Focus and relativization: Head-final relatives in Thompson Salish

Karsten A. Koch
Department of Linguistics, University of Calgary
karstenak@hotmail.com

This paper presents previously unreported data on relatively rare head-final relatives in Thompson River Salish. I show that head-final relatives are used in discourse contexts where narrow focus falls on the relative clause itself, excluding the final head noun. As a result, this is the first report of narrow focus marking within a nominal domain in Salishan; previous accounts of focus marking in Salish have observed that the focus is always associated with the matrix predicate. While focus marking in both the nominal and predicate domain can be characterized as following a linear FOCUS >> BACKGROUND order, focus sensitive expressions (*only*) cannot associate with in situ nominals. This suggests that there are two focus marking strategies at work in the language: a syntactic strategy (focus=predicate), and a prosodic one (left alignment). Only the former is relevant for truth-conditional uses of focus (e.g. association with *only*).

1 Introduction

Why do we use relative clauses? Pragmatically, restrictive relative clauses provide a more specific referent relative to some discourse alternative (e.g. Weinert 2004; see also Wiltschko, this volume, on descriptive relative clauses, which cannot serve this function). As Downing and Mtenje (2011) observe, this satisfies common definitions for focus (e.g. Rooth 1992). Processing studies have shown that nominal modifiers, including relative clauses, are inherently related to focus (Sedivy et al. 1999, cited in Downing & Mtenje 2011, on modifiers and contrastive focus; Ni et al. 1996, Liversedge 2002 on the focus sensitive expression *only* facilitating relative clause processing). It is from this information structure perspective that I wish to pursue the distinction between head-initial and head-final relative clauses in Nɬeʔkepmxcín (Thompson River Salish).

In this paper I have two modest goals. The first is to provide some examples of (relatively rare) head-final relatives in Nɬeʔkepmxcín, from recent original fieldwork. The second goal is to think about what factors condition the use of head-initial versus head-final relatives. I shall suggest that the variation is related to focus. When focus falls on the entire noun phrase containing the

relative clause, head-initial relatives are used. However, when narrow focus falls on the relative clause itself, excluding the head noun, head-final relative clauses may be used. The effect is to linearize FOCUS before BACKGROUND, parallel to previous focusing strategies observed in Nɬeʔkepmxcín. However, this focus marking occurs inside the nominal domain, whereas previous work on Salishan has described the focus system as purely predicative (Kroeber 1997, Koch 2008, Koch & Zimmermann 2010; Davis 2007 for St'át'imcets, Benner 2006 for Sencóthen, Davis & Saunders 1978, Beck 1997 on Nuxalk (Bella Coola)).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews previous work on Nɬeʔkepmxcín relative clauses, and introduces new data on head-final relatives. Section 3 examines the broader contexts in which head-final relatives arise, with specific reference to focus marking in Nɬeʔkepmxcín. Section 4 concludes.

2 Relative clauses in Thompson

Nɬeʔkepmxcín is an endangered Northern Interior Salish language. The data in this paper come from original fieldwork with two speakers of the Lytton (*ƛ̓q'əmcín*) dialect. Like all Salish languages, Nɬeʔkepmxcín is predicate initial (Thompson & Thompson 1992, Kroeber 1997, 1999, Koch 2008, to appear).

There are three types of relative clauses: head-initial and headless relative clauses are quite common, while head-final relatives are relatively rare.[1] Paul Kroeber's (1997, 1999) excellent account of the morpho-syntax of relative clauses treats head-initial and headless relatives in detail. The basic form for head-initial relative clauses is shown in (1a): a determiner precedes the head NP, while a second determiner precedes the relative clause itself. The head NP and relative clause are joined by the LINK proclitic *t* (what Kroeber calls the "attributive" marker). A head-initial relative is shown in (1b), and the structure that I am assuming in (1c). This follows previous work by Kroeber (1997, 1999), Davis (2004), Koch (2006), and most recently Davis (2010), which argues for a matching analysis of relative clauses in both St'át'imcets (Lillooet) and Nɬeʔkepmxcín Salish. Under this account, the head NP_1 is generated external to the relative clause, while fronting of a relative-clause internal DP generates the second determiner that precedes the relative clause itself. The relative clause internal NP_2 is deleted under matching with the head NP_1 (Sauerland 2004, Hulsey and Sauerland 2006), shown by strikethrough.

