you choose Alice to go.”*
- f. Spike mi ylmíx<sup>w</sup>əm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 Spike mi ylmíx<sup>w</sup>m  
 Spike FUT chief  
 ‘Spike will be the chief.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 10/28/11, 9172)

Example (21) shows clefted, determiner-headed common noun DP subjects.

- (21) a. iʔ s̄ax<sup>w</sup>píx̄əm cak<sup>w</sup> mi sysyus. **Nsyilxcn**  
 iʔ sx<sup>w</sup>-píx̄əm cak<sup>w</sup> mi sysyus  
 DET OCC-hunt BOUL FUT energetic  
 ‘The hunter is the one who should be energetic.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 3/5/12, 10768)
- b. iʔ tətwt̄ mi x<sup>w</sup>uy. **Nsyilxcn**  
 iʔ ttwt̄ mi x<sup>w</sup>uy  
 DET boy FUT go  
 ‘The boy will go.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 3/4/12, 10973)
- c. re sqéqlēm̄cw me7 qwetséts.<sup>27</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 re sqéqlēm̄cw me7 qwetséts  
 DET man.DIM.RDP FUT leave  
 ‘The boy will go.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)
- d. iʔ q̄<sup>w</sup>ʕaylqs mi k̄ʕám. **Nsyilxcn**  
 iʔ q̄<sup>w</sup>ʕay-lqs mi k̄ʕá-m  
 DET black-robe FUT pray-MID  
 ‘The priest will/can pray.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 2/16/10, 3745)

<sup>27</sup> Ungrammatical examples like the following confirm that subjunctive is not possible in argument clefts in Secwepemctsin: \*re sqéqlēm̄cw me7 qwetsétses ‘The boy will go’ (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21).

- e. re qwéy'elqs me7 qweqwentsín. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re qwéy'-elqs me7 qweqwen-tsín  
 DET black-robe FUT pitiful.DIM.RDP-mouth  
 'The priest will pray.'  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)

Example (22) shows cases involving clefted independent pronoun subjects, which can incidentally be conjoined (as shown in 22d,e). Example (22b) shows that person agreement between the independent pronoun and the verbal residue is variable in Secwepemctsin.<sup>28</sup> Agreement patterns in independent pronoun clefts are discussed in more detail in Section 2.4.

- (22) a. anwí mi kw qwəlq'ílt. **Nsyilxcn**  
 anwí mi kw q'íq'ílt  
 2SG.INDEP FUT 2SG.SUB speak  
 'You may/must speak now.'  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 4/24/09, 286)

- b. re ntsétswe7 (ri7) me7 qweqwlút. (*judged better*) **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 (ri7) me7 qweqwlúlt-ken. (*judged good*)  
 re ntsétswe7 (ri7) me7 qweqwlú(ł)t(-ken)  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP that.VIS FUT speak.(1RDP-1SG.SUB)  
 'I'm the one that will speak.'  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21, 7/21/21)

- c. cnílc mi n'ciġs i? qáqx'əlx. **Nsyilxcn**  
 cnílc mi n-ġiġ-s i? qáqx'əlx  
 3SG.INDEP FUT LOC-fry-[DIR]-3ERG DET fish  
 'She'll cook the fish.'  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15531)

- d. incá na?ł anwí mi kwu ksx'uya?x. **Nsyilxcn**  
 incá na?ł anwí mi kwu ks-x'uy-a?x  
 1SG.INDEP CONJ 2SG.INDEP FUT 1PL.SUB PROS-go-INTR  
 'Me and you are going.'  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 10/28/12, 12367)

<sup>28</sup> Our sense is that *re ntsétswe me7 qweqwlúlt-ken* is equivalent to 'Me, I will speak', with the independent pronoun in an external topic position (Gardiner 1993), whereas with *re ntsétswe me7 qweqwlút*, the independent pronoun is in a focus position and is equivalent to an actual cleft 'It is I who will speak.' This hypothesis seems to be supported by Gardiner (1993:139) who shows that the focus position should not trigger agreement. Gardiner (1993:section 3.1) also provides a battery of tests for external topic position. More work needs to be done in this area, especially with regards to clefted independent pronouns.

Ron Ignace (p.c.) indicates that the variant without *-ken* on the predicate is "more non-chalant", as in 'Yeah I will speak.' (Also note that Ron does not first-person reduplicate the predicate: *re ntsétswe7 me7 qweqwlút*.) Again, forms such as ungrammatical *\*re ntsétswe7 me7 qweqwlúltwen* (Cecilia DeRose) confirm that subjunctive marking is not possible in argument clefts.

- e. re ntsétswe7 ell re newí7 me7 qwetséts-kucw.<sup>29</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 ell re newí7 me7 qwetséts-kucw.  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP CONJ DET 2SG.INDEP FUT leave-1PL.INCL  
 ‘Me and you will go.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)

Argument-denoting demonstratives may be clefted as well (23). In Secwepemctsin, demonstratives *ri7* and *lu7* often follow a focused element (23d,f), though this demonstrative is strictly-speaking optional.<sup>30</sup>

- (23) a. ixíʔ mi ylmíx<sup>w</sup>əm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixíʔ mi ylmíx<sup>w</sup>m  
 that FUT chief  
 ‘He will be a chief.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 3/05/12, 10978)

- b. yeri7 me7 kúkwpí7.<sup>31</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 yeri7 me7 kúkwpí7  
 that FUT chief  
 ‘He will be a chief.’ (Literally: *That one will be chief.*)  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)

- c. axáʔ mi k<sup>w</sup>intx<sup>w</sup>. **Nsyilxcn**  
 axáʔ mi k<sup>w</sup>in-[n]t-x<sup>w</sup>  
 this FUT take-DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘This is the one you should take.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 10/29/12, 12344)

- d. ye7éne (ri7) me7 kwenc. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ye7éne (ri7) me7 kwenc  
 this.VIS that.VIS FUT take.DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘This is the one you should take.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 6/16/21)

<sup>29</sup> Ron Ignace (p.c.) volunteered *re ntsétswe7 ell re newí7 me7 qwetséts-kt* for this sentence.

<sup>30</sup> Gardiner (1993:76) refers to these secondary demonstratives as “focus particles”. We instead analyze either the pre-residue determiners or *me7* as clefting (i.e., “focus”) particles, given that these secondary demonstratives are optional, since contrastive interpretations survive in the absence of such secondary demonstratives, and since pronominal agreement patterns seem identical regardless of the presence or absence of the secondary demonstrative.

<sup>31</sup> The non-future equivalent is *yeri7 re kúkwpí7* ‘That is the chief.’ This is used as “an answer to a question, you’re pointing at him.” Otherwise, *kúkwpí7 ri7* is used “when you’re just talking” (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21).



- e. *ixiʔ mi ʃacəntíx<sup>w</sup>.* **Nsyilxcn**  
*ixiʔ mi ʃac-nt-íx<sup>w</sup>*  
 that FUT tie-DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘That’s the one you’ll tie up.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 6/14/09, 1445)
- f. *yeri7 (ri7) me7 yegímenc.<sup>32</sup>* **Secwepemctsin**  
*yeri7 (ri7) me7 yegím-en-c*  
 that.VIS that.VIS FUT tie-DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘That’s the one you will tie up.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/21/21)
- g. *axáʔ mi x<sup>w</sup>úystəm naʔi iʔ yámǰ<sup>w</sup>aʔ.* **Nsyilxcn**  
*axáʔ mi x<sup>w</sup>úy-st-m naʔi iʔ yámǰ<sup>w</sup>aʔ*  
 this FUT go-CAUS-1PL.ERG CONJ DET cedar.bark.basket  
 ‘We’ll take this and the baskets.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 10/28/11, 8928)
- h. *yeréy ri7 me7 mímc.* **Secwepemctsin**  
*yeréy ri7 me7 mímc*  
 that.VIS that.VIS FUT basket  
 ‘That will be a basket.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/2/21)

Though the examples in this section primarily involve clefted intransitive and transitive subject arguments, the clefted demonstrative examples in (23) confirm that transitive objects follow the same pattern. Gardiner (1993:141) states that the focus position in Secwepemctsin clefts is reserved for subjects, except in the presence of a WH-word. Examples like (23d) thus appear to be counter-evidence to this claim.

### 2.3 Comparing future and non-future clefts in Nsyilxcn and Secwepemctsin

Aside from the subjunctive marking present in Secwepemctsin adjunct clefts, future adjunct and argument clefts with Nsyilxcn *mi* and Secwepemctsin *me7* pattern similarly. Their non-future analogues are different, however. First, while Nsyilxcn *mi* is in complementary distribution with the non-future particle *kiʔ* in adjunct focus contexts (24), Secwepemctsin *me7* is in complementary distribution with core determiners *re* and *le* (or irrealis determiner *k* in questions) (25).<sup>33</sup>

- (24) a. *ǰl sənǰǰáwmən mi k<sup>w</sup>u ʔúllus.* **Nsyilxcn**  
*ǰl s-n-kǰǰáw-mn mi k<sup>w</sup>u ʔúllus*  
 to NMLZ-LOC-pray-INST FUT 1PL.SUB gather  
 ‘It’s at the church that we will gather.’  
 (Lyon 2013:346)

<sup>32</sup> The non-future equivalent is *yeri7 ri7 le m-yegímenc* ‘That’s the one you tied up’ (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21).

<sup>33</sup> Though *me7* occurs alongside oblique *te* and *tek* in relativization contexts, as noted above.

- b.  $\dot{k}l$  sən $\dot{k}\zeta$ áw $\dot{m}ən$   $ki?$   $k^w$ u  $\zeta\dot{u}llus$ . Nsyilxcn  
 $\dot{k}l$  s-n-k $\zeta$ áw-mn  **$ki?$**   $k^w$ u  $\zeta\dot{u}llus$   
 to NMLZ-LOC-pray-INST NON.FUT 1PL.SUB gather  
 ‘It’s at the church that we gathered.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, Sarah McLeod, 8/24/13, 14589)

- (25) a. penhé7e me7 téwemucw tek nexúlecw?<sup>34</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 penhé7e **me7** téw-em-ucw tek nexúlecw  
 when FUT buy-MID-2SG.SBJV OBL.IRR car  
 ‘When will you buy a car?’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21)

- b. penhé7e k téwencwes re nexúlecw? Secwepemctsin  
 penhé7e **k** téw-n-c-wes re nexúlecw?  
 when DET.IRR buy-DIR-2SG.ERG-3SBJV DET car  
 ‘When did you buy the car?’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21)

To be clear, Nsyilxcn non-future *ki?* is not a determiner: It can neither introduce a nominal argument, nor a clause from which a core nominal argument has been extracted. The latter is shown in (26). The determiner *i?* is always used in such cases.

- (26) a.  $i?$  sqłtmíx<sup>w</sup> kils  $i?$  s $\lambda$ a $\zeta$ ínəm  $i?/*ki?$  scwíks. Nsyilxcn  
 $i?$  sqłtmíx<sup>w</sup> kil-s  $i?$  s $\lambda$ a $\zeta$ ínm  
 DET man chase-[DIR]-3ERG DET deer  
 **$i?/*ki?$**  s-c-wik-s  
 DET/\*NON.FUT NMLZ-CUST-see-3POSS  
 ‘The man chased the deer he saw.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 7458, \*7460, 3/6/11)

- b.  $ixi?$   $i?$  tkłmilx<sup>w</sup>  $i?/*ki?$  x<sup>w</sup>ist. Nsyilxcn  
 $ixi?$   $i?$  tkłmilx<sup>w</sup>  **$i?/*ki?$**  x<sup>w</sup>ist  
 that DET woman DET/\*NON.FUT walk  
 ‘That’s the woman who walked.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 6294, \*6292, 9/30/10)

- c. ( $ixi?$ ) Alice  $i?/*ki?$  x<sup>w</sup>uy  $\dot{k}l$  səx<sup>w</sup>mə $\dot{r}ím$ . Nsyilxcn  
 ( $ixi?$ ) Alice  **$i?/*ki?$**  x<sup>w</sup>uy  $\dot{k}l$  s $x^w$ -mrím  
 that Alice DET/\*NON.FUT go to OCC-medicine  
 ‘Alice is the one who went to the doctor.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 15200, \*16207, 6/11/19.)

<sup>34</sup> Note that for speakers from northern communities (e.g., Eskét) *nexúlecw* designates ‘car’, whereas for speakers from southern communities (e.g., Skeetchestn) it designates ‘train’.

Conversely, Nsyilxcn determiner *i?* cannot be used to cleft adjuncts in non-future contexts (27), unlike Secwepemctsin determiners *re*, *le*, and *k* (28a–c).

- (27) (ixi?) k̓l snk̓s̓áwmn ki?/\*i? kʷu yaʃp. Nsyilxcn  
 (ixi?) k̓l snk̓s̓áwmn **ki?/\*i?** kʷu yaʃp  
 DEM to church NON.FUT/\*DET 1PL.SUB arrive.PL  
 ‘We got to the church.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 6530, \*6529, 9/29/10)

- (28) a. t̓l7éne re tskwékwnes. Secwepemctsin  
 t̓l7éne **re** ts-kwékwn-es  
 from.here.VIS DET CISL-take.1RDP-[DIR-1SG.ERG]-3SBJV  
 ‘I took it from here.’  
 (Mona Jules)

- b. ne sllwélsten lu7 le w7é7cwen. Secwepemctsin  
 ne sllwélsten lu7 **le** w7é7c-wen  
 at autumn that.ABS DET.ABS be.1RDP-1SG.SBJV  
 ‘It was in the fall that I was there.’  
 (Garlene Dodson, Bridget Dan)

- c. thé7en k̓ t̓7ekucw? Secwepemctsin  
 thé7en **k̓** t̓7ek-ucw  
 to.where DET.IRR go.along-2SG.SBJV  
 ‘Where are you going?’  
 (Bridget Dan)

In sum, Secwepemctsin determiners cleft not only adjuncts but arguments as well in non-future contexts. The grammatical status of the clefted element is unambiguously signaled via the presence or absence of subjunctive marking. Nsyilxcn *ki?*, as the functional equivalent of Secwepemctsin subjunctive marking in non-future adjunct clefting contexts, is also unambiguous. Secwepemctsin and Nsyilxcn non-future patterns converge in argument clefts with the consistent use of determiners in both languages. These grammatical patterns are distilled in Table 1 below.

