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This note concerns the consonantal opposition between \( -s - \) and \( -n - \), usually occurring before ubiquitous \( -t \), an opposition possible on most but not all predicates of Okanagan. Most of the data is from the Nicola Lake dialect of this Interior Salishan language, spoken in British Columbia.

The \( -s - / -n - \) opposition occurs most frequently in constructions such as:

(1) a. \( tsa\ -\ \text{skà} - s\ - \text{tn} \)
   actual - count-e-t-S1
   the my-money/beaver
   "I count my money."

b. \( \text{skà} - n\ - \text{tn} \)
   count-n-t-S1
   the my-money/beaver
   "I count my money."

Two hypotheses have already been proposed for these morphemes.

The following one has been proposed for the contiguous Interior Salishan language, Thompson, by the linguists L. C. and M. T. Thompson

---

1 This work has been supported by a Killam Predoctoral Fellowship at Univ. of British Columbia, 1977 - present, and in part by a B.C. Provincial Museum contract for a word list, Summer 1978.

Thanks are given to the native speakers who patiently teach me of their language; they are identified in later footnotes. Thanks also to Jessica Roberts (UBC), Sandra Chung (UCSD), and especially to Alan Tiberlak (UCLA) who commented on an earlier draft and whose own work on Russian aspect influenced the shape of this note.

Unfortunately, the responsibility for this analysis of Okanagan remains my own.
as marking a lexical causative, implying that
the action or state results from the activity
of some agent who is not in full control;

- n - t
as marking a control transitive, implying
control by the subject.

This is also a possible analysis for (NL) Okanagan and is in fact
generally accepted as a possible analysis for most Salishan languages
in which these morphemes occur. This will be referred to as the
Control Hypothesis.

A somewhat different hypothesis has been proposed for the
Colville dialect of Okanagan, as spoken in Washington state. Mattina
(1978, pp. 91-93) proposes that both of these are transitive constructions
which obligatorily include reference to two and only two persons, an
actor and a primary goal, such that the

- s - t
predicates always imply either purposeful or
customary involvement on the part of the actor
and are characterized as transitives with
co-terminous actor and secondary goal (p. 93);

- n - t
predicates imply reference only to an actor and
a primary goal (p. 91).

This will be referred to as the Customary Involvement Hypothesis.

It is the purpose of this note to propose that this consonantal
alternation - s - / - n - reflects an imperfective/perfective

distinction and to outline some support for this identification. This
will be referred to as the Aspect Hypothesis.

These three hypotheses are similar in that they seek to
explicitly encode semantic features onto morphological categories.
Additionally, the Customarily Involvement Hypothesis and part of the
Control Hypothesis link these semantic features to transitivity, a
class that is not made by the Aspect Hypothesis. The Aspect Hypothesis
will be supported by two types of evidence: by native speaker intuitions
and by the syntax of aspect, i.e., the distribution of certain prefixes,
adverbials, and the interaction with the passive and limited control
constructions. However, before proceeding to this evidence, let us
explore briefly the two aspectual categories of imperfective and
perfective: their frequency of occurrence, their characteristics
and their definition.

That Okanagan may encode this distinction is not unusual when
considering languages more generally. These two aspect categories,
along with a third, were proposed by Friedrich (1974: 536) for the
analysis of aspect systems:

(1) durative, continuative, imperfective, etc.,
(2) punctual, complective, perfective, etc.,
(3) stative, perfect, etc.

The morphology of Russian, for example, encodes the two basic aspect
categories of imperfective/perfective, each of which includes a number
of semantic features not otherwise distinctively marked (cf. Timberlake
1979 for a discussion). Meanwhile, Hopper (1977/78, 1979), who examined
the role of aspect in discourse, notes the universality of this
aspectual distinction.

According to Comrie (1976), the concept of imperfectivity
may be characterized as expressing a continuous or durative situation
as well as a habitual or customary situation, occurring over an extended
period of time, while perfectivity may be characterized as indicating
completed action, as being a resultative, i.e., indicating the successful
completion of a situation. However, perfectivity includes but is not
limited to punctual or momentaneous situations, to situations of short
or long duration, or even to the termination or beginning of a situation
since the perfective denotes a complete situation, with beginning,
middle and end.