[1] I don't discuss locative relatives here, a variant of the head-initial and headless varieties. See Kroeber 1997, 1999, and Koch 2008b.

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

(1) a. Head-initial relative clause template:
DET NP LINK DET RELATIVE CLAUSE

b. e=cítx^{w} t=ɬ=s=cuw-éɬx^{w}=s ɬ=Jóhn[2]
DET=house LINK=DET=NOM=build-house=3PoCl DET=John
'the house which John built'

c. [$_{DP}$ e=[$_{NP}$ [$_{NP1}$ cítx^{w}] [$_{CP}$ t=[$_{DP}$ ɬ=~~NP2~~]$_{i}$ s=cuw-éɬx^{w}=s ɬ=Jóhn t_{i}]
DET= house LINK=DET=NOM=build-house=3PoCl D=John t_{i}
'the house which John built'

The basic form for headless relatives is shown in (2a), while (2b) shows a sentence containing a headless relative DP. Inside the DP containing the relative, there is no overt NP corresponding to the noun 'question' in the English translation. The link marker and second determiner are also not used, presumably due to a morphological restriction preventing the linear cooccurrence of two determiners (Davis's 2010 *Double Determiner Filter*).

(2) a. Headless relative clause template:
DET RELATIVE CLAUSE

b. sew-ín'-t-iy-e t=[$_{DP}$ k=s=cúw=kt x^{w}úy'].
ask-RPT-TR-1PL.O-2SG.IMP OBL=DET$_{IRL}$=NOM=work=1pl.PoCl FUT
'Ask us (some questions) that we're going to work on.'

On the head-final/head-initial distinction, Kroeber observes that "the relative clause normally follows its head" (1997: 385). Head-final relative clauses are much less common; in fact, Kroeber provides only a single case of a Thompson head-final relative (the intransitive stative *ʔescaʕ* shown in 3), which he suggests may not be a relative clause at all, but some sort of adjectival

[2] See Thompson and Thompson (1992, 1996), Kroeber 1997, Koch 2008, for keys to the orthography and further details on glossed morphemes. '-' marks an affix, and '=' a clitic; acute stress marks word-level stress. Abbreviations used in glosses are: 1,2,3 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, AUG = augmentative reduplicant, BG = background, CLEFT = cleft predicate, CnCl = conjunctive subject clitic, C(OMP) = complementizer, DEM = demonstrative, D(ET) = determiner, DP = determiner phrase, FOC = focus, FUT = future, IM = immediate (intransitive), IMP = imperative, IMPF = imperfective, InCl = indicative subject clitic, INTR(ANS) = intransitive, IRL = irrealis, LINK = link marker, LOC = locative, MDL = middle (intransitive), NEG = negation, NOM = nominalizer, NP = noun phrase, O(BJ) = object, OBL = oblique, PL = plural, PoCl = possessive subject clitic, Q = yes/no question, RC = relative clause, RFM = reaffirmative, RPT = repetitive, SG = singular, STAT = stative, S(UBJ) = subject, TR(ANS) = transitive, TS = transitive suffix, VP = verb phrase.

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

modifier, similar to the form *torn* in the English translation.

(3) e=ʔes-cáʕ t=e=nƛ̓ píc'eʔ
DET=STAT-tear LINK=DET=shirt
'the torn shirt' (Kroeber 1999:256)

In the remainder of this section I show new examples of head-final relatives that include more than a simple intransitive (possibly adjectival) verb form – that is, these involve true relatives clauses. They take the basic form in (4). Comparing with (1a), we see that the head NP and relative clause have changed position, but the remaining morphology remains unchanged.