**Table 1:** Comparing Future and Non-Future Clefting Particles in Nsyilxcn and Secwepemctsin

	Nsyilxcn			Secwepemctsin		
	<i>mi</i> (FUT)	<i>ki?</i> (NON.FUT)	<i>i?</i> (DET)	<i>me7</i> (FUT)	SBJV	<i>re, le, k</i> (DET)
future argument cleft	√	*	(√) <sup>35</sup>	√	*	*
non-future argument cleft	*	*	√	*	*	√
future adjunct cleft	√	*	*	√	√	*
non-future adjunct cleft	*	√	*	*	√	√

<sup>35</sup> The parentheses are here because argument clefts with future interpretations can be realized with a clefting determiner *i?* plus prospective *ks-*, rather than using future *mi*.

## 2.4 Clefted independent pronouns and agreement

Independent pronouns in Secwepemctsin are emphatic pronouns with human referents, and are often “used to place contrastive, or narrow, focus on the intensified referent” (Lai 1998:309).<sup>36</sup> We focus here on both non-future and future agreement patterns for Secwepemctsin independent pronoun clefts, both for the sake of comparison, but also because the non-future pattern elicits clearer judgements from our Elders.

With clefted 1<sup>st</sup> person independent pronoun arguments in Nsyilxcn, 1<sup>st</sup> person intransitive (29a,b) or ergative (29c,d) subject agreement is required on the residue predicate in both future *mi* and non-future *i?* clefts (though we have no negative judgements at this time).<sup>37</sup>

- (29) a.    *incá i? kn səx<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>úl<sup>h</sup>x<sup>w</sup>əm.* Nsyilxcn  
**incá**        *i?*        **kn**        *səx<sup>w</sup>-k<sup>w</sup>úl<sup>h</sup>-x<sup>w</sup>-m*  
 1SG.INDEP    DET    1SG.SUB    OCC-make-house-MID  
 ‘I’m the one that is the housebuilder.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 3/04/12, 10698)
- b.        *incá mi kn kskm<sup>h</sup>qínəm † anǰmínk.* Nsyilxcn  
**incá**        *mi*        **kn**        *ks-km<sup>h</sup>-qín-m*        †        *an-ǰmínk*  
 1SG.INDEP    FUT    1SG.SUB    PROS-take-head-MID    IRR.C    2SG.POSS-want  
 ‘I will drive if you want.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15544)
- c.        *incá i? cúntsən.* Nsyilxcn  
**incá**        *i?*        *cú-nt-s-n*  
 1SG.INDEP    DET    say-DIR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I’m the one who told you.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/20/10, 6723)
- d.        *cmay incá mi x<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>əntín.* Nsyilxcn  
*cmay*    **incá**        *mi*        *x<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>-nt-ín*  
 EPIS    1SG.INDEP    FUT    clean-DIR-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I might clean it.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 9/14/09, 2326)

Parallel forms in Secwepemctsin prefer 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement, but nevertheless allow 1<sup>st</sup> person subject agreement on future cleft residues, as shown with intransitive (30) and transitive examples

<sup>36</sup> Lai (1998) discusses pronominal agreement on non-future sentences with fronted independent pronouns, however it is unclear whether their data are examples of clefts, or cases of unmarked fronting, since clefting determiners are absent in their data, possibly because determiners regularly reduce for speakers in Skeetchestn and other southern micro-dialects.

<sup>37</sup> Exceptions include simple noun residues, for which 1<sup>st</sup> person subject agreement is absent, at least for some fluent speakers. Compare *incá i? səx<sup>w</sup>má?máya?m* ‘I’m the teacher’ (Lottie Lindley, 11/20/10, 6722) with *\*incá i? ylmíx<sup>w</sup>əm* ‘I am the chief’ (Sarah McLeod, 10/27/11, 9096). Inter-speaker discrepancies, and variability in pronominal agreement, require further work.

with 1<sup>st</sup> person subjects and 2<sup>nd</sup> person objects (31a–b).<sup>38</sup> Among the Eskét speakers but less so among Skeetchestn speakers, there is a much stronger preference for 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement in non-future 1<sup>st</sup> person pronoun clefts with 2<sup>nd</sup> person objects (30c, 31c), however, interestingly, 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement is required with 3<sup>rd</sup> person objects (31d).<sup>39</sup>

- (30) a. re ntsétswe7 me7 qweqwlút. (CD: *better*) **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 me7 qweqwlúlt-ken. (CD: *good*)  
**re ntsétswe7** me7 qweqwlú(ł)t(-ken)  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP FUT speak.1RDP(-1SG.SUB)  
 ‘I’m the one that will speak.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)
- b. re ntsétswe7 me7 tskwnéłk. (CD: *good*) **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 me7 tskwnéłk-ken. (CD: *good*)  
**re ntsétswe7** me7 tskwné(ł)łk(-ken)  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP FUT drive.1RDP(-1SG.SUB)  
 ‘I’ll be the one to drive.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/14/21)
- c. re ntsétswe7 le qweqwlút. **Secwepemctsin**  
**re ntsétswe7** le qweqwlút  
 DET 1SG.INDEP DET.ABS speak  
 ‘I’m the one that spoke.’  
 (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/6/21)
- (31) a. re ntsétswe7 me7 tsúntss. (CD: *better*) **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 me7 tsúntsen. (CD: *okay*)  
**re ntsétswe7** me7 tsún-t-s-s/-n  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP FUT say-DIR-2SG.OBJ-3ERG/-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I’m the one that will tell you.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/14/21)
- b. re ntsétswe7 me7 knúcwentss. (CD: *okay*) **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 me7 knúcwentsen. (CD: *okay*)  
**re ntsétswe7** me7 knúcw-n[t]-ts-s/-n  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP FUT say-DIR-2SG.OBJ-3ERG/-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I’m the one that will help you.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/14/21)

<sup>38</sup> Data such as the following confirm that subjunctive marking is not possible in these cases: \**re ntsétswe7 le tsúntsenes* ‘I’m the one who told you’ (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 6/16/21).

<sup>39</sup> See also *yen lu7 re ntsétswe7 le tsúntsen?* ‘Was it me that told you?’ (Cecilia DeRose, \*Bridget Dan 7/21/21), vs. *yen lu7 re ntsétswe7 le tsúntss?* ‘Was it me that told you?’ (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/21/21). It is also important to note that Gardiner (1993:91–92) gives examples showing that in Skeetchestn at least, 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement is perfectly fine in non future clefts, contra (31c): *re ntsétswe ri7 re wíwktsen* ‘I’m the one that saw you,’ as is 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement *re7 newi7 ri7 re wíwktsemc* ‘You’re the one that saw me.’ Whether this discrepancy represents a dialect distinction remains unclear.

- c. re ntsétswe7 le tsúntss. Secwepemctsin  
 \*re ntsétswe7 le tsúntsen.  
**re ntsétswe7** le tsún-t-s-s/\*-n  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP DET.ABS say-DIR-2SG.OBJ-3ERG/-\*1SG.ERG  
 ‘I’m the one who told you.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 6/16/21)
- d. \*re ntsétswe7 lu7 le yegímens. Secwepemctsin  
 re ntsétswe7 lu7 le yegímen.  
**re ntsétswe7** lu7 le yegíg-m-[en]\*-s/-en  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP that.ABS DET.ABS tie.up(.1RDP)-APPL-DIR-\*3ERG/-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I was the one who tied it up.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21)

For Secwepemctsin, the non-future pattern indicates that 1<sup>st</sup> person subject agreement cannot occur with a 2<sup>nd</sup> person object. The future pattern is less robust, though trends in this direction.

Compare (31c) with cases of non-future unmarked fronting in Secwepemctsin, where the independent pronoun *does* co-occur with 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement. Notice, too, the absence of any clefting determiner before the verb. It is notable that similar examples in Lai (1998) lack determiners before both the independent pronoun and the verb, and display 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement (32b), although, as we noted above, among Skeetchestn speakers, determiners often delete, although in slow speech they are articulated.

- (32) a. re ntsétswe7 m-tsúntsen lu7. Secwepemctsin  
**re ntsétswe7** m-tsún-t-s-en lu7  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP PAST-say-DIR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG that.ABS  
 ‘I told you.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/16/21)
- b. ntsétswe7 wíwkten. Secwepemctsin  
**ntsétswe7** wíwk-t-en  
 1SG.INDEP.1RDP see.1RDP-DIR-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I saw him (you didn’t).’  
 (Lai 1998:316)

There is some inter-speaker variation where 3<sup>rd</sup> person objects are concerned:<sup>40</sup> In (33), Bridget Dan chooses 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement in an active 1<sup>st</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> sentence, while Cecilia DeRose instead treats the independent pronoun as a clefted passive agent (33b).

---

<sup>40</sup> Cecilia DeRose more consistently judges against 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement than Bridget Dan in these contexts, and in favour of treating the independent pronoun as a clefted passive agent. Gardiner (1993) finds a similar pattern in 3/3 WH-questions, where questioning a transitive subject requires passivization.

(33) a. re ntsétswe7 re m-wiwkten. Secwepemctsin  
**re ntsétswe7** re m-wiwk-t-en  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP DET PST-see.1RDP-DIR-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I was the one that saw them.’  
 (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/15/21)

b. re ntsétswe7 lu7 le wíktmes. Secwepemctsin  
**re ntsétswe7** lu7 le wíkt-m-es  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP that.ABS DET.ABS see-DIR-PASS-3SBJV  
 ‘I was the one that saw them.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 7/15/21)

Clefted 1<sup>st</sup> person independent pronouns may also reference transitive objects, contra Lai’s (1998) finding for Secwepemctsin that there is a subject restriction on independent pronouns, and contra Gardiner’s (1993) claim that focus positions were reserved for subjects except in the presence of a WH-word. In such cases, agreement on the residue predicate is 1<sup>st</sup> person in Nsyilxcn. In Secwepemctsin, the agreement pattern is the same as the transitive subject pattern described above: Either 1<sup>st</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> person object agreement is possible in future clefts (33b), however, 1<sup>st</sup> person object agreement is only possible in non-future clefts if the subject is 3<sup>rd</sup> person (33c–d).

(33) a. incá kn t sáma? i? k<sup>w</sup>u cq<sup>w</sup>əlq<sup>w</sup>ílsts. Nsyilxcn  
**incá** kn t sáma? i? k<sup>w</sup>u c-q<sup>w</sup>lq<sup>w</sup>íl-st-s  
 1SG.INDEP 1SG.SUB OBL white.person DET 1SG.OBJ CUST-speak-CAUS-3ERG  
 ‘I’m the white guy he was talking to.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 11/24/12, 12801)

b. re ntsétswe7 me7 knúcwenc. Secwepemctsin  
 re ntsétswe7 me7 knúncwentsemc.  
**re ntsétswe7** me7 knú(n)cw-nt-∅/-tsem-c  
 DET 1SG.INDEP FUT help-DIR-3OBJ/-1SG.OBJ-2SG.ERG  
 ‘I’m the one you’re gonna help.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21)  
*Comment: “Either way, same thing.”*

c. re ntsétswe7 lu7 le wiktc. Secwepemctsin  
 \*re ntsétswe7 lu7 le wiwktsemc.  
**re ntsétswe7** lu7 le wi(w)k-t-∅/-\*tsem-c  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP that.ABS DET.ABS see-DIR-3OBJ/-\*1SG.OBJ-2SG.ERG  
 ‘I was the one that you saw.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 4/14/21, 6/16/21)

d. re ntsétswe7 lu7 le knúcwens. (CD) Secwepemctsin  
 re ntsétswe7 le m-knúncwentsems. (BD)  
**re ntsétswe7** (lu7) le (m-)knú(n)cw-∅/-tsem-s  
 DET 1SG.INDEP that.ABS DET.ABS PST-help.1RDP-DIR-3OBJ/-1SG.OBJ-3ERG  
 ‘I was the one that they helped.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF, 7/15/21)

Thus, for Secwepemctsin non-future 1<sup>st</sup> person independent pronoun clefts, not only can 1<sup>st</sup> person subject agreement *not* co-occur with a 2<sup>nd</sup> person object (31), but 1<sup>st</sup> person object agreement cannot co-occur with a 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject (33). Again, the future pattern is less robust.

For clefted 2<sup>nd</sup> person independent pronouns in Nsyilxcn, agreement on the residue predicate is present for 2<sup>nd</sup> person for intransitive cases (34a,b), though 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject agreement is an option for transitive cases (compare 34c,d). Object agreement is (null) 3<sup>rd</sup> person (34e).<sup>41</sup>

- (34) a. *anwí mi kw qwəɫqwílt.* **Nsyilxcn**  
**anwí**     **mi**     **kw**             **qwəɫqwílt**  
 2SG.INDEP   FUT   2SG.SUB   speak  
 ‘You may/must speak now.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 4/24/09, 286)
- b. *anwí mi kw ylmíxwəm.* **Nsyilxcn**  
**anwí**     **mi**     **kw**             **ylmíxwəm**  
 2SG.INDEP   FUT   2SG.SUB   chief  
 ‘You will be the chief.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, Lottie Lindley, 3/4/12)
- c. *anwí i? kwu knxíts.* **Nsyilxcn**  
**anwí**     **i?**     **kwu**     **knxít-s**  
 2SG.INDEP   DET   1SG.OBJ   help.BEN-3ERG  
 ‘You’re the one who helped me.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 1/21/11, 7091)
- d. *anwí t sqəłtmíxw i? kwu knxítxw.* **Nsyilxcn**  
**anwí**     **t**     **sqəłtmíxw**   **i?**     **kwu**     **knxít-xw**  
 2SG.INDEP   OBL   man     DET   1SG.OBJ   help.BEN-2SG.ERG  
 ‘You’re the man who helped me.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 1/21/11, VF, 7097)
- e. *anwí kw t pǰpáǰt t ylmíxwəm a? cǰa?ǰa?stím.* **Nsyilxcn**  
**anwí**     **kw**     **t**     **pǰpáǰt**   **t**     **ylmíxwəm**  
 2SG.INDEP   2SG.SUB   OBL   smart     OBL   chief  
                   **a?**     **c-ǰa?ǰa?-st-ǰ-ím**  
                   DET     CUST-look.for-CAUS-3OBJ-1PL.ERG  
 ‘You’re the smart chief we’re looking for.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 9/23/11, 8534)

<sup>41</sup> In Upper Nicola Nsyilxcn, there is some inter-speaker variation with intransitive 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person independent pronoun clefts in cases where the residue predicate is a simple noun: Sarah McLeod requires agreement, while Lottie Lindley does not: *anwí i? ylmíxwəm* ‘You are the chief’ (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/20/10, 6719); *\*anwí i? ylmíxwəm* ‘You are the chief’ (Sarah McLeod, 10/27/11, 9088); *\*anwí i? səxwkwíłłxwəm* ‘You’re the carpenter.’ (Sarah McLeod, 10/27/11, 9091).