Comrie gives definitions of these concepts, as well as the
categories listed above:
- perfectivity indicates the view of a situation as a single
  whole, without distinction of the various separate phases
  that make up that situation; while the imperfective pays
  essential attention to the internal structure of the
  situation. (p. 10)

Both the lists of characteristic semantic features of these two aspectual
categories and their definitions with reference to an external view of
a situation - for perfectivity vs an internal view for imperfectivity
will be relevant to the discussion of the three hypotheses for
- s - / - n - in Okanagan.

Let us now proceed to the support available for the Aspect
Hypothesis, and then to the discussion of the three hypotheses. Two
types of evidence for aspect are available in the data collected to date
for this dialect:
(a) evidence from native speaker intuitions and
(b) evidence from the syntax of aspect, more specifically here,
   i) the distribution of the two prefixes
      ka- 'unrealized action'
      te- 'actually occurring action'
   with respect to the two aspectual categories in question
   ii) the distribution of the adverbial pusti 'still';
   iii) the verbal morphology of the limited control and the
        passive constructions, with reference to the universal tendency
        of languages to associate the passive with perfectivity.

In the data that follows, I will identify the subject pronoun
sets as 'transitive' and 'intransitive', according to the assignment
and practice of Metine, although this terminology may in future work
be shown to be somewhat inexact. The third subject pronoun set will
be identified as subordinate/genitive.

Support is available from the intuitions of several native
speakers who, on separate, unrelated occasions, identified the
distinction as follows:
1. Of these two sentences, the latter was said to be completed,
over with.

(1) a. tɛə ʰɛə - s - tɛn ʰɛə-ɛklɛə
    actual-count- s - tɛi1 the my-money/beaver
trenɛ
    "I'm counting my money.
    "/ "I count my money."

b. ʰɛə - n - tɛn ʰɛə-ɛklɛə
    count- n - tɛi1 the my-money/beaver
trenɛ
    "I count my money."

2. Similarly, the same verbal morphology was identified as
   completed, as just finisheds

(2) n - ɛɛə - n - n ɛɛə
    contained-fry-n-tɛi1 the eggs
trenɛ
    "I fry/fried the eggs."

(3) ɛɛə - n - tɛn ɛɛə
    tie- n - tɛi1 the rope
trenɛ
    "I tie a knot on a rope."

(4) ɛɛə - n - tɛn ɛɛə
    braid-n-tɛi1 the rope
trenɛ
    "I braided the rope." (completed, finished braiding the rope)

3. The - s - t was identified, in a comparison with a medio-passive construction with the same prefix te- s

(5) a. tɛə ʰɛə - Xə - s - tɛn
    actual-whittle- s - tɛi1
    "I'm actually whittling.
    "

b. ʰɛə - tɛn ʰɛə-ɛklɛə
    meio-whittle of
    the my-monay/berry
trenɛ
    "I count my money."

4. Confirmation from other dialect areas is also available.

(6) a. ɛɛə - n - n ɛɛə
    see- n - tɛi1 the our-house
trenɛ
    "I see our house."

b. ɛɛə - tɛi1 of ɛɛə - tɛi1
    see-n - tɛi1 the house-our
trenɛ
    "I see our house."

4 As specified by Joe Pete Saddleman of Quilchena (NL dialect), Okanagan language instructor, in a workshop at UBC, March 25, 1979.

5 As insisted upon by Bernice Baptiste (Penticton dialect) and agreed upon by Joe Pete Saddleman (NL), Herman Laverde (Keremeos dialect), Tillie George (Colville dialect), all language instructors-in-training, Univ. of Victoria, Nov. 28, 1978. Importantly, these speakers represent the geographical spread of the languages, from the northwestern-most area (Quilchena) to the southeastern-most (Colville).
These were again identified as completed action, as done already, in spite of the fact that the -a-t marking is not possible:

c. * aśkātn

d. * ta- aśkātn

Let us now proceed to the distributional evidence which supports the Aspect Hypothesis. The distribution of the two prefixes ke- 'unrealized action' and ta- 'actually occurring action' with respect to -a-t and -a- will be presented first, followed by the distribution of the adverbial ẖāstā 'still'.

For the verbal roots which accept either -a-t or -a- marking, the prefix ta- 'actually occurring action' may co-occur with the -a-t:

(10) a. * ta- ašā"-a-t-ātn
actual-whittle -a-t-ātn trans
“I'm actually whittling.”

Similarly, the te- prefix, 'actually occurring action,' may occur on these roots in a medio-pas.sive constructions.

(15) a. kn te - x'N he
    S1 actual-whittle-media
    Intr
    "I actually whittling."

b. kn te - m t b - 9
    S1 actual-count-media now/today
    Intr
    "I'm counting now."