(4) Head-final relative clause template:
DET RELATIVE CLAUSE LINK DET NP

(5) shows a relative clause with an intransitive predicate like (3), but the relative clause in addition contains possessive 2SG subject marking morphology *eʔ*, as well as the nominalizer *s*. Example (6) shows another intransitive case with a different verb, *kʷukʷ*, also marked with possessive subject morphology *eʔ=s=*. (Note that formally intransitive verbs, like "middle" marked *kʷnəm* 'get' in (5), and *kʷukʷ* 'cook' in (6), can take oblique objects. That is, the head NP *keks* 'cake' in (5) is matched with a relative clause internal oblique object DP. Extraction of oblique objects is maked via nominalization morphlogy (Kroeber 1997, 1999).)

(5) ɬ=eʔ=s=kʷn-ə́m t=e=kéks
DET=2SG.PoCl=NOM=get-MDL LINK=DET=cake
'the cake that you bought' [770aPM]

(6) h=eʔ=s=kʷúkʷ t=e=stú
DET=2SG.PoCl=NOM=cook[INTRANS] LINK=DET=stew
'the stew that you cooked' [726dFE]

In (7), a relative clause with a transitive form of the verb 'bite,' complete with transitive, subject and object morphology, precedes the head NP *sqáqxaʔ* 'dog.' (8) contains another transitive verb 'help' in a relative clause preceding the head NP *smúɬec* 'woman.'

(7) e=qəl-t-sí-s t=e=sqáqxaʔ
DET=bite-TRANS-2SG.OBJ-3TS LINK=DET=dog
'the dog that bit you' [PM013]

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

(8) e=kən-t-sém-s t=e=smúɬec
DET=help-TRANS-1SG.OBJ-3TS LINK=DET=woman
'the woman that helped me' [PM012]

The relative clause in (9) contains a transitive verb, but also the future auxiliary *x^{w}uy'*. (A quantifier *tekm us* precedes the initial determiner as well.)

(9) tékm=us e=x^{w}úy' q^{w}əz-t-éne t=e=n-sɬaʔxa̓ns
all=3CnCl DET=FUT use-TRANS-3OBJ.1SG.TS LINK=DET=1SG.POSS-food
'all the food that I had to use' (lit. 'all the I had to use food') [783cPM]

Finally, in (10), the relative clause contains the negation predicate *tete?*, possessive subject morphology, and a second postion clitic *i?* 'yet,' all of which precede the head NP 'huckleberry.'

(10) e=teté? k=s=q'^{w}íy-t=s=i? t=e=c'əl-c'ále
DET=NEG C=NOM=ripe-IM=3PoCl=yet LINK=DET=AUG-huckleberry
'the huckleberries that weren't yet ripe' [742fFE]

3 Head-final relatives in context

In this section, I will examine the wider discourse contexts for head-final relatives in Thompson. We shall see that the head-final relative is employed where narrow focus falls on the relative clause itself, while the head noun is backgrounded (given) in the discourse. I will make a few observations about issues that this raises for focus marking in Nɬeʔkepmxcín.

I'll use two classic diagnostics for focus. Let's look at some non-relative clause cases to begin with. The first focus diagnostic is the answer to a wh-question. In (11), the wh-question targets a wide VP focus, and we see that B's answer is a verb-initial form (the basic Salish clause type), starting with the verb *nk^{w}isk^{w}u* 'fall into water.' The VP is marked with a syntactic FOCUS (FOC) feature that mediates semantic interpretation of focus (e.g. association of truth conditional particles like *only* – see Koch & Zimmermann 2010 on Thompson). The subject DP *Monik* is BACKGROUND (BG) (von Stechow 1990, Krifka 2006).