In Secwepemctsin, clefted 2<sup>nd</sup> person independent pronouns allow 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement in future clefts, as shown with intransitives (35a), transitive subjects (35b), and transitive objects (35c), with a slight preference for 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement.

- (35) a. re7 newí7 me7 kúkwpí7(-k). Secwepemctsin  
 re **7newí7** me7 kúkwpí7(-k)  
 DET 2SG.INDEP FUT chief(-2SG.SUB)  
 ‘You will be chief.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)  
 Comment: “re newí7 me7 kúkwpí7-k, if you really mean it.”
- b. re7 newí7 me7 knúncwentsemc. Secwepemctsin  
 re7 newí7 me7 knúncwentsemc.  
**re 7newí7** me7 knúncw-en-tsem-c/-s  
 DET 2SG.INDEP FUT help.1RDP-DIR-1SG.OBJ-2SG.ERG/-3ERG  
 ‘You’re the one who will helped me.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/15/21)
- c. re7 newí7 me7 knúncwen. (B, C: *Sounds better*) Secwepemctsin  
 re7 newí7 me7 knúncwentsen. (B, C: *okay*)  
**re 7newí7** me7 knúncw-nt- $\emptyset$ -/[t]s-n  
 DET 2SG.INDEP FUT help-DIR-3OBJ-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG  
 ‘You’re the one I will help.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21)

Surprisingly, 2<sup>nd</sup> person ergative agreement is *required* with 1<sup>st</sup> person objects in non-future clefts (36a,b), in stark contrast to the 1<sup>st</sup> person pattern shown above. Either 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> ergative person agreement is allowed for 3<sup>rd</sup> person objects (36c) and 2<sup>nd</sup> person object agreement appears required with 3<sup>rd</sup> person subjects (36d).

- (36) a. re7 newí7 lu7 le knúncwentsemc. Secwepemctsin  
 \*re7 newí7 lu7 le knúncwentsemc.  
**re 7newí7** lu7 le knúncw-en-tsem-c/-\*s  
 DET 2SG.INDEP that.ABS DET.ABS help.1RDP-DIR-1SG.OBJ-2SG.ERG/-\*3ERG  
 ‘You’re the one who helped me.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)
- b. re7 newí7 le qwelentsétsemc. Secwepemctsin  
 \*re7 newí7 le qwelentsétsemc.  
**re 7newí7** le qwel-en-tsétsem-c/-\*s  
 DET 2SG.INDEP DET.ABS speak-DIR-1SG.OBJ.1RDP-2SG.ERG/-\*3ERG  
 ‘You’re the one who told me.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

- c. re7 newí7 lu7 le yegímenc. Secwepemctsin  
 re7 newí7 lu7 le yegímens.  
**re 7newí7 lu7 le yegímen-c/-s**  
 DET 2SG.INDEP that.ABS DET.ABS tie.up.APPL-DIR-2.SG.ERG/-3ERG  
 ‘You were the one that tied it up.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/21/21)
- d. re newí7 lu7 re núxwenxw re qwelentsís. Secwepemctsin  
**re 7newí7 lu7 re núxwenxw re qwel-ent-s-ís**  
 DET 2SG.INDEP that.ABS DET woman DET speak-DIR-2SG.OBJ-3ERG  
 ‘You’re the one that the woman talked to.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 7/15/21)

In sum, several patterns seem emergent:

- Intransitive 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement is required in Nsyilxcn independent pronoun clefts, but is optional in Secwepemctsin.
- Secwepemctsin future clefts are more flexible in terms of their agreement patterns than non-future clefts.
- In Secwepemctsin, non-future cases with clefted 1<sup>st</sup> person independent pronouns *disallow* 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement to co-occur on a transitive verb.
- In Secwepemctsin, non-future cases with clefted 2<sup>nd</sup> person independent pronouns *require* 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement to co-occur on a transitive verb.

There is preliminary data indicating that clefted 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural independent pronouns in Secwepemctsin pattern analogously to 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular pronouns, however, more work is required here.<sup>42</sup> Table 2 below distills the pronominal agreement patterns discussed above for Secwepemctsin non-future clefts:

**Table 2:** Subject/Object Agreement Patterns in Secwepemctsin Non-Future Independent Pronoun Clefts

1 <sup>st</sup> person independent pronoun clefts	2 <sup>nd</sup> person independent pronoun clefts
*1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> → 1 <sup>st</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup>	*3 <sup>rd</sup> /1 <sup>st</sup> → 2 <sup>nd</sup> /1 <sup>st</sup>
*2 <sup>nd</sup> /1 <sup>st</sup> → 2 <sup>nd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup> ↔ 3 <sup>rd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup>
3 <sup>rd</sup> /1 <sup>st</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup>

Overall, these patterns suggest a kind of person hierarchy in Secwepemctsin (cf. Gardiner 1993), such that 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement is preferred to 2<sup>nd</sup> when a 1<sup>st</sup> person is emphasized, but 2<sup>nd</sup> agreement is preferred to 3<sup>rd</sup> when a 2<sup>nd</sup> person is emphasized.

These patterns also indicate possible structural differences between future and non-future clefts in Secwepemctsin, since future judgements are less robust than non-future judgements. Given that

<sup>42</sup> Compare for example the ungrammatical 1<sup>st</sup> person plural independent pronoun cleft with 1<sup>st</sup> person ergative agreement and a 2<sup>nd</sup> person object: \*wellnewí7s kucw lu7 le knucwentst. ‘We’re the ones that helped you (sg.)’ as opposed to the same cleft with 3<sup>rd</sup> person ergative agreement which was judged as being grammatical: wellnewí7s kucw lu7 le knucwentss.

*me7* takes the place of determiners in clefting contexts, and that *me7* occurs clause-initially in non-clefting contexts (see Section 3), there is no morpho-syntactic means of distinguishing clefted arguments from arguments which have been simply fronted in Secwepemctsin future contexts (as opposed to non-future 31a and 32, for example). While the presence vs. absence of agreement in these cases could indicate a cleft vs. non-cleft structure, the differences in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement patterns described above suggest that other factors are at play.

## 2.5 vP-related restrictions on future argument clefts

With argument clefts, a significant difference emerges between the two languages: with Upper Nicola Nsyilxcn *mi*, argument clefting is not generally possible if the residue predicate is a non-agentive noun, adjective, or verb. This makes argument *mi* clefts different from both non-future argument *i?* clefts in Nsyilxcn and Secwepemctsin argument *me7* clefts, where there is no such restriction. Assuming that intransitive *doers* are introduced at the vP level (see Tollan & Oxford 2017 for Algonquian), clefting *mi* seems to be dependent on vP.

First of all, the class of predicates which may not undergo argument clefting with *mi*, but may with *me7*, include individual level nouns and adjectives, as in (37–39).

- (37) a. \*ixí? mi yámǎwa?  
           \*ixí? mi yámǎwa?  
           that FUT cedar.bark.basket  
           ‘That will be a basket.’  
           (Sarah McLeod, 5/21/13, 14078) Nsyilxcn
- b. axá? i? yámǎwa?  
       axá? i? yámǎwa?  
       this DET cedar.bark.basket  
       ‘This is the basket.’  
       (Lottie Lindley, VF, 13798, 1/26/13) Nsyilxcn
- c. yeréy ri7 me7 miǎc.  
       yeréy ri7 me7 miǎc  
       that.VIS that.VIS FUT basket  
       ‘That will be a basket.’  
       (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/2/21) Secwepemctsin
- (38) a. \*axá? mi caǎ.  
           \*axá? mi caǎ  
           this FUT red  
           ‘This is gonna be red.’  
           (Sarah McLeod, 2/13/13, 13141) Nsyilxcn
- b. ixí? i? caǎ.  
       ixí? i? caǎ  
       that DET red  
       ‘It is red.’  
       (Lottie Lindley, VF, 7/24/10, 5202) Nsyilxcn

- c. ye7éne ri7 me7 tsiqw (ell ye7éne ri7 me7 qweyqwyít). **Secwepemctsin**  
 ye7éne ri7 me7 tsiqw (ell ye7éne ri7 me7 qweyqwyít)  
 this.VIS that.VIS FUT red CONJ this.VIS that.VIS FUT blue  
 ‘This is gonna be red (...and this one will be blue.)’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/2/21)

- (39) a. \*John mi tíq<sup>w</sup>əlq<sup>w</sup>. **Nsyilxcn**  
 \*John mi tíq<sup>w</sup>lq<sup>w</sup>  
 John FUT tall  
 ‘John will be tall.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 6/1/12, 11533)

- b. re John me7 ʔext. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re John me7 ʔext  
 DET John FUT tall  
 ‘John is gonna be tall.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/2/21)  
*Comment: “Okay, you wouldn’t say that very often, but okay.”*

Non-agentive, stage-level predicates may also not undergo argument-clefting with Nsyilxcn *mi* but may with Secwepemctsin *me7* (40–43).

- (40) a. \*iʔ tətwt mi ʔilx<sup>w</sup>t. **Nsyilxcn**  
 \*iʔ tətwt mi ʔilx<sup>w</sup>t  
 DET boy FUT hungry  
 ‘The boy will be hungry.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 3/4/12, 10972)

- b. #anwí mi k<sup>w</sup> ʔilx<sup>w</sup>t. **Nsyilxcn**  
 #anwí mi k<sup>w</sup> ʔilx<sup>w</sup>t  
 2SG.INDEP FUT 2SG.SUB hungry  
 ‘You get hungry!’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15601)

- c. re sqéqlemcw me7 teyt. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re sqéqlemcw me7 teyt  
 DET boy FUT hungry  
 ‘The boy will get hungry.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

- (41) a. \*John mi ʕimt. **Nsyilxcn**  
 \*John mi ʕimt  
 John FUT angry  
 ‘John will be mad.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, Lottie Lindley, 6/1/12. 11535)

- b. re John me7 geyép. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re John me7 gey-ép  
 DET John FUT angry-INCH  
 ‘John will get mad.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)
- (42) a. \*ixíʔ mi ǰilt. **Nsyilxcn**  
 \*ixíʔ mi ǰilt  
 that FUT sick  
 ‘He’s gonna get sick.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15584)
- b. yerí7 ri7 me7 k7ep. **Secwepemctsin**  
 yerí7 ri7 me7 k<7>ep  
 that.VIS that.VIS FUT sick<INCH>  
 ‘He/she will get sick.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)
- (43) a. #John mi ǰqʷáqʷ. **Nsyilxcn**  
 #John mi ǰqʷáqʷ  
 John FUT cry  
 ‘John is taking turns to cry.’ (VG)  
 (Sarah McLeod, 12/02/11, 9548)
- b. re John me7 tṣ7um. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re John me7 tṣ<7>um  
 DET John FUT cry<INCH>  
 ‘John will cry.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

In contrast, agentive intransitive predicates easily allow argument clefting with *mi* in Nsyilxcn.

- (44) a. Jerry mi ǰxʷup. **Nsyilxcn**  
 Jerry mi ǰxʷup  
 Jerry FUT win  
 ‘Jerry will win.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 5/21/13, 14189)
- b. John mi xʷuy. **Nsyilxcn**  
 John mi xʷuy  
 John FUT go  
 ‘John (is the one that) is going to go.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/20/13, 14314)

- c. anwí mi k<sup>w</sup> x<sup>w</sup>uy / pulx / yalt / q<sup>w</sup>əlq<sup>w</sup>ílt. **Nsyilxcn**  
 anwí mi k<sup>w</sup> x<sup>w</sup>uy / pulx / yalt / q<sup>w</sup>əlq<sup>w</sup>ílt  
 2SG.INDEP FUT 2SG.SUB go / camp / run / speak  
 ‘You are going to go / camp / run / speak.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15299/15553/15603/ Lottie Lindley, 4/24/09)  
 Comment: “YOU will run, you’re pointing at one.”

The reason behind this restriction in Nsyilxcn may be purely syntactic and could be related to the presence versus absence of a vP (or possibly Voice) projection. A secondary issue may be that argument *mi* clefts strongly imply contrastive focus, as indicated for example by Sarah’s comment in (44c), and by the given translations of (40b) and (43a), assuming that contrastive focus in sentences with non-agentive eventualities is for some reason pragmatically more marked. However, contrastive focus is clearly pragmatically compatible with non-agentivity in some cases (e.g., *This* will be red, and *that* will be blue). Syntax therefore seems to be the relevant issue here.

Nsyilxcn uses other strategies to give future readings of non-agentive predicates: non-cleft, clause-initial uses of *mi* (45a) (see Section 3), modal futures<sup>43</sup> (45b), or *ks-* prospectives (45c–e).

- (45) a. John ǰǰap mi ǰǰq<sup>w</sup>əlq<sup>w</sup>. **Nsyilxcn**  
 John ǰǰa-p mi ǰǰq<sup>w</sup>lq<sup>w</sup>  
 John grow-INCH FUT tall  
 ‘John will be tall when he grows up.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 6/1/12, 11534)
- b. cəm John ǰǰq<sup>w</sup>əlq<sup>w</sup>. **Nsyilxcn**  
 cəm John ǰǰq<sup>w</sup>lq<sup>w</sup>  
 EPIS John tall  
 ‘Maybe John will be tall.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15241)
- c. ixí? ksq<sup>w</sup>Ʒaymíxa?x. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixí? ks-q<sup>w</sup>Ʒay-míxa?x  
 that PROS-blue-INTR  
 ‘That will be blue.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/22/10, 6611)
- d. ksǰíltax. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ks-ǰílt-a?x  
 PROS-sick-INTR  
 ‘He’s gonna get sick.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15582)

<sup>43</sup> In Secwepemctsin, an epistemic modal like *héqen* is not sufficient to induce a future reading, *me7* is also required: *héqen me7 ǰǰǰ re John* ‘Maybe John will be tall’ versus *héqen ǰǰǰ re John* ‘Maybe John is tall.’ (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 6/16/21). This implies that *héqen*, unlike Nsyilxcn *cəm*, is not future-oriented, and also supports the analysis of *me7* as an actual T(ense) marker, as opposed to *mi* which adjoins to a null anaphoric tense (Lyon 2020). See N. Mattina (1999:217) for additional examples of modal futures.

- e. John ksc̣qʷáqʷaʔx. Nsyilxcn  
 John ks-čqʷáqʷ-aʔx  
 John PROS-cry-INTR  
 ‘John is going to cry.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 12/2/11, 9549)

Nominal predicates, which are typically non-agentive, may be clefted with *mi* if irrealis *kl-* is prefixed to the nominal predicate (46a,b).<sup>44</sup> There is no such prefix in Secwepemctsin, and so predictably, bare nominal predicates are fine in parallel contexts (23c).