(11) VP focus after a wh-question: verb-initial form
a. kénm=meɬ=xeʔe e=Moník.
which=indeed=DEM DET=Monique
'What happened to Monique?' [761lPM]
b. [$_{VP}$ n-k^{w}ís-k^{w}u=xeʔ [e=Moník]$_{BG}$ u=cíʔ u=ɬe=q^{w}uʔ-ʔúy]$_{FOCUS}$
LOC-fall-water=DEM DET=Monique to=there to=DET=water-RFM
'[Monqiue]$_{BG}$ [fell into the river]$_{FOC}$.'

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

In (12), the wh-question *swet* 'who' targets a narrow subject focus. Since predicates are always initial in Thompson Salish matrix clauses (Koch to appear), and DPs are not predicates, B's reply uses a cleft predicate *c'e* to mark the focus on the DP *Sam*. The cleft structure thus maintains a predicate-initial form, and also the generalization that the predicate (here the cleft VP containing the cleft predicate *c'e* and the focused subject DP *Sam*) is marked with a FOCUS feature. BACKGROUND information is in a cleft remnant clause following the focus (see Koch 2008, 2008b for discussion). The generalization for focus marking is thus a syntactic one: the focus is (part of) the matrix predicate (here, VP).

(12) Subject DP focus after a wh-question: DP cleft
a. swét=me=xeʔ k=xáx̌'-m u=cíʔ u=e=syép ....
who=indeed=DEM C=climb-MDL to=there to=DET=tree
'Who climbed the tree .... (to get the ball that was stuck there)?'
b. [$_{VP}$ c'é he=Sám]$_{FOCUS}$ [u=cíʔ e=xáx̌'-m]$_{BACKGROUND}$.
CLEFT DET=Sam to-there COMP=climb-MDL
'It was [Sam]$_{FOCUS}$ [that climbed (the tree) there]$_{BACKGROUND}$.' [761gPM]

A second common diagnostic for focus is a contrastive configuration where two symmetrical phrases, differing in one element (the focus), stand in opposition (e.g. Rochemont 1986, Rooth 1992, Féry & Samek-Lodovici 2006). In (13), speaker B contrasts the subject *Patricia* with the subject *Flora* in speaker A's yes/no question. This subject DP focus is marked via clefting, like in (12). (Note that the contrastive symmetry is not under syntactic identity, since A uses a auxiliary/verb-initial form, while B uses a subject DP cleft. Rather, the symmetry is on the level of focus/background structure.)

(13) Subject DP focus in a contrastive context: DP cleft
a. ʔéx=n'=me=xeʔ=neʔ p'-ə́m e=Flóra
IMPF=Q=indeed=DEM=there hang-MDL DET=Flora
t=e=x^{w}eʔpít-s u=cíʔe, k'éx-es.
OBL=DET=clothes-3POSS to=there, dry-TRANS.3OBJ.3TS
'Did Flora hang up some clothes, to dry?' [819kFE]
b. téʔe. [$_{VP}$ c'é e=Patrícia]$_{FOCUS}$
NEG. CLEFT DET=Patricia
[e=ʔéx k'éx-es e=sṭ́akn-s.]$_{BACKGROUND}$
COMP=IMPF dry-TRANS.3OBJ.3TS DET=sock-3POSS
'No. It's [Patricia]$_{FOCUS}$ that [is drying her socks]$_{BACKGROUND}$.'

While the focus marking system here is characterized as syntactic (a focus feature associates with the matrix predicate), there is also a linear phonological

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

effect: the focus is the first lexical information, while backgrounded information follows the focus. Thus, there is a general FOCUS >> BACKGROUND order (see Mithun 1987 on other North American languages with FOCUS >> BACKGROUND order; Ariel 2010: 209 for discussion).

Now let's look at some discourse contexts where head-final relatives are used. We'll use the same diagnostics for focus to see what effect there is on relative clauses. Example (14) is from a discourse describing two mice in a picture. The relevant contrast set for (14) is {the mouse that is standing on the ground, the mouse that is sitting on the boxes}.