- (46) a. axáʔ mat mi klyámǰʷaʔ. Nsyilxcn  
 axáʔ mat mi kl-yámǰʷaʔ  
 this EVID FUT IRR.N-basket  
 ‘Maybe this will be the basket.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 3/8/13, 13517)

- b. ixíʔ mi ksc̣əlčál. Nsyilxcn  
 ixíʔ mi k[ɬ]-s-čəl-čál  
 that FUT IRR.N-NMLZ-PL.RDP-stand  
 ‘These will be trees.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 5/10/13, 14161)  
*Context: Pointing at young sprouts in the ground.*

- c. yerí7 ri7 me7 tseqtsqéllp. Secwepemctsin  
 yerí7 ri7 me7 tseq-tsqéllp  
 that.VIS that.VIS FUT PL.RDP-tree  
 ‘These will be (fir) trees.’  
*Context: Pointing at young sprouts in the ground.*  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 6/16/21)

Interestingly, Nsyilxcn de-verbal nouns may be created by nominalization with occupational *səxʷ-* and these allow argument clefting with *mi*, perhaps because despite being nouns, they are agentive.

- (47) a. iʔ tətʷít mi səxʷpíǰəm. Nsyilxcn  
 iʔ ttʷít mi sxʷ-píǰəm  
 DET boy FUT OCC-hunt  
 ‘The little boy will be a hunter (when he grows up).’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 3/8/13, 13359)

---

<sup>44</sup> In Nsyilxcn, *mi* may be replaced with determiner *iʔ* in these cases, with no apparent change in meaning. Compare for example *mat cmay axáʔ iʔ klyámǰʷaʔ* ‘Maybe this will be the basket.’ (Sarah McLeod, VF, 13516, 3/8/13) with (46a).

- b. John mi səx<sup>w</sup>má?máya?m. Nsyilxcn  
 John mi sx<sup>w</sup>-má?máya?m  
 John FUT OCC-teach  
 ‘John is going to be a teacher.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 2/18/13, 13188)
- c. re sqéqlemcw me7 scw-píxem e tuwít-es. Secwepemctsin  
 re sqéqlemcw me7 scw-píxem e tuwít-es  
 DET man.DIM.RDP FUT OCC-hunt IRR.C grow.up-3SBJV  
 ‘The little boy will be hunter when he grows up.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

Both languages disallow future argument clefts if the referent of the focus already satisfies the property expressed by the nominal residue (48), which is evidence that *mi* and *me7* structures cannot be interpreted as truncated clefts, and confirmation that post-*mi* and post-*me7* material constitutes the residue.<sup>45</sup> Examples like (49) are discussed in more detail in Section 2.7.

- (48) a. \*axá? mi pəptwinax<sup>w</sup>. Nsyilxcn  
 \*axá? mi pəptwinax<sup>w</sup>  
 this FUT old.woman  
 ‘That’s going to be the old lady (that speaks).’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 2/18/13, 13134)
- b. \*yeréy ri7 me7 kyéy7e. Secwepemctsin  
 \*yeréy ri7 me7 kyéy7e  
 this.VIS that.VIS FUT old.woman  
 ‘That will be the old lady (that speaks).’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan)
- (49) a. axá? i? pəptwínax<sup>w</sup> mi q<sup>w</sup>elq<sup>w</sup>ilt. Nsyilxcn  
 axá? i? pəptwínax<sup>w</sup> mi q<sup>w</sup>lq<sup>w</sup>ilt  
 this DET old.woman FUT speak  
 ‘That’s going to be the old lady that will speak.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15216)
- b. yeréy ri7 te kyéy7e me7 qweqwlút. Secwepemctsin  
 yeréy ri7 te kyéy7e me7 qweqwlút  
 this.VIS that.VIS OBL old.woman FUT speak  
 ‘That’s the old lady who will speak.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan)

Overall, the data suggest that agentivity is important for Nsyilxcn *mi* argument clefting, however, the role of contrastive focus, and possible interactions with the syntax of agentivity, remain elusive.

<sup>45</sup> This is in contrast to non-future cases like *axá? t nǰ<sup>w</sup>ícula?x<sup>w</sup>tən* ‘This is the land.’ (Sarah McLeod, 13392, 03/08/13) and *ixí? t pəptwinax<sup>w</sup>*. ‘That’s the old lady.’ (Lottie Lindley, VF, 9269, 12/02/11) which are analyzable as truncated clefts (see also Lyon 2013).



## 2.6 Negation and subject position in *mi* and *me7* clefts

In Upper Nicola Nsyilxcn, negation cannot co-occur with *mi* in its clefting role. This applies to both argument (50) and adjunct (51) clefts. Future negatives are instead realized by other means, such as prospective nominalizations (52). (Note that the combination *mi lut* is possible in clause-linking uses of *mi*, to be discussed in Section 3.)

- (50) a. axá? mi k<sup>w</sup>intx<sup>w</sup>. Nsyilxcn  
 axá? **mi** k<sup>w</sup>in-[n]t-x<sup>w</sup>  
 this FUT take-DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘You take this one.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15304)
- b. \*axá? mi lut k<sup>w</sup>intx<sup>w</sup>. Nsyilxcn  
 \*axá? **mi lut** k<sup>w</sup>in-[n]t-x<sup>w</sup>  
 this FUT NEG take-DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘You shouldn’t take this one.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15307)
- c. \*lut axá? mi k<sup>w</sup>intx<sup>w</sup>. Nsyilxcn  
 \***lut** axá? **mi** k<sup>w</sup>in-[n]t-x<sup>w</sup>  
 NEG this FUT take-DIR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘You shouldn’t take this one.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15306)
- (51) a. iklí? mi x<sup>w</sup>uy. Nsyilxcn  
 iklí? **mi** x<sup>w</sup>uy  
 to.there FUT go  
 ‘He’ll go that way.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 10/17/15, 14926)
- b. \*iklí? mi lut x<sup>w</sup>uy. Nsyilxcn  
 \*iklí? **mi lut** x<sup>w</sup>uy  
 to.there FUT NEG go  
 ‘He won’t go that way.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 10/17/15, 14928)
- (52) a. lut axá? t̄ aksk<sup>w</sup>ním. Nsyilxcn  
 lut axá? t̄ a-ks-k<sup>w</sup>n-ím  
 NEG this NEG.EMPH 2SG.POSS-PROS.NMLZ-take-MID  
 ‘Don’t take this one.’ (VG)  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15311)

- b. lut iklíʔ aksx<sup>w</sup>úy. Nsyilxcn  
 lut iklíʔ a[n]-ks-x<sup>w</sup>úy  
 NEG to.there 2SG.POSS-PROS.NMLZ-go  
 ‘Don’t go over there.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 10410)

In Secwepemctsin *me7* clefts, there is no such incompatibility between negation and *me7*, as shown in (53) and (54).<sup>46</sup>

- (53) a. héqen ye7éne me7 kwenc. Secwepemctsin  
 héqen ye7éne me7 kwen-c  
 maybe this.VIS FUT take-[DIR]-2SG.ERG  
 ‘Maybe you should take this one.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF)
- b. \*ye7éne me7 tá7 k skwenc. Secwepemctsin  
 \*ye7éne me7 tá7 k s-kwen-c  
 this.VIS FUT NEG DET.IRR NMLZ-take-[DIR]-2SG.ERG  
 ‘You shouldn’t take this one.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)
- c. héqen ye7éne ta7 me7 skwenc. Secwepemctsin  
 héqen ye7éne ta7 me7 s-kwen-c  
 maybe this.VIS NEG FUT NMLZ-take-[DIR]-2SG.ERG  
 ‘Maybe you shouldn’t take this one.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)
- d. ta7 ye7éne me7 skwenc. Secwepemctsin  
 ta7 ye7éne me7 s-kwen-c  
 NEG this.VIS FUT NMLZ-take-[DIR]-2SG.ERG  
 ‘Don’t take this one.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)
- (54) a. tel7éne me7 qwetsétses. Secwepemctsin  
 tel7éne me7 qwetséts-es  
 from.here FUT leave-3SBJV  
 ‘From here he will leave.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/21/21)
- b. \*tel7éne me7 ta7 k sqwetsétss. Secwepemctsin  
 \*tel7éne me7 ta7 k sqwetséts-s  
 from.here FUT NEG DET.IRR [NMLZ]-leave-3POSS  
 ‘He won’t go that way.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)

<sup>46</sup> Note that the linear order of negation and future *me7* is reversed from the Nsyilxcn order seen in non-cleft uses, to be discussed in Section 3. Hence (53b) and (54b) are ungrammatical.

- c. ta7 tri7 tel7éne me7 sqwetsétss. Secwepemctsin  
 ta7 tri7 tel7éne me7 sqwetséts-s  
 NEG to.there.VIS from.here.VIS FUT [NMLZ]-leave-3POSS  
 ‘He won’t go this way.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF)

Adjunct clefts in both languages allow some flexibility in the position of a DP subject. Subjects can occur for example directly before *mi* or *me7* (a cases below). Nsyilxcn permits a subject to precede a clefted adjunct in an external topic position (Gardiner 1993), whereas Secwepemctsin does not, at least in the Esket dialect (b cases).<sup>47</sup> Both languages permit the subject to occur inside the residue clause in a post-verbal position (c cases), but they cannot directly follow *mi* or *me7* (d cases).<sup>48</sup>

- (55) a. ḵlap **Alice** mi x<sup>w</sup>uy kl səx<sup>w</sup>marím. Nsyilxcn  
 ḵlap Alice mi x<sup>w</sup>uy kl sx<sup>w</sup>-marím  
 tomorrow Alice FUT go to OCC-medicine  
 ‘Alice is going to the doctor tomorrow.’

- b. **Alice** ḵlap [mi x<sup>w</sup>uy kl sx<sup>w</sup>marím]. Nsyilxcn  
 c. ḵlap [mi x<sup>w</sup>uy **Alice** kl sx<sup>w</sup>marím]. Nsyilxcn  
 d. \*ḵlap [mi **Alice** x<sup>w</sup>uy kl səx<sup>w</sup>marím]. Nsyilxcn  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15192/15193/15172/\*15173)

- (56) a. e pexyéwtes **re Alice** me7 néses te tákte.<sup>49</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 e pexyéwt-es re Alice me7 nés-es te tákte  
 IRR.C next.day-3SBJV DET Alice FUT go-3SBJV to doctor  
 ‘Alice is going to the doctor tomorrow.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/21/21)  
*Comment: “I suppose.”*

- b. \***re Alice** e pexyéwtes me7 néses te tákte. Secwepemctsin  
 c. e pexyéwtes me7 nés(es) **re Alice** te tákte. Secwepemctsin  
 d. \*e pexyéwtes me7 **Alice** néses te tákte. Secwepemctsin  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21)

<sup>47</sup>Assuming that *Alice* is in an external topic position in (55b, 56b) (Gardiner 1993; Lai 1998), the ungrammaticality of (56b) may be evidence for a dialect distinction, since Gardiner (1993:126) cites parallel examples as grammatical for Skeetchestn speakers: *re skwimémelt le pexyéwtes lu7 m-7illenses* ‘The child, it was yesterday that he ate (the berries).’ Even setting up a sentence which involves a topic shift does not improve (56b) for Bridget and Cecilia: \**me7 néns-ken te tákte pyin te sitqt, ell re Alice e pexyéwtes me7 néses te tákte* ‘I’m going to the doctor today, and Alice, tomorrow she is going to the doctor’ (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21), was instead corrected to *me7 néns-ken te tákte pyin te sitqt, ell re Alice me7 nés te tákte e pexyéwtes* (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21).

<sup>48</sup>In (56d), the expectation is that *me7*, as usual, should take the place of the determiner in *re Alice*.

<sup>49</sup>An argument clefted-version of this sentence would be *re Alice me7 nes te tákte e pexyéwtes*. (C, B, 7/14)

Given that both subjects and negation easily occur initially in main clauses in both languages, the absence of both directly following *mi* and *me7* has important structural implications for the residue clauses. Secwepemctsin and Nsyilxcn differ in that Nsyilxcn (Upper Nicola at least) never allows negative *lut* and *mi* to co-occur in cleft contexts, opting instead for negative prospectives, while Secwepemctsin, perhaps predictably, does allow their co-occurrence.

## 2.7 Argument clefts, oblique marking, and focus effects

Contrastive focus is strongly implied by argument focus using *mi* in Nsyilxcn. For example, examples like (57a) are often judged infelicitous without an appropriate focus set (57c) and are instead changed by fluent speakers to a prospective *ks-* structure where an initial subject does not imply contrastive focus, such as in out-of-the-blue contexts (57b).

- (57) a. # iʔ kəkəwáp mi siwstx. Nsyilxcn  
 # iʔ kəkəwáp mi siwst-x  
 DET dog FUT drink-INTR  
 ‘The dog is going to drink.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15459)
- b. iʔ kəkəwáp kssiwstaʔx. Nsyilxcn  
 iʔ kəkəwáp ks-síwst-aʔx  
 DET dog PROS-drink-INTR  
 ‘The dog is going to drink.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15460)
- c. iʔ kəkəwáp mi siwst... lut anwí k<sup>w</sup> siwst! Nsyilxcn  
 iʔ kəkəwáp mi siwst-[x]... lut anwí k<sup>w</sup> siwst-[x]  
 DET dog FUT drink-INTR NEG 2SG.INDEP 2SG.SUB drink-INTR  
 ‘The DOG is going to drink, don’t drink!’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15461)

In Secwepemctsin, since *me7* is the only option for future, parallel structures are not generally judged infelicitous for lack of an appropriate focus set.

A sub-class of argument clefts (see Section 2.2 above) involve demonstrative-headed or independent-pronoun-headed oblique nominals in focus position. These may be thought of as sub-cases of the simple demonstrative and independent pronoun argument focus clefts but with an additional nominal restriction. Their status as a sub-class of argument cleft is consistent with the absence of subjunctive marking in these cases for Secwepemctsin.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Given that cases like (58) are a type of argument cleft, exactly how a DP structure projects for the focus constituent is unclear, since neither demonstratives nor independent pronouns are themselves determiners, nor is the oblique marker *t*. At the same time, demonstrative-oblique-noun sequences are functionally and distributionally equivalent to other DPs, in both cleft and non-cleft contexts (see Lyon 2013 for Nsyilxcn). It is worthwhile considering, however, that independent pronoun-oblique-noun sequences (as in 59) do not have typical DP distributions, and this fact should in turn also have structural implications for the demonstrative examples in (58).