(14) Wh-question targeting narrow focus on a relative clause:

a. hén' kə=ses-q'^{w}íƛ'.
which COMP=STAT-smile
'Which (one) is smiling?'

b. c'é=neʔ [$_{DP}$ e=[$_{RC}$ ʔéx ʔestéɬix n=e=ƛ'əp']$_{FOC}$
CLEFT=there DET=IMPF stand in=D=ground
t=e=[$_{NP}$ k'^{w}etn'íʔ]$_{BG}$] [e=ʔéx ʔes-q'^{w}íƛ']$_{BACKGROUND}$
LINK=DET=mouse COMP=IMPF STAT-smile
'It's the [mouse]$_{BG}$ that [$_{RC}$ is standing on the ground]$_{FOC}$ [that is smiling]$_{BG}$.'
(more literally: 'It's the [$_{RC}$ is standing on the ground]$_{FOC}$ [mouse]$_{BG}$ [that is smiling]$_{BG}$') [631eFE]

In (14), speaker A asks which mouse is smiling. *Mouse* is backgrounded in the prior discourse context – in fact, the speaker does not pronounce it all. The wh-word *hen'* targets the focus, a nominal modifier, in this case a relative clause. In speaker B's answer, we see that, when the narrow focus falls on the relative clause (RC) itself, excluding the head, a head-final relative is employed. In addition, the entire DP containing the relative clause is clefted. The effect is that the focused relative clause is the leftmost lexical content of the utterance, while all backgrounded information, including the head NP and the final cleft clause, follows the focus in the linear string. This head-final relative clause, notably, also violates the Same Side Filter (Ross 1973), which mitigates against relative clauses whose main predicate (here the verb 'stand') is separated by additional lexical material from the head NP modified by the relative clause.

Note that the syntactic focus marking that I have provided in the bracketing in (14) is rather different from that in (11-13), since it is associated with the relative clause (RC), and not with the matrix cleft-VP predicate. We may well wonder if this is truly grammatical focus marking, or just pragmatically inferred, given that Koch and Zimmermann (2010) showed that the truth conditional operator 'only' must associate with the focused predicate. An alternative, which maintains the focus=predicate generalization, is to focus mark

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

the entire cleft predicate as before, but mark 'mouse' as backgrounded within this. Here we may follow Aloni and van Rooy (2002: 26), who assume that "a which-phrase gives rise to the presupposition that the set over which it ranges is already given as a topic," where topics are backgrounded. In (14), 'mouse' is the set being ranged over by the *hen'* phrase. Under this analysis, the FOCUS and BACKGROUND marking would look as in (14'):

(14') b. [$_{VP}$ c'é=ne ʔ [$_{DP}$ e=[$_{RC}$ ʔéx ʔesté ɬix n=e=ƛ' əṕ'] t=e=[$_{NP}$ k'^{w}etn'íʔ]$_{BG}$]$_{FOC}$
CLEFT=there DET=IMPF stand in=D=ground LINK=DET=mouse
[e=ʔéx ʔes-q'^{w}íƛ']$_{BACKGROUND}$
COMP=IMPF STAT-smile
'It's [the [mouse]$_{BG}$ that [$_{RC}$ is standing on the ground]]$_{FOC}$ [that is smiling]$_{BG}$.'
(more literally: 'It's [the [$_{RC}$ is standing on the ground] [mouse]$_{BG}$]$_{FOC}$ [that is smiling]$_{BG}$') [631eFE]

I won't mark the focus/background distinction as in (14') in the rest of this section; rather, I'll stick to the marking in (14), to illustrate what we (at least pragmatically) understand to be the narrow focus in these examples: the relative clause itself. Just bear in mind that this pragmatic marking may not correspond to a formal syntactic FOCUS or BACKGROUND feature.

Let's turn to another discourse that produces a head-final relative. Example (15) comes from a context in which various cuts of meat at a butcher's shop are under discussion. Relevant discourse alternatives for (15) are the set {the meat that is lying on the table, the meat that is hanging}.