In all such cases, the demonstrative indicates a contrastive focus, and the oblique-marked nominal delimits the focus set. In (58a) for example, *horses* constitute the focus set, not a larger set including horses and other animals or entities, and the demonstrative points to one salient member of that set.

- (58) a. ixí? t sənkl̩caʔsqáχaʔ mi λ̩x<sup>w</sup>up. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixí? t snkl̩caʔsqáχaʔ mi λ̩x<sup>w</sup>up  
 that OBL horse FUT win  
 ‘That’s the horse that will win.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 3/18/13, 13448)
- b. yerí7 rey te nt̩se7sqéxe me7 t̩cum. **Secwepemctsin**  
 yerí7 yeréy te nt̩se7sqéxe me7 t̩cum  
 that.VIS that.VIS OBL horse FUT win  
 ‘That’s the horse that will win.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)
- c. axá? t yámχ<sup>w</sup>aʔ mi k̩<sup>w</sup>úl̩ən. **Nsyilxcn**  
 axá? t yámχ<sup>w</sup>aʔ mi k̩<sup>w</sup>úl̩-n  
 this OBL basket FUT make-[TR]-1SG.ERG  
 ‘THIS is the basket I’m going to make.’  
*Context: Looking through a catalogue at designs...*  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/20/13, 14275)
- d. ixí? t nχ<sup>w</sup>ículáʔx<sup>w</sup>t̩ən mi nyak<sup>w</sup>mín. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixí? t nχ<sup>w</sup>ículáʔx<sup>w</sup>t̩ən mi n-yak<sup>w</sup>-mí-n  
 that OBL field FUT LOC-cross.over-APPL-1SG.ERG  
 ‘That’s the field I’m gonna cross.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 1/25/13, 13880)
- e. yerí7 te cucwéll me7 cteq̩emém̩ews̩en. **Secwepemctsin**  
 yerí7 te cucwéll me7 c-teq̩-emém̩-ews-en  
 that.VIS OBL road.DIM.RDP FUT LOC-cross.over-MID.1SG.RDP-middle-DIR+1SG.ERG  
 ‘That’s the road I’m gonna cross.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

Parallel structures are also possible in Nsyilxcn with independent pronouns in focus positions rather than demonstratives, however, these were judged ungrammatical in Secwepemctsin (see however minimal sentences below where Secwepemctsin determiner *re* may substitute for *te* in these cases).

- (59) a. anwí t sq̩ltmíx<sup>w</sup> mi k<sup>w</sup> ylmíx<sup>w</sup>əm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 anwí t sq̩ltmíx<sup>w</sup> mi k<sup>w</sup> ylmíx<sup>w</sup>m  
 2SG.INDEP OBL man FUT 2SG.SUB chief  
 ‘You’re the man that will be the chief.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 9/22/11, 8310)

- b. \*re ntsétswe7 te lleq̄mélten ec me7 tsqwelstéses re stsmémelt. **Secwepemctsin**  
 \*re ntsétswe7 te lleq̄mélten ec me7  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP OBL teacher IPFV FUT  
 ts-qwel-st-és-es re stsmémelt  
 CUST-speak-CAUS-3ERG-3SBJV DET children  
 ‘I’m the teacher who will talk to the kids.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

These contrastive focus constructions have parallel, non-future argument clefts in both languages.

- (60) a. ixí? t sənkl̄ca?sqáǰa? i? ǰxwup. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixí? t snkl̄ca?sqáǰa? i? ǰxwup  
 that OBL horse DET win  
 ‘That’s the horse that won.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 1/21/11, 7250)

- b. yerí7 ri7 te ntse7sqéxe re ǰcum (lu7.) **Secwepemctsin**  
 yerí7 ri7 te ntse7sqéxe re ǰcum (lu7)  
 that.VIS that.VIS OBL horse DET win that.ABS  
 ‘That’s the horse that won.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)

- c. anwi t tk̄milxw i? kw sysyus. **Nsyilxcn**  
 anwi t tk̄milxw i? kw sysyus  
 2SG.INDEP OBL woman DET 2SG.SUB energetic  
 ‘You are the woman that’s energetic.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 3/04/12, 10687)

Nsyilxcn (58–60) contrast minimally with similar sentences where the nominal is introduced with an *i?* determiner rather than oblique *t* (61–63). In these cases, contrastive focus on the *i?* nominal becomes possible. The demonstrative in these cases is, at least ambiguously, non-deictic as well as optional.

- (61) a. ixí? i? st̄malt i? náq̄wəms Ben, lut i? sənkl̄ca?sqáǰa?. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixí? i? st̄malt i? náq̄w-m-s Ben lut i? snkl̄ca?sqáǰa?  
 that DET cow DET steal-MID-[DIR]-3ERG Ben NEG DET horse  
 ‘It’s a *cow* that Ben stole, not a horse.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 3/8/13, 13407)

- b. #ixí? t st̄malt i? náq̄wəms Ben, lut i? sənkl̄ca?sqáǰa?. **Nsyilxcn**  
 #ixí? t st̄malt i? náq̄w-m-s Ben lut i? snkl̄ca?sqáǰa?  
 that OBL cow DET steal-MID-[DIR]-3ERG Ben NEG DET horse  
 ‘*That*’s the cow that Ben stole, not a horse.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 3/8/13, 13408)

- (62) a. axá? i? yámǎʷa? mi xʷuystəm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 axá? **i?** yámǎʷa? mi xʷuy-st-m  
 this DET basket FUT go-CAUS-1PL.ERG  
 ‘It’s the *basket* we’re taking. (not) *This* is the basket we’ll take.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 2/16/13, 13510)
- b. axá? t yámǎʷa? mi xʷuystəm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 axá? **t** yámǎʷa? mi xʷuy-st-m  
 this OBL basket FUT go-CAUS-1PL.ERG  
 ‘*This* is the basket we’ll take.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 2/16/13, 13511)
- (63) a. #ixí? i? nǎʷíçulaʔxʷtən mi nyakʷmín. **Nsyilxcn**  
 #ixí? **i?** n-ǎʷíç-ulaʔxʷ-tn mi n-yakʷ-mí-n  
 that DET LOC-cut-ground-INS FUT LOC-cross.over-APPL-1SG.ERG  
 ‘That’s the hay field I’m gonna cross.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 1/25/13, 13879)
- b. ixí? t nǎʷíçuláʔxʷtən mi nyakʷmín. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ixí? **t** n-ǎʷíç-ulaʔxʷ-tn mi n-yakʷ-mí-n  
 that OBL LOC-cut-ground-INST FUT LOC-cross.over-APPL-1SG.ERG  
 ‘That’s the field I’m gonna cross.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 1/25/13, 13880)

Parallel structures in Secwepemctsin function analogously. For determiner-headed variants in both languages, the initial demonstratives are typically non-deictic, and optional, as in (64–65).

- (64) a. yerí7 re Hannah re m-tsecentés re nexúlecw, ta7 k syecs re Tson. **Secwepemctsin**  
 yerí7 **re** Hannah re m-tsec-nt-és re nexúlecw  
 that.VIS DET Hannah DET PAST-fix-DIR-3ERG DET car  
 ta7 k s-yec-s re Tson  
 NEG DET.IRR NMLZ-be.the.one-3POSS DET John  
 ‘It’s Hannah that fixed the car, not John.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose)
- b. #yerí7 **te** Hannah re m-tsecentés re nexúlecw, ta7 k syecs re Tson. **Secwepemctsin**  
*Comment: “Maybe if there was two Hannahs. That’s the Hannah that fixed the car...”*  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose)
- (65) (yerí7) re nexúlecw lu7 re tsecentés re Hannah, ta7 k syecs re selcén. **Secwepemctsin**  
 (yerí7) **re** nexúlecw lu7 re tsec-nt-és re Hannah  
 that.VIS DET car that.ABS DET fix-DIR-3ERG DET Hannah  
 ta7 k s-yec-s re selcén.  
 DET DET.IRR NMLZ-be.the.one-3POSS DET bicycle  
 ‘It’s the car Hannah fixed, not the bicycle.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)

While oblique *t/te* removes the possibility of a focused nominal, replacing them with determiners does not always remove the possibility of a focused demonstrative, as can be seen by comparing (66a) and (66b), though in these cases it is likely that the entire demonstrative *i?* nominal string is in focus, as illustrated in the secondary translations (see Lyon 2013 for Nsyilxcn).

- (66) a. *ixi?* *i?* *sqəłtmix<sup>w</sup>* *i?* *k<sup>w</sup>u* *wiks*, *lut* *i?* *pəptwínax<sup>w</sup>*. **Nsyilxcn**  
*ixi?* *i?* *sqəłtmix<sup>w</sup>* *i?* *k<sup>w</sup>u* *wik-s* *lut* *i?* *pəptwínax<sup>w</sup>*  
 that DET man DET 1SG.OBJ see-[DIR]-3ERG NEG DET old.woman  
 ‘It’s the *man* who saw me, not the old woman.’  
 ‘*That man* is the one who saw me, not the old woman.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 8/23/13, 14509)
- b. *axá?* *i?* *spícən* *i?* *níkən*, *lut* *ya?ǰís*. **Nsyilxcn**  
*axá?* *i?* *spícən* *i?* *ník-n* *lut* *ya?ǰís*  
 this DET rope DET cut-[DIR]-1SG.ERG NEG that.one  
 ‘*This* is the rope that I cut, not that one.’  
 ‘*This rope* is the one that I cut, not that one.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 1/26/13, 13947)
- c. *yerí7* *lu7* *re* *sqéqlemcw* *le* *wikt.s* *re* *smúwe7*. **Secwepemctsin**  
*yerí7* *lu7* *re* *sqéqlemcw* *le* *wik-t-s* *re* *smúwe7*  
 that.VIS that.ABS DET man.DIM.RDP DET.ABS see-DIR-3ERG DET cougar  
 ‘*That’s* the boy who saw the cougar.’  
*Comment: “Either way, or yerí7 lu7 te sqéqlemcw le wikt.s re smúwe7.”*  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose)

Similar data are possible with independent pronouns in both languages (67) (though as shown above, Secwepemctsin may only allow determiner *re* in these cases, not oblique *te*).

- (67) a. *incá* *i?* *sqəłtmíx<sup>w</sup>* *i?* *kn* *ksq<sup>w</sup>əñq<sup>w</sup>əntmíxa?x*. **Nsyilxcn**  
*incá* *i?* *sqəłtmíx<sup>w</sup>* *i?* *kn* *ks-q<sup>w</sup>əñq<sup>w</sup>ənt-míxa?x*  
 1SG.INDEP DET man DET 1SG.SUB PROS-poor-INTR  
 ‘I’m the man that’s gonna be poor.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 9/22/11, 8567)
- b. *re* *ntsétswe7* *re* *lleqməłten* *ec* *me7* *tsqwelstéses* *re* *stsmémelt*. **Secwepemctsin**  
*re* *ntsétswe7* *re* *lleqməłten* *ec* *me7*  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP DET teacher IPFV FUT  
*ts-qwel-st-és-es* *re* *stsmémel*  
 CUST-speak-CAUS-3ERG-3SBJV DET children  
 ‘I’m the teacher that will talk to the kids.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)



- c. re ntsétswe7 re lleq̣mélten ec re tsqwelstéses re stsmémelt. **Secwepemctsin**  
 re ntsétswe7 re lleq̣mélten ec re  
 DET 1SG.INDEP.1RDP DET teacher IPFV DET  
 ts-qwel-st-és-es re stsmémelt  
 CUST-speak-CAUS-3ERG-3SBJV DET children  
 ‘I’m the teacher who talked to the kids.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

This concludes our survey of clefting uses of *mi* and *me7*. We now turn to clause-initial uses.

### 3 Clause-initial uses of *mi* and *me7*

For clause-initial uses of *mi* and *me7*, any material which precedes *mi* and *me7* must be construed as propositional. If no material precedes *mi* or *me7*, the condition is vacuously satisfied. This contrasts with clefting uses of *mi* and *me7*, where preceding material may not be construed as propositional. In this section, we make an additional distinction between:

- (i) *mono*-clause-initial uses of *mi* and *me7* (Section 3.1)  
 (ii) clause-initial uses where *mi* and *me7* link two clauses together (Section 3.2)

This distinction is motivated for Nsyilxcn because mono-clause-initial structures are often rejected in favour of a *ks*-prospective form, or else interpreted as incomplete instances of clausal-linking. This distinction is motivated for Secwepemctsin because mono-clause-initial uses do not involve subjunctive marking, whereas linking uses typically do. Nsyilxcn *mi* is more restricted as a clause-introducer for reasons which will be discussed.

#### 3.1 Mono-clause initial uses of *mi* and *me7*

Secwepemctsin *me7* commonly occurs at the beginning of a mono-clause inflected with indicative, main-clause pronominal morphology. For Secwepemctsin, these are the most straightforward way to express a future proposition (68a–e). 2<sup>nd</sup> person forms tend to have imperative force.

- (68) a. me7 nens-ken te ctuméllcw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 nens-ken te ctuméllcw  
 FUT go-1SG.SUB OBL store  
 ‘I will go to the store.’
- b. me7 qwetséts. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 qwetséts  
 FUT leave  
 ‘He will depart.’  
 (Kuipers 1974:80)

- c. me7 penmínc yerí7. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 pen-mín-c yerí7  
 FUT find-APPL-2SG.ERG that.VIS  
 ‘You will find it.’  
 (Garlene Dodson)
- d. me7 tétwen pexyéwt. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 tétw-en pexyéwt  
 FUT buy.1RDP-[DIR]-1SG.ERG tomorrow  
 ‘I will buy it tomorrow.’
- e. me7 elkʷenc ye7élye te stsqey. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 elkʷ-en-c ye7élye te stsqey  
 FUT store-DIR-2SG.ERG this.VIS OBL paper  
 ‘Put these papers away (pointing at *these* ones).’  
 (Garlene Dodson, Bridget Dan)

Negative versions of these constructions place negative *ta7* before the future *me7* and nominalize the predicate (69a,b).

- (69) a. ta7 me7 sqwetsétss. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ta7 me7 sqwetséts-s  
 NEG FUT [NMLZ]-leave-3POSS  
 ‘He won’t leave.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 7/14/21)
- b. ta7 me7 spenmínc. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ta7 me7 s-pen-mín-c  
 NEG FUT NMLZ-find-APPL.TR-2SG.ERG  
 ‘You won’t find it.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, 7/14/21)

For Nsyilxcn *mi*, these are far less common though still possible (70a–c). Many cases of mono-clause-initial *mi* initial structures are either (a) rejected or (b) interpreted as incomplete subordinate clauses. The preferred way of expressing future in an Nsyilxcn non-cleft mono-clause is to use a prospective *ks-* form (70d) (see also N. Mattina 1999:222).