(15) Contrastive context targeting narrow focus on a relative clause:
a. e=Róss, ník'-es=n'=xeʔe e=smíyc neʔ n=e=típl.
DET=Ross, cut-TR.3O.3TS=Q=DEM DET=meat there in=DET=table
'Is Ross cutting the meat that is on the table?' [840fFE841cPM]
b. téʔe. c'é=neʔ [$_{DP}$ e=[$_{RC}$ ʔes-ɬwáqs]$_{FOCUS}$ t=e=[$_{NP}$ smíyc]$_{BG}$]
NEG. CLEFT=DEM DET=STAT-hang LINK=DET=meat
[e=ʔéx ník'-es]$_{BACKGROUND}$
COMP=IMPF cut-TR.3O.3TS
'No. It's [the meat]$_{BG}$ [$_{RC}$ that's hanging]$_{FOC}$ [that he's cutting]$_{BG}$.'
(more literally: 'It's the [$_{RC}$ hanging]$_{FOC}$ [meat]$_{BG}$ [that he's cutting]$_{BG}$')

In (15), speaker A uses a yes/no question to ask if Ross is cutting the meat that is on the table. The head NP *smiyc* 'meat' is backgrounded in the context, being overtly given in A's question. Parallel to (13), speaker B employs corrective focus to say that it is the meat that is hanging that Ross is cutting (not

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

the meat on the table). This gives rise to narrow focus on the relative clause itself. The target structure once again employs a head-final relative, and again the whole DP containing the relative clause is clefted. Once more the effect is for narrowly focused information to linearly precede all backgrounded information.

The final example I will look at is the relative clause from (10). Speakers were provided the discourse context in (16), which they then translated into Nɬeʔkepmxcín. In the target clause, *then he ate some huckleberries that weren't even ripe*, the head noun *huckleberries* is backgrounded from the previous sentence, while the relative clause *that weren't even ripe* is not. This contrasts huckleberries that are ripe (which we typically eat) with huckleberries that are not ripe.

(16) CONTEXT: Tom picked and ate some huckleberries. He was very hungry though, so then he ate some huckleberries that weren't even ripe. [742fFE]

(17) ʔe s=[$_{VP}$ ʔúpi-s e=[$_{RC}$ teté ʔ
and NOM=eat-TRANS.3OBJ.3TS DET=NEG
k=s=q'^{w}íy-t=s=iʔ]$_{FOCUS2}$ [t=e=[$_{NP}$ c'əl-c'ále]$_{BG}$]]$_{FOCUS1}$
C=NOM=ripe-IM=3PoCl=yet LINK=DET=AUG-huckleberry
'And then he [ate the [huckleberries]$_{BG}$ that [weren't yet ripe]$_{FOC2}$]$_{FOC1}$.'

In (17), the final utterance of this context is shown in Nɬeʔkepmxcín. Consistent with the previously observed pattern, the speaker produces a head-final relative, such that the focused relative clause precedes the backgrounded head NP *c'əlc'ále*. Unlike the cases in (14) and (15), however, the entire DP containing the relative clause is not clefted here. In fact, it appears in a verb-initial utterance, which marks a focus on the VP (11). Conceivably, this utterance thus contains two foci, FOCUS1 and FOCUS2 as I have indicated: the speaker firstly marks the VP (that Tom *ate the huckleberries that weren't ripe*) as focused new information, and in addition marks the relative clause as contrastively focused (i.e. unripe versus ripe huckleberries) (see Koch & Zimmermann 2010, Koch 2011, on focus marking within a speaker's discourse turn). The use of the head-final relative here may thus signal focus marking within the in situ nominal argument (see Rooth 1992 on the focus operator attaching to the N' level of syntax in "farmer" sentences). This again raises the question of whether with FOCUS2 we are dealing with a different sort of focus marking than the strictly matrix VP-oriented focus marking of FOCUS1 and in (11-13).