- (70) a. mi kʷu xʷuy. **Nsyilxcn**  
 mi kʷu xʷuy  
 FUT 1PL.SUB go  
 ‘We’re going to go.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 9347, 12/02/11)

- b. mi k<sup>wu</sup> xitmíst. Nsyilxcn  
 mi k<sup>wu</sup> xit-míst  
 FUT 1PL.SUB run.PL-INTR.RFLX  
 ‘We’re gonna run.’ / ‘When we run...’  
 (SM, VF, 3/04/12, 10956)
- c. mi k<sup>wu</sup> cyaʃp. Nsyilxcn  
 mi k<sup>wu</sup> c-yaʃ-p  
 FUT 1PL.SUB CISL-gather-INCH  
 ‘We will arrive.’ / ‘When we come...’  
 (SM, VF, 3/04/12, 10955)
- d. k<sup>wu</sup> ksx<sup>wúyaʔx</sup>. Nsyilxcn  
 k<sup>wu</sup> ks-x<sup>wúyaʔx</sup>  
 1PL.SUB PROS-go-INTR  
 ‘We’re going to go.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 12354, 10/28/12)

Secwepemctsin *me7*-initial structures alternate easily with adjunct and argument (74) clefts (71–73 cf. Gardiner 1993:95–96). *me7*-initial mono-clauses do not employ subjunctive morphology. Based on the pattern of subject morphology and the fact that *me7* occurs initially, *me7* is not itself a marker of subordination.

- (71) a. me7 múmt-ken ne penkúpe. Secwepemctsin  
 me7 múmt-ken ne penkúpe  
 FUT live.1RDP-1SG.SUB at Vancouver  
 ‘I will live in Vancouver.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)
- b. ne penkúpe me7 múmtwen. Secwepemctsin  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)
- (72) a. me7 knúcwentsen e pexyéwtes. Secwepemctsin  
 me7 knúcw-ent-s-en e pexyéwt-es.  
 FUT help-DIR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG IRR.C next.day-3SBJV  
 ‘I will help you tomorrow.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)
- b. e pexyéwtes me7 knúcwentsenes.<sup>51</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 ‘I could help you.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/2/21)

---

<sup>51</sup> Indicative subject marking is ungrammatical for (71b): \**ne penkúpe me7 múmt-ken* ‘I will live in Vancouver.’ For (72b) and (73b) however, indicative (i.e., the absence of subjunctive) is possible under an analysis of the fronted adverbial clause as containing syntactically-active subjunctive marking. Hence (72b) has an alternative *e pexyéwtes me7 knúcwentsen* ‘I will help you.’ which was judged by Cecilia DeRose as

- (73) a. me7 ts̀pelq̀ilc-ekwe e nené̄nses. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 ts̀pelq̀ilc-ekwe e nené̄ns-es  
 FUT CISL-return-AUT-REP IRR.C later-3SBJV  
 ‘He will be back later.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)
- b. e nené̄nses me7 ts̀pelq̀ilcwes-ekwe. **Secwepemctsin**  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)
- (74) a. me7 qweqwentsín re q̀wé̄yelqs. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 qweqwentsín re q̀wé̄yelqs  
 FUT pray DET priest  
 ‘The priest will pray.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)
- b. re q̀wé̄yelqs me7 qweqwentsín. **Secwepemctsin**  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/9/21)

Nsyilxcn *mi* can also be used initially in mono-clauses with temporal or spatial adjuncts, and these also alternate with clefts (75–76).<sup>52</sup>

- (75) a. mi x̄w̄ic̄əxtəmən atlá? **Nsyilxcn**  
 mi x̄w̄ic̄-xt-m-n atlá?  
 FUT give-BEN-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG from.here  
 ‘I’ll give you some from this (container).’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 12/02/11, 9355)  
*Comment: “If somebody asks you a question, you explain what is and say I’ll get you some.”*
- b. atlá? mi x̄w̄ic̄əxtəmən. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ‘I’ll give you some from this (container).’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 11/06/09, 2776)
- (76) a. mi n̄ínw̄i?̄s kn ɬ̀plak̄. **Nsyilxcn**  
 mi n̄ínw̄i?̄s kn ɬ̀plak̄  
 FUT later 1SG.SUB return-come.back  
 ‘I’ll come back soon/sometime.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 10/17/15, 14871)

---

sounding “more definite” than (72b) itself. Similarly, (73b) alternates with *e nené̄nses me7 ts̀pelq̀ilc-ekwe*. Non-subjunctive variants of (72b) and (73b) may be analyzed as involving clause-initial uses of *me7*, with fronted (non-clefted) adverbials. For argument cleft (74b), subjunctive marking is ungrammatical: *\*re q̀wé̄yelqs me7 qweqwentsines*.

<sup>52</sup> It is unclear whether such alternations exist for argument clefts.

- b. níńwíʔs mi kn łplák. Nsyilxcn  
 ‘I’ll come back soon/sometime.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 10/17/15, 14872)

We now turn to linking uses of *mi* and *me7*.

### 3.2 Linking clause-initial uses of *mi* and *me7*

Linking uses of *mi* and *me7* most notably include future conditional statements (§3.2.1) and event sequencing (§3.2.2).

#### 3.2.1 Future conditionals

Future *mi* and *me7* often signal the consequent of a conditional clause. The antecedent clause is usually introduced by Nsyilxcn complementizer *ł(aʔ)* ‘if/when’ or Secwepemctsin irrealis complementizer *e* ‘if’ (77a–c), which generally requires subjunctive marking in the clause it introduces.<sup>53</sup> The consequent *me7* clause is the main clause, as indicated by the lack of subjunctive marking.

- (77) a. lut k<sup>w</sup> ł wrwrám, mi ławt iʔ scwar. Nsyilxcn  
 lut k<sup>w</sup> ł wr-wr-ám mi ławt iʔ scwar  
 NEG 2SG.SUB COMP PL.RDP-fire-MID FUT extinguish DET fire  
 ‘If you don’t put on more wood, the fire will go out.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/6/09, 2663)
- b. łaʔ kaʔkícis iʔ sənkláʔsqáʔaʔ, mi cłx<sup>w</sup>úysts. Nsyilxcn  
 łaʔ kaʔkíc-is iʔ snkláʔsqáʔaʔ mi c-ł-x<sup>w</sup>úy-st-s  
 COMP find-[DIR]-3ERG DET horse FUT CISL-return-go-CAUS-3ERG  
 ‘If he finds a horse, he will bring it back.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 4/19/11, 7760)
- c. cmay łaʔ nq<sup>w</sup>ńán, mi łʔapám t słaʔcínəm. Nsyilxcn  
 cmay łaʔ n-q<sup>w</sup>ń-án, mi łʔap-ám t słaʔcínəm  
 EPIS COMP LOC-pitiful-RDP FUT shoot-MID OBL deer  
 ‘He’ll shoot a deer if he’s blessed.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 4/19/11, 7780)

<sup>53</sup> Note that for Secwepemctsin *e* clauses in initial position, subjunctive marking is optional. The sentence in (77e) for example has subjunctive, while the first version of (77f) does not. For *e* clauses in final position (e.g., 78c) subjunctive marking is obligatory. The following variants, with subjunctive marking in the future consequent clause, were both judged ungrammatical: \**e tsut-k te7 sqwetséts, me7 kwéntsnes*. (Cecilia DeRose); \**e tsítucw te7 sqwetséts, me7 kwéntsnes*. (Cecilia DeRose).

- d. nsþýáq iʔ qáqɣ<sup>w</sup>əlɣ, mi k<sup>wu</sup> ʔəlʔíln. **Nsyilxcn**  
 n-s-þýáq iʔ qáqɣ<sup>w</sup>əlɣ mi k<sup>wu</sup> ʔí-ʔíln  
 LOC-NMLZ-cooked DET fish FUT 1PL.SUB PL.RDP-eat  
 ‘If the fish is cooked, we’ll eat it.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/06/09, 2658)
- e. e geyépuɣw, me7 qwetséts-ken.. **Secwepemctsin**  
 e geyépuɣw me7 qwetséts-ken  
 if angry-2SG.SBJV FUT leave-1SG.SUB  
 ‘If you get angry, I will go.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Bridget Dan, VF)
- f. e tsút-k te7 sqwetséts, me7 kwéntsen. **Secwepemctsin**  
 e tsútucw te7 sqwetséts, me7 kwéntsen.  
 e tsút-k-ucw te 7-sqwetséts, me7 kwén-ts-n  
 if say-2SG.SUB/SBJV OBL 2SG.POSS-[NMLZ]-leave FUT take.DIR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG  
 ‘If you want to go, I’ll take you.’  
 (Garlene Dodson, Bridget Dan)
- g. e ʔek7ílcwes k swet, me7 wi7 es séyses. **Secwepemctsin**  
 e ʔek7-ílc-wes k swet me7 wi7 e-séyse-s  
 if go.along-AUT-3SBJV DET who FUT finish IRR.C-[NMLZ]-play.3POS  
 ‘If someone runs away, then they stop playing.’  
 (Mona Jules, Cecilia DeRose)

The two clauses can be reversed with respect to one another in both languages.

- (78) a. mi k<sup>w</sup> ʔíln ʔ ckiɣ anlʔíw. **Nsyilxcn**  
 mi k<sup>w</sup> ʔíln ʔ c-kic-x an-lʔíw  
 FUT 2SG.SUB eat COMP CISL-arrive-INTR 2SG.POSS-male’s.father  
 ‘You’ll eat when you dad comes.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, 8/22/12, 11734)
- b. mi sɣ<sup>w</sup>þíxəm Spike ʔ ʔǎǎǎpílt. **Nsyilxcn**  
 mi sɣ<sup>w</sup>þíxəm Spike ʔ ʔǎǎǎp-ílt  
 FUT OCC-hunt Spike COMP RDP-grow-INCH-child  
 ‘Spike will be a hunter when he grows up.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 6/2/12, 11521)
- c. me7 wi7 e (s)séyses e ʔek7ílcwes k swet. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 wi7 e-[s]-séyse-s e ʔek7-ílc-wes k swet  
 FUT finish IRR.C-NMLZ-play.3POSS if go.along-AUT-3SBJV DET who  
 ‘They will stop playing if someone runs away.’  
 (Mona Jules, Cecilia DeRose)

- d. me7 qíqt̚em-ken e tsecéllcwucw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 qíqt̚-em-ken e tsec-éllcw-ucw  
 FUT go.fish-MID-1SG.SUB if clean-house-2SG.SBJV  
 ‘I will fish if you clean the house.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, Daniel Calhoun)

- e. me7 kect̚sín e tséwkstmucw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 kect̚-[t]s-ín e tséwkst-m-ucw  
 FUT give.BEN-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG if reach.hand-MID-2SG.SBJV  
 ‘I’ll give it to you if you reach for it.’  
 (Kuipers 1974)

### 3.2.2 Temporal sequencing

Most clause-initial uses of Nsyilxcn *mi* involve temporal sequencing across clauses. This is also a common and natural use for Secwepemctsin *me7*. In such cases, *mi* and *me7* introduce an event in a sequence of two or more temporally-ordered events, each event being expressed by its own verbal predicate which heads its own clause. The beginning of the *mi* or *me7*-introduced event typically occurs after the end of the preceding event. In other words, there is generally no temporal overlap, as there is for example with Nsyilxcn *laʔ* clauses or Secwepemctsin *le* clauses.

The first event in the sequence is commonly marked as an imperative in both languages (79). Secwepemctsin requires subjunctive marking on the event introduced by *me7* in these contexts.<sup>54,55</sup>

- (79) a. x<sup>w</sup>t̚ílx̚əx mi k<sup>w</sup> ʃcməncút. **Nsyilxcn**  
 x<sup>w</sup>t̚-ílx̚-x mi k<sup>w</sup> ʃc-m-ncút  
 get.up-AUT-IMP FUT 2SG.SUB get.clothed-APPL-REFL  
 ‘Get up and get dressed.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 7/29/09, 1972)

- b. ʔq̚ílx̚əx ilíʔ mi k<sup>w</sup> ʔíl̚əmstx. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ʔq̚-ílx̚-x ilíʔ mi k<sup>w</sup> ʔíl̚-mst-x  
 lie.down-AUT-IMP there FUT 2SG.SUB keep.still-INTR.REFL-IMP  
 ‘Lay down and keep still.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 7/24/10, 5274)

- c. tsxwént(c)e me7 íll(e)nucw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 tsxwént-(c)e me7 íll(e)n-ucw  
 come-IMP FUT eat-2SG.SBJV  
 ‘Come and eat!’  
 (Literally: ‘Come, you will eat!’)

<sup>54</sup> Neighbouring Salish languages take different morpho-syntactic approaches in expressing sequenced events: In St’át’imcets, for example, the predicate *nilh* introduces the second verb, which undergoes nominalization. Thanks to Henry Davis for raising this point of variation.

<sup>55</sup> A variant of (79c) with an indicative subject in the *me7* clause was judged ungrammatical: \**tsxwéntce me7 íllen-k*.

- d. nésce me7 tkéymucw. Secwepemctsin  
 nés-ce me7 tkéym-ucw  
 go-IMP FUT pee-2SG.SBJV  
 ‘Go and pee!’  
 (Literally: ‘Go, you will pee!’)

The two languages also use *mi* and *me7* in non-imperative clause-sequencing contexts, where they typically translate as ‘before’ or ‘and then’.<sup>56</sup> In these cases subjunctive marking is optional in Secwepemctsin on the *me7*-introduced event. When present, it unambiguously indicates that there is no temporal overlap between events.

- (80) a. kn ðkam mi anwí k<sup>w</sup> wíkw<sup>w</sup>míst! Nsyilxcn  
 kn ðk-am mi anwí k<sup>w</sup> wíkw<sup>w</sup>-míst  
 1SG.SUB count-MID FUT 2SG.INDEP 2SG.SUB hide-INTR.REFL  
 ‘I’ll count while you go hide!’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 10287)
- b. k<sup>w</sup> ǰstwílx mi sic k<sup>w</sup> x<sup>w</sup>uy kl asǰílwí?<sup>57</sup> Nsyilxcn  
 k<sup>w</sup> ǰst-wílx mi sic k<sup>w</sup> x<sup>w</sup>uy kl a[n]-sǰílwí?  
 2SG.SUB good-become FUT then 2SG.SUB go to 2SG.POSS-husband  
 ‘You get better before you go back to your husband.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 7/14/09, cf. 5920)
- c. x<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>ntísəlx, k<sup>w</sup>ílstənəm mi sic píǰəm. Nsyilxcn  
 x<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>-nt-ílx k<sup>w</sup>ílstn-m mi sic píǰ-m  
 clean-DIR-3PL.ERG sweat.house-MID FUT then hunt-MID  
 ‘They cleaned (everything) and sweated before hunting.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 7/14/09, cf. 5927)
- d. ǰǰáplaǰmísəlx mi sic ǰaws píǰəməlx. Nsyilxcn  
 ǰǰ-áplaǰ-mí-slx mi sic ǰaws-píǰ-m-lx  
 cross.over-handle-APPL-3PL.ERG FUT then go-hunt-MID-3PL  
 ‘They pray for themselves before they go hunting.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 3/19/10, cf. 5982)

<sup>56</sup> In Nsyilxcn, modal elements like epistemic *cəm* may precede *mi* when it links two clauses together: *k<sup>w</sup>u kstǰaphtísəlx, cəm mi ǰlal* ‘They are going to shoot me, and he might die.’ (Sarah McLeod, VF, 10474). Similar facts obtain for Secwepemctsin, as shown by the following sentence with *héqen* ‘maybe, might’: *héqen me7 nes re John*. ‘Maybe John will go.’ (Cecilia DeRose, VF).

<sup>57</sup> *mi* co-occurs with several other adverbs in partially lexicalized combinations. The sequence *mi sic* seems to be partially lexicalized as ‘and then’: *John sk<sup>w</sup>ulǰx<sup>w</sup> t citx<sup>w</sup> cmay naqspíntk, mi sic wiǰstís* ‘John is building a house, it might take a year to finish it’ (Lottie Lindley, VF, 7/24/10, 5384). Another common combination is *mi nix<sup>w</sup>*: for example, *kn ksasǰítk<sup>w</sup>aǰx, náǰəmǰ ilí? ǰwínxǰmən mi nix<sup>w</sup> anwí k<sup>w</sup> sasǰítk<sup>w</sup>* ‘I will eat soup, but I will leave you some so you can also have soup’ (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11/21/10, 6954).



- e. me7 qweqwentsín éytsell me7 píxmes. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 qweqwen-tsín éytsell me7 píx-m-es  
 FUT poor.RDP-mouth before FUT hunt-MID-3SBJV  
 ‘They pray before they go hunting.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, VF, 6/09/21)
- f. níńwíʔs aláʔ cʔitx, mi kʷu xʷtíłləx, mi kʷu ʔimx.<sup>58</sup> **Nsyilxcn**  
 níńwíʔs aláʔ c-ʔitx mi kʷu xʷt-łləx, mi kʷu ʔimx  
 later here STAT-sleep FUT 1PL.SUB get.up-AUT.PL FUT 1PL.SUB move  
 ‘And when he is asleep, we will get up and we will move.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 2/17/10, 6012)
- g. re John ey e ítcwes, re Sarah me7 llwélens.<sup>59</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 re John ey e ít-wes re Sarah me7 llwél-en-s  
 DET John still IRR.C sleep-3SBJV DET Sarah FUT abandon-DIR-3ERG  
 ‘When John is asleep, Sarah will leave him.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)
- h. me7 tíqwen, me7 estúll(e)nes, me7 tu7kemínes.<sup>60</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 tíqw-en, me7 estúll-(e)n-es  
 FUT kill-[DIR]-1SG.ERG FUT skin-[DIR]-1SG.ERG-3SBJV  
 me7 tu7k-mí-n-es  
 FUT sell-APPL-[DIR]-1SG.ERG-3SBJV  
 ‘I’ll kill them, I’ll skin them, and I’ll sell them.’  
 (Kuipers 1974)

In Nsyilxcn, these sequential uses of *mi* often translate into English as infinitives, and in many cases an “in order to” causal relation between two or more eventive clauses is implied, at least in such cases where the two events allow for a causal link to be pragmatically inferred (81).

- (81) a. kn sckʷaʔkʷúlstx mi kn sxʷəlkám. **Nsyilxcn**  
 kn s-c-kʷaʔkʷúlst-x mi kn sxʷ-łk-ám  
 1SG.SUB NMLZ-CUST-practice-INTR FUT 1SG.SUB OCC-tie.up-MID  
 ‘I’m practicing to be a policeman.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 1/30/10, 3455)

<sup>58</sup> This sentence shows how the adverb *níńwíʔs* is sufficient to yield a future reading in the absence of any other future or prospective morphology. See N. Mattina (1999:217).

<sup>59</sup> Example (80g) was also volunteered with a passive in the main clause: *ey e ítcwes re John, me7 llwélentem te Sarah* ‘When John is asleep, Sarah will leave him.’ (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/14).

<sup>60</sup> In narratives by Skeetchestn speakers Seymour Pitel and Charlie Draney transcribed in Kuipers (1974), the narrators do not use 1<sup>st</sup> singular consonant reduplication when using quoted speech in the first person.

- b. kn səcmaʔmáyaʔx ʒapnáʔ mi kn səx<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>úłłx<sup>w</sup>əm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 kn s-c-maʔmáyaʔ-x ʒapnáʔ mi kn səx<sup>w</sup>-k<sup>w</sup>úłł-x<sup>w</sup>-m  
 1SG.SUB NMLZ-CUST-teach-INTR now FUT 1SG.SUB OCC-make-house-MID  
 ‘I’m going to school to be a house builder.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 4/19/11, 7692)
- c. ʔyam ul ʔtytymul ul akspícaʔ mi sic x<sup>w</sup>uy. **Nsyilxcn**  
 ʔyam ul ʔtytymul ul a-k[s]-sp-ícaʔ mi sic x<sup>w</sup>uy  
 refuse and lazy CONJ 2SG.POSS-PROS-whip-outside FUT then go  
 ‘He’s tired and lazy and you beat him to get him to go.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 3/19/10, 4255)
- d. lut nix<sup>w</sup> kłcx<sup>w</sup>úym̄p mi mypnúntp sxʔkínaʔx kiʔ kn ʔlál. **Nsyilxcn**  
 lut nix<sup>w</sup> k[s]-ł-c-x<sup>w</sup>úy-mp mi  
 NEG again PROS-return-CISL-go.PL-2PL.POSS FUT  
 my-p-nú-nt-p sxʔkínaʔx kiʔ kn ʔlál  
 know-INCH-manage.to-DIR-2SG.ERG how NON.FUT 1SG.SUB dead  
 ‘You all will never come back to find out what happened, how I die.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 6/02/10, 7890)
- e. nyʕip ʔʒat mi sic ɛʒánɔn. **Nsyilxcn**  
 nyʕip ʔʒat mi sic ɛʒán-ɔn  
 always wet FUT then RDP-tight  
 ‘They keep it (i.e. roots) wet all the time so that it gets tight.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 9/15/09, 5940)

Secwepemctsin *me7*, on the other hand, is not used to indicate causality. Instead, if a causal-link between two events is intended, “goal-directed” nominalizations (Kuipers 1974) must be used.<sup>61</sup>

- (82) a. tekwentús me7 sllétenc ri7 es lutst.s. **Secwepemctsin**  
 tekwentús me7 s-llét-en-c ri7 e s-lutst-s  
 always FUT NMLZ-wet-DIR-2SG.ERG that.VIS IRR.C NMLZ-tight-3POS  
 ‘You keep it wet all the time so that it gets tight.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/09/21)

<sup>61</sup> The combination of *me7* plus subjunctive marking provides temporal subsequence in future contexts, but there is no causal implication between events. For example, compare (82b) with the following: *néns-ken te skul me7 tswéwllcwen tek tsitcw* ‘I’m going to school and then build a house,’ which was judged as being a strange thing to say if one is going to school to learn *how* to build houses. Example (82b) was also later dispreferred to the following which also includes a goal-directed nominalization, but leaves off the noun *tsitcw* ‘house’ as redundant with the suffix *-éllcw* ‘house’: *néns-ken te skul es xepqenwéwen k stswewéllcw* ‘I’m going to school to learn how to build houses.’ (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, VF, 7/21/21).

- b. néns-ken te skul es xepqenwéwen ens tswewllcw tek tsitcw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 néns-ken te skul e s-xepqen-wéwen  
 go.1RDP-1SG.SUB to school IRR.C NMLZ-learn-manage.to.DIR.1RDP-[1SG.ERG]  
 e n-s-tswew-llcw tek tsitcw  
 IRR.C 1SG.POSS-NMLZ-build.1RDP-house OBL.IRR house  
 ‘I’m going to school to learn how to build a house.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, VF, 7/14/21)
- c. \*néns-ken te skul me7 tswewllcw-ken tek tsitcw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 \*néns-ken te skul me7 tswew-llcw-ken tek tsitcw  
 go.1RDP-1SG.SUB to school FUT build.1RDP-house-1SG.SUB OBL.IRR house  
 ‘I’m going to school to learn how to build a house.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose, 6/09/21)

### 3.3 Negation and subject position in linking uses of *mi* and *me7*

It was shown in Section 2.7 that negation and *mi* do not co-occur in Nsyilxcn clefting contexts, whereas negation and *me7* do co-occur in Secwepemctsin clefting contexts. In linking contexts, however, negation and *mi* do co-occur in Nsyilxcn, with causal import as described above in Section 2.2.

- (83) a. lk<sup>w</sup>ílx i? t l snlqútn mi lut kəsəsípəlaʔs i? səx<sup>w</sup>píxəm. **Nsyilxcn**  
 lk<sup>w</sup>-ílx i? t l snlqútn mi lut ks-s-ípəlaʔ-s  
 far-AUT DET from bed FUT NEG bad-RDP-handle-[DIR]-3ERG  
 i? sx<sup>w</sup>-píx-m  
 DET OCC-hunt-MID  
 ‘Leave your bed so that the hunters don’t get bad luck.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 7/14/09, 5937)
- b. k<sup>w</sup>u xitmíst, mi lut k<sup>w</sup>u q<sup>w</sup>cq<sup>w</sup>uct. **Nsyilxcn**  
 k<sup>w</sup>u xit-míst mi lut k<sup>w</sup>u q<sup>w</sup>c-q<sup>w</sup>uct  
 1PL.SUB run.PL-INTR.REFL FUT NEG 1PL.SUB PL.RDP-fat  
 ‘We’ll run so we won’t get fat.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 11528, 6/1/12)

In Secwepemctsin, goal-directed nominalizations are required in negative causal contexts (84a,b) just as they are in positive contexts (82). A combination of *ta7* and *me7* was judged ungrammatical here (84d).

<sup>62</sup> Example (82c) is not quite a minimal pair with (81c), but we fully expect the minimal pair to be ungrammatical as well, though this should be tested: \*néns-ken te skul en s-xepqenwéwllen me7 tswewllcw-ken tek tsitcw.

- (84) a. ec kucw re cwíselcwes tucw tsukw es ta7s es csweyt.s. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ec kucw re cwís-elc-wes tucw tsukw  
 IPFV 1PL.SUB DET run-AUT-3SBJV EXCL finish  
 e s-ta7-s e s-csweyt-s  
 IRR.C NMLZ-NEG-3POSS IRR.C NMLZ-lazy-3POSS  
 ‘We’ll run so that we don’t get lazy.’  
 (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/6/21)
- b. ec kucw re cwíselcwes tucw es tá7s kucw es csweyt.s. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ‘We’ll run so that we don’t get lazy.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)
- c. \*ec kucw re cwíselcwes tucw tsukw me7 ta7 e scsweyt.s. **Secwepemctsin**  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)
- d. \*ec kucw re cwíselcwes tucw ta7 me7 scsweyt.s kucw. **Secwepemctsin**  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/6/21)

However, *me7* and *ta7* do co-occur in conditionals, in both antecedent<sup>63</sup> (85a) and consequent clauses (85b). Consequent uses of *me7* such as (85b) are equivalent to cases of simple clause-initial uses discussed in Section 3.1.

- (85) a. ec kucw re cwíselcwes tucw tsukw e ta7es me7 scsweyt.s. **Secwepemctsin**  
 ec kucw re cwís-elc-wes tucw tsukw  
 IPFV 1PL.SUB DET run-AUT-3SBJV EXCL finish  
 e ta7-es me7 s-csweyt-s  
 if NEG-3SBJV FUT NMLZ-lazy-3POSS  
 ‘We’ll run if we don’t get lazy.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)
- b. yúmell e geyépuw, ta7 me7 nsqwetséts.<sup>64</sup> **Secwepemctsin**  
 yúmell e gey-ép-ucw ta7 me7 n-s-qwetséts  
 even if angry-INCH-2SG.SBJV NEG FUT 1SG.POSS-NMLZ-leave  
 ‘Even if you get mad, I won’t go.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

It was also shown in Section 2.7 that DP subjects do not directly follow *mi* or *me7* in clefting contexts. In Nsyilxcn, textual examples can be found of DP subjects directly following *mi* as a linker in both positive (86a) and negative (86b) contexts.

<sup>63</sup> Though even in antecedent *if* clauses, *me7* is often dispreferred to a goal-directed nominalization: *ta7 me7 skectsin e tá7es e stséwktmenc* (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/6/21) ‘I won’t give it to you if you don’t reach for it.’  
 \**ta7 me7 skectsin e tá7es me7 stséwktmenc* (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21).

<sup>64</sup> Additional judgements like the following confirm that the Nsyilxcn ordering of *mi lut* (future before negation) does not work in Secwepemctsin: \**yúmell e geyépuw, me7 ta7 nsqwetséts* (Bridget Dan) ‘Even if you get mad, I won’t go.’

- (86) a. cǎlits iʔ sumíxs mi ninw̄t ixíʔ mi iʔ skʷəkʷrnínaʔ naʔl s̄m̄cim cscsʔalx. **Nsyilxcn**  
 c-ǎlit-s iʔ sumíx-s mi ninw̄t ixíʔ  
 CISL-invite-[DIR]-3ERG DET power-3POSS FUT wind.DIM.RDP that  
**mi iʔ skʷəkʷrnínaʔ naʔl s̄m̄cim** cscsʔalx  
 FUT DET clam CONJ PL.RDP-bone make.noise  
 ‘He [Coyote] called up his powers so that a little wind would make the clam shells  
 and bones make noise.’  
 (Sarah Peterson, 2014:80)
- b. kʷu ksknxítəm mi lut iʔ sqilxʷ kʷu ksʔəxʷntím. **Nsyilxcn**  
 kʷu ks-knxít-m **mi lut iʔ sqilxʷ**  
 1PL.OBJ IRR-help.BEN-3PL/1OBJ FUT NEG DET indigenous.person  
 kʷu ks-ʔəxʷ-nt-ím  
 1PL.OBJ PROS-kill.many-DIR-3PL/1OBJ  
 ‘They’re gonna help us, so that the Indians won’t get the best of us.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 10563)

In Secwepemctsin, however, DP subjects can never directly follow *me7* in either clefting or clause-initial uses:

- (87) a. me7 cuyt re sqexqéxe. **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7 cuyt re sqexqéxe  
 FUT get.out DET dog.PL.RDP  
 ‘The dogs will go out.’  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21)
- b. \*me7 (re) sqexqéxe cuyt. **Secwepemctsin**  
 (Bridget Dan, Cecilia DeRose, 7/21/21)

Before closing, we discuss combined and doubled uses of *mi* and *me7*.