4 Conclusion

Previous work on focus in Thompson and other Salish languages has shown that focus is associated with the matrix predicate (see 11-13). Head-final relatives

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

also seem to be associated with narrow focus on the relative clause, but do not match the general focus=predicate strategy, since relative clauses cannot be matrix predicates.

Because Thompson Salish is strictly predicate initial, the effect of the focus=predicate strategy in (11-13) is also to linearize focused information before backgrounded information. In head-final relative contexts, we have seen the same FOCUS >> BACKGROUND ordering, though within the DP and not necessarily in the clausal domain (e.g. in an in situ DP in 17). Thus, the focus account of head-final relatives looks like it has promising parallels in the general focus marking system, but in terms of linearity, **not** FOCUS features on the VP.

Does this mean that we give up the syntactic characterization of focus=predicate? In that case, we would have to account for our focus marking prosodically, in terms of left alignment: roughly, the focus is the leftmost lexical material in the focus domain (see Koch 2008; also Truckenbrodt 1995).

It is not clear, though, that this is a good solution. The focus sensitive particle *ƛ̓u?* 'only' associates strictly with syntactically marked foci (Koch & Zimmermann 2010; Rooth 1996). In (18), *ƛ̓u?* 'only' can associate with the matrix verb or VP, but crucially not with in situ DPs. This is consistent with the syntactic analysis where the association of *ƛ̓u?* 'only' is sensitive to a syntactic focus feature on the matrix VP, but not to linear order in a nominal (or verbal) domain.

This suggests that there may be two focus marking strategies operating in the language. The syntactic strategy is targeted by focus sensitive particles and is thus relevant for truth conditional uses of focus, while the prosodic strategy (left-alignment) has no apparent truth-conditional effects. The syntactic focus strategy (FOCUS marking on the matrix predicate) can be only used once per matrix clause, while the prosodic strategy can be used in every relevant prosodic domain (e.g. in each phonological phrase). Whether the linear focus marking in head-final relative observed here can be reduced to a pragmatic effect, or whether we are dealing with a truly different type of grammatical focus marking here, is an issue for future research.

(18) [$_{VP}$ nʕʷɬqʷ-əḿ=kn=ƛ̓u?=ne? t=e=he?úse?]$_{FOCUS}$.
boil-MDL=1SG.InCl=only=DEM OBL=DET=egg
'I only [$_{VP}$ boiled an egg]$_{FOC}$.' / 'I only [$_{VP}$ boiled]$_{FOC}$ an egg.'
(NOT * 'Only [$_{DP}$ I]$_{FOC}$ boiled an egg.' / * 'I boiled only [$_{DP}$ an egg]$_{FOC}$.')

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Flora Ehrhardt and Patricia McKay for their patience and teaching. Thanks to Shin Ishihara for asking about what happens to focus inside

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

relative clauses, and to participants of the Workshop on the Syntax of Relative Clauses for helpful feedback, and their own idea-generating presentations. This work has been supported by a Jacobs Research Grant, a SSHRC postdoctoral Research Fellowship, and a Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst Research Fellowship to the author. All errors, of course, are my own.

References

Ariel, M. (2010). *Defining pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beck, D. (1997). Rheme, theme, and communicative structure in Lushootseed and Bella Coola. In *Recent trends in Meaning-Text Theory*, ed. Leo Wanner, 93-135. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Benner, A. (2006). The prosody of Senchóthen. Paper given at *The 41st ICSNL*, University of Victoria.

Davis, H. (2004). Locative relative clauses in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). In *Papers for the 39th ICSNL*, eds. J.C. Brown and Tyler Peterson, 83-116. Vancouver: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics 14.

Davis, H. (2007). Prosody-focus dissociation and its consequences. Paper presented November 10, 2007, Nagoya, Japan.

Davis, H. (2010). A unified analysis of relative clauses in St'át'imcets. *Northwest Journal of Linguistics* 4(1): 1-43.

Davis, P. & Saunders, R. (1978). Bella Coola syntax. In *Linguistic studies of Native Canada*, eds. Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye, 37-66. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Downing, L. & Mtenje, A. (2011). Un-WRAP-ing prosodic phrasing in Chichewa. *Lingua* (to appear).

Féry, C. & Samek-Lodovici, V. (2006). Focus projection and prosodic prominence in nested foci. *Language* 82(1): 131-150.

Hulsey, S. & Sauerland, U. (2006). Sorting out relative clauses. *Natural Language Semantics* 14: 111-137.

Koch, K. (2006). Nominal modification in N̓e?kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). In *MIT Working Papers on endangered and less familiar languages: Salishan volume*, eds. Shannon T. Bischoff, Lynnika Butler, Peter Norquest, and Daniel Siddiqi, 127-158. Boston: MIT.

Koch, K. (2008). *Intonation and focus in N̓e?kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish)*. Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.

Koch, K. (2008b). Some issues in the structure and interpretation of clefts in N̓e?kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). In *Papers for the 43rd ICSNL*, eds. Christiana Christodolou and John Lyon, 97-120. Vancouver: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics.

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

Koch, K. (2011). Watering the garden and stepping on snakes: an animated story and association with focus in Nɬeʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). In *Papers for the 46th ICSNL*, ed. John Lyon, 49 pages. Vancouver: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics.

Koch, K. (to appear). Revisiting translation effects in an oral language: Emphatic topics in Salish. In *Multilingual discourse production: synchronic and diachronic perspectives. Series: Hamburg studies on multilingualism*, eds. Svenja Kranich, Viktor Becher, Steffen Höder and Juliane House. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Koch, K. & Zimmermann, M. (2010). Focus sensitive operators in Nɬeʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, eds. Martin Prinzhorn, Viola Schmitt and Sarah Zobel, 237-255. Vienna: Universität Wien Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Krifka, M. 2006. Association with focus phrases. In *The Architecture of Focus*, eds. Valeria Molnar and Susanne Winkler, 105-136. Berlin: Mouton.

Kroeber, P. (1997). Relativization in Thompson Salish. *Anthropological Linguistics* 39(3): 376–422.

Kroeber, P. (1999). *The Salish language family: reconstructing syntax.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Liversedge, S., Paterson, K. & Clayes, E. (2002). The influence of 'only' on syntactic processing of 'long' reduced relative clause sentences. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 55(1): 225-240.

Mithun, Marianne. (1987). Is basic word order universal? In *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, ed. Russel Tomlin, 281-328. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ni, W., Crain, S. & Shankweiler, D. (1996). Sidestepping garden paths: the contribution of syntax, semantics and plausibility in resolving ambiguities. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 11: 283–334.

Rochemont, M. (1986). *Focus in generative grammar.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75-116.

Rooth, M. (1996). Focus. In *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*, ed. Shalom Lappin, 271–297. London: Blackwell.

Ross, J.R. (1973). The same side filter. In *Papers from the 9th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, eds. Claudia Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark, and Ann Weiser, 549-559. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Sauerland, U. (2004). The interpretation of traces. *Natural Language Semantics* 12: 63–127.

Sedivy, J., Tanenhaus, M., Chambers, C. & Carlson, G. (1999). Achieving incremental semantic interpretation through contextual representation. *Cognition* 71: 109-147.

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch

Thompson, L. & Thompson, M. (1992). *The Thompson language*. Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8.

Thompson, L. & Thompson, M. (1996). *Thompson River Salish dictionary*. Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 12.

Truckenbrodt, H. (1995). *Phonological phrases: their relation to syntax, focus and prominence.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

von Stechow, A. (1990). Focusing and background operators. In *Discourse Particles*, ed. Werner Abraham, 37-84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Weinert, R. (2004). Relative clauses in spoken English and German - their structure and function. *Linguistische Berichte* 197: 3-51.

Wiltschko, M. (2011). What does it take to host a (restrictive) relative clause? In *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle of the University of Victoria 21(2)*, ed. Matt Richards. Victoria: WPLC. 45 pages.

© 2012 Karsten A. Koch