### 3.4 Combined uses and doubled uses

Nsyilxcn *mi* often occurs multiple times within the same sentence, as both a clefting particle and a linker. In (88a) for example, the first instance of *mi* is a sequential subordinator, while the second instance of *mi* signals that the demonstrative adverb *ilíʔ* is clefted. In (88b), the first and third instances of *mi* are sequential subordinators, while the second signals that the adverbial WH-word *kaʔkín* ‘to where’ is clefted (or possibly being used as the head of a free relative).

- (88) a. way kʷ ikskʷúltxʷəm, mi ilíʔ mi kʷ cʔitx. **Nsyilxcn**  
 way kʷ i-ks-kʷúl-txʷ-m, **mi** ilíʔ  
 yes 2SG.OBJ 1SG.POSS-PROS-make-house-MID FUT there  
**mi** kʷ c-ʔitx  
 FUT 2SG.SUB CUST-sleep  
 ‘I will build you a hut over there, where you will sleep.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 4/25/09, 5871)

- b.    ńus ǰláp, k<sup>w</sup> qı̄łt, mi cúnmentəm káʔkín mi k<sup>w</sup> x<sup>w</sup>uy                               **Nsyilxcn**  
 mi púlstx<sup>w</sup> iʔ słaʔcínəm.  
 ńus   ǰláp            k<sup>w</sup>            qı̄łt            **mi**        cún-m-nt-m            káʔkín  
 later tomorrow    2SG.SUB awake    FUT say-APPL-DIR-PASS to.where  
                     **mi** k<sup>w</sup>            x<sup>w</sup>uy **mi**    púl-st-x<sup>w</sup>            iʔ    słaʔcínəm  
                     FUT 2SG.SUB go    FUT kill-CAUS-2SG.ERG DET deer  
 ‘Tomorrow you will wake up, you will be told where to go, and you will kill a deer.’  
 (Lindley & Lyon 2016, 2/17/10, 6028)

Parallel structures in Secwepemctsin are ungrammatical. Example (89a) shows an adjunct clefting use of *me7* within a larger linking environment, though (89b) shows that adding an additional linking *me7*, parallel to the Nsyilxcn examples in (88), is not possible. Subjunctive particle *wes* may be fulfilling a similar role to linking *me7* in these cases.

- (89) a.    me7 tswéllcwctsen nu7, ńlu7 wes me7 etícucw.                               **Secwepemctsin**  
 me7    tsw-éllcw-ct-s-en   nu7  
 FUT    build-house-BEN-2SG.OBJ-1SG.ERG    there.VIS  
           ńlu7                               wes    **me7**    etíc-ucw  
           to.there.ABS    SBJV    FUT    sleep-2SG.SBJV  
 ‘I will build you a house over there, where you will sleep.’  
 (Bridget Dan, VF, 7/6/21)

- b.    \*me7 tswéllcwctsen nu7, **me7** ńlu7 wes **me7** etícucw.                               **Secwepemctsin**

In Nsyilxcn, *mi* can optionally double in a cleft construction (Lyon 2019). It is always the initial *mi* which is optional, and the final *mi* which is required (90a, 91a).<sup>65</sup> Doubling is not possible for Secwepemctsin *me7* (90b, 91b).

- (90) a.    (mi) John mi x<sup>w</sup>uy.   **Nsyilxcn**  
 (mi) John mi    x<sup>w</sup>uy  
 (FUT) John    FUT    go  
 ‘Maybe John will go.’  
 (Lottie Lindley, VF, 3/05/12, 10969)
- b.    \*me7 John me7 nes.   **Secwepemctsin**  
 \*me7 John me7 nes  
 FUT John FUT go  
 ‘John will go.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)  
 Comment: “re John me7 nes.”

<sup>65</sup> This may or may not be related to the subject pronoun doubling seen in Nsyilxcn cases involving clefted independent pronouns (Lyon 2019).

- (91) a. (mi) anwí mi k<sup>w</sup> ylmíx<sup>w</sup>əm. Nsyilxcn  
 (mi) anwí mi k<sup>w</sup> ylmíx<sup>w</sup>əm  
 FUT 2SG.INDEP FUT 2SG.SUB chief  
 ‘You will be a chief.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 3/04/12, 10977)
- b. \*me7 newí7 me7 kúkwi7. Secwepemctsin  
 \*me7 newí7 me7 kúkwi7  
 FUT 2SG.INDEP FUT chief  
 ‘You will be a chief.’  
 (Cecilia DeRose)  
 Comment: “re newí7 me7 kúkwi7.”

This concludes our comparative survey of clause-initial uses of *mi* and *me7*.

#### 4 Summary and conclusion

This paper has compared and contrasted the distributions of Nsyilxcn future marker *mi* with Secwepemctsin cognate *me7* across a range of clefting and clause-initial contexts. The two particles pattern similarly in many contexts, however, a careful examination has uncovered important differences between the two.

Nsyilxcn *mi* is more restricted in its distribution than Secwepemctsin *me7* for reasons that remain unclear, but likely relate to there being other strategies to mark future in Nsyilxcn besides *me7*, notably prospective *ks-*, nominal irrealis *kł-*, and modal and adverbially-marked futures. Future *mi* strongly implies contrastive focus in non-clause-initial position, which leads to pragmatic infelicity in some contexts. The incompatibility of *mi* with negation in clefting contexts but not linking contexts, along with the ungrammaticality of DP subjects directly following *mi* and *me7* in clefting contexts may suggest that *mi* and *me7*-headed clauses are not full CPs here, as opposed to non-clefting contexts. Nsyilxcn *mi* further exhibits an apparent vP dependency in its clefting use which Secwepemctsin *me7* does not, as evidenced by the agentivity requirement. In their clause-initial uses, *mi* is consistent with causal interpretations whereas *me7* is not, and *mi* can double within the same clause, while *me7* cannot.

While the data in this paper should offer much syntactic food for thought, many semantic questions remain. Most obviously, *me7* is required for future interpretations in Secwepemctsin, but is certainly not in Nsyilxcn as evidenced for example by the use of bare modal futures.

Second of all, neither *mi* nor *me7* are particularly conducive to future-in-the-past interpretations: Nsyilxcn uses *ks-* prospective nominalizations in such cases, and Secwepemctsin uses goal-directed nominalizations.

- (92) a. \*i? kəkəwáp mi siwstx uł nǰił uł yalt. Nsyilxcn  
 \*i? kkwáp mi siwst-x uł nǰił uł yalt  
 DET dog FUT drink-INTR CONJ afraid CONJ run.away  
 ‘The dog was going to drink, but then it got scared and ran away.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, 6/11/19, 15482)

- b. iʔ kəkəwáp kssíwstaʔx ul n̄xíl ul yalt. Nsyilxcn  
 iʔ kkwáp ks-síwst-aʔx ul n̄xíl ul yalt  
 DET dog PROS-drink-INTR CONJ afraid CONJ run.away  
 ‘The dog was going to drink, but then it got scared and ran away.’  
 (Sarah McLeod, VF, 6/11/19, 15483)

- (93) a. \*re sqéxe me7 ste7 tek séwllkwe kémell m-nexéll te m-tek7ílç.<sup>66</sup> Secwepemctsin  
 \*re sqéxe me7 ste7 tek séwllkwe  
 DET dog FUT drink OBL.IRR water  
 kémell m-nexéll te m-tek7-ílç  
 but PAST-afraid OBL PAST-go.along-AUT  
 ‘The dog was going to drink, but then it got scared and ran away.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

- b. re sqéxe tsut e sté7s kémell m-nexéll te m-tek7ílç. Secwepemctsin  
 re sqéxe tsut e s-te7-s tek séwllkwe  
 DET dog think IRR.C NMLZ-drink-3POSS OBL.IRR water  
 kémell m-nexéll te m-tek7-ílç  
 but PAST-afraid OBL PAST-go.along-AUT  
 ‘The dog was going to drink, but then it got scared and ran away.’  
 (Bridget Dan, 7/6/21)

Both Secwepemctsin goal-directed and Nsyilxcn prospective nominalizations may therefore likely be classified as prospective aspects, as opposed to future tenses.<sup>67</sup>

In conclusion, we hope that this survey has further clarified grammatical patterns noticed by previous researchers and has accurately elucidated previously undocumented patterns. We also hope that we have provided some insight into some of the syntactic similarities and differences between Nsyilxcn and Secwepemctsin, as neighbouring languages from different sub-branches of Interior Salish, and that our work will spark interest in researchers to carry out further comparative work across Salish languages.

## References

- First Peoples’ Cultural Council. 2018. *Report on the Status of B.C. First Nations Languages, 2018*. First Peoples’ Cultural Council, Brentwood Bay, BC.
- Gardiner, Dwight. 1993. *Structural Asymmetries and Preverbal Positions in Shuswap*. PhD Dissertation. Simon Fraser University. Burnaby, BC.

<sup>66</sup> Bridget Dan indicated that *re sqéxe me7 ste7 tek séwllkwe* can only mean ‘The dog *is going* to drink the water’, not ‘The dog *was going* to drink the water.’

<sup>67</sup> Secwepemctsin goal-directed nominalizations are more restricted in their distributions than Nsyilxcn prospective nominalizations, the latter of which may for example occur in main or subordinate clauses environments. The following picture emerges:

	<i>mi / me7</i>	<i>prospective nominalizations</i>
Nsyilxcn	special case	default future
Secwepemctsin	default future	special case



- Ignace, Marianne & Ron Ignace. 2017. *Secwépemc People, Land, and Laws: Yeri7 Re Stsq'ey's-kucw*. McGill – Queens University Press: Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON.
- Kroeber, Paul. 1999. *The Salish Language Family*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, NE.
- Kuipers, Aert. 1974. *The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. Mouton & Co: The Hague, Netherlands.
- Lai, Sandra. 1998. *Secwepemctsin Independent Pronouns: Evidence for Subject – Object Assymetry*. In Papers for the 33<sup>rd</sup> Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages.
- Lindley, Lottie & John Lyon (ed). 2016. *Okanagan Grouse Woman*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, NE.
- Lyon, John. 2013. *Predication and Equation in Okanagan Salish*. PhD Dissertation. University of British Columbia. Vancouver, BC.
- Lyon, John. 2019. *Clitic Distributions and Domains in Okanagan Salish: A Preliminary Study*. In: Lisa Matthewson, Erin Guntly, and Michael Rochemont (eds.), *Wa7 xweysás i nqwal'utteniha i ucwalmícwa: He Loves the People's Languages. Essays in Honour of Henry Davis*. UBC Occasional Papers in Linguistics: Vancouver, BC.
- Lyon, John. 2020. *Re-revisiting Okanagan Sentential Aspect*. Presented at the Tense and Aspect in Languages of the Pacific Lab Meeting, June 26, 2020.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1973. *Colville Grammatical Structures*. PhD Dissertation. University of Hawai'i. Manoa, HI.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1985. *The Golden Woman*. University of Arizona Press: Tucson, AZ.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1995. *Okanagan ks- and kł-*. In Papers for the 30<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages.
- Mattina, Anthony & Nancy Mattina. 1996. *Interior Salish to-be and Intentional Forms: A Working Paper*. In Papers from the 31<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages.
- Mattina, Nancy. 1999. *Future In Colville-Okanagan Salish*. In Papers for the 34<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages.
- Peterson, Sarah. 2017. *Captik<sup>vł</sup>* volumes. Salish School of Spokane, Spokane, WA.
- Tollan, Rebecca & Will Oxford. 2017. *Distinguishing VoiceP subjects and vP subjects in Algonquian*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association.

**Appendix A Orthographic conversion chart**

APA (Nsyilxcn)	Practical (Secwepemctsin)	APA (Nsyilxcn)	Practical (Secwepemctsin)
p̣	p̣	q̣	q̣
p̣̌	p̣̌	q̣ <sup>w</sup>	qw
ṃ	ṃ	q̣ <sup>w</sup>	q̣w
ṃ̌	ṃ̌	x̣	x
ṭ	ṭ	x̣ <sup>w</sup>	xw
ṭ̌	(ṭ̌)	ỵ	r
c̣	tṣ	ỵ̌	ṛ
č̣	tṣ̌	ç̣	g̣
ṣ	ṣ	ç̣̌	ǧ̣
ṇ	ṇ	ç̣ <sup>w</sup>	g̣w
ṇ̌	ṇ̌	ç̣ <sup>w</sup>	ǧ̣w
λ̣	ṭ̌	ḥ	h
ł̣	lḷ	ẉ	w
ḷ	ḷ	ẉ̌	ẉ̌
ḷ̌	ḷ̌	ỵ	ỵ
ḳ	ḳ	ỵ̌	ỵ̌
ḳ̌	ḳ̌	ʔ̣	ʔ
ḳ <sup>w</sup>	kẉ	ạ	a
ḳ̌ <sup>w</sup>	kẉ̌	ə̣	e
x̣	c̣	ị	i
x̣ <sup>w</sup>	cẉ	ọ	o
q̣	q̣	ụ	u

**Appendix B Glossing abbreviations**

Abbreviation	Meaning
ABS	absent
APPL	applicative transitivizer
AUT	autonomous intransitivizer
BEN	benefactive transitivizer
BOUL	bouletic modal
C	complementizer
CAUS	causative transitivizer
CISL	cislocative
CONJ	conjunction
CUST	customary/habitual
DET	determiner
DIM	diminutive
DIR	directive transitivizer
EMPH	emphatic
EPIS	epistemic modal
ERG	ergative
EXCL	exclusive
FUT	future
IMP	imperative
INCL	inclusive
INCH	inchoative
INDEP	independent pronoun
INST	instrumental

Abbreviation	Meaning
INTR	intransitivizer
INVIS	invisible
IPFV	imperfective
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
MID	middle intransitivizer
N	noun
NEG	negative
NMLZ	nominalizer
OBJ	object
OBL	oblique marker
OCC	occupational
PASS	passive
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PROS	prospective
PST	past tense marker
RDP	reduplication
REP	reportative
RSLT	resultive
SBJV	subjunctive
SUB	intransitive subject
VIS	visible