Let us now examine the occurrence of the adverbial p'utf? 'still,' which is attested with imperfective aspect or with the medio-pasive constructions.

(16) a. p'utf? te - x'N he - s - tfn
    still actual-whittle- s - t - S1 tr
    "I'm still whittling." (and have been doing so for a long time.)

b. p'utf? kn te - x'N he
    still S1 actual-whittle-media
    Intr
    "I'm actually still whittling."

c. p'utf? kn x'N he
    still S1 whittle-media
    Intr
    "I still whittling."

but not with perfective aspects

d. * p'utf? x'N he - n - tfn
    still whittle- n - t - S1 tr
    I still whittled.

The above comparisons suggest a continuative/completive semantic distinction for these morphemes - s - t and - n - t respectively.

- There are however some important limitations on the appearance of perfective - n -(t) and imperfective - s -(t). Not all verbal roots may take either of these markings, as Mattira has noted (1978, p. 102, fn.2). Some roots may take only one of these and are ungrammatical with the other. Examples show that punctual or momentaneous action, i.e., action that does or may not continue, takes only the - n - (t) markings.

(17) a. x'N int 1
    "Take it!"
    take-n - t - y tr imperative

b. * x'N int 1
(18) a. 巴 - n - t - sn 你 拳
   - n - t - 51 the stove
   trn
   downward motion of hand and lower arm from elbow-
   "I put my hand on the stove." (to see if it's warm)

b. * (ts) - 低处

c. * afketn

d. * ts - 低处

(19) a. 升 - n - t 低 - n - 低
   call - n - t 低 / the your-brother/the your-sister
   tr imp
   "Call Dion! / your brother! / your sister!"

b. * 升 - n - 低

c. * 高 - n - 低

(20) a. 高 - n - n 低
   break - n - t - 51 the cup
   tr
   "I break a cup." (on purpose or accidentally)

b. * 高 - n - 低

c. * 拳 - n - 低

(21) a. 低 - n - n 高 - n - 低
   pl. kiss-nose-n-reciprocal
   intr
   "We kiss each other."

b. * 低 - n - n 高 - n - 低

and we repeat here for conveniences

b. 看 - n - n 低 - n - 低 - n
   see - n - t - 51 the house-our
   tr
   "I see our house."

(22) a. 低 - n - 低
   smile; a male's name

b. 低
   happy and smiling all the time;
   smiling.

c. 低 - n - 低
   smile (on both sides), (with diminutive)

d. 低 - n - 低
   "I'm smiling."

Sl actual - dim - smile - redup - s
   intr
   "I'm smiling all the time."

Sl actual - dim - smile - redup - s
   all the time
   intr

f. Danny 临
   "Danny smile."
   - s - medio

g. 低 - n - 低
   "Smile for the elders!"

h. * 低 - n - 低

i. Danny 低 - n - 低 - n - 低
   me smile - s - benefactive - t - 51
   tr
   "Danny smile / smiling at me (continuous-like)."
(23) a. Danny k'w n -ğ4' - us - x - t - s
   me - cont-laugh-face-bene-t S1
   "Danny smiled at me (a 'flash' of a smile).
   
   b. kn ğ4' - n - cdt
   Sl' intr. laugh - n - reflexive

Thus to take, to touch-tasty to call, to break, to kiss exemplify actions which are classified by this language as non-continuous/punctual/non-durative, while to smile is considered as a continuous-type of action. Not only are these aspectual markings limited by the type of verbal root with which they may occur, they are also limited by sentence type. These aspectual markings are not obligatory in certain syntactic constructions. Unless the action is one that is classified by the language as continuous only (cf. (22f,1)), these aspectual markings do not ordinarily occur in a benefactive construction (cf.(4b)) or in a medio-passive construction (cf. (3), (8b), (14a), (15a,b), (16a,c)).

The tendency for the passive construction to carry intrinsic perfective meaning has been discussed, for example, by Delancey (1979). As part of a broader discussion of viewpoint manifestation in aspectual and voice distinctions, he points out that, in the passive which specifies the patient from an agent → patient viewpoint, one is necessarily looking at the termination viewpoint of a situation, hence perfective aspect. In a speaker-oriented, encoding model, Timberlake (1979) examines a number of semantic features for aspect in Russian. Of importance to Okanagan, Timberlake breaks down the definition of the perfective as 'a view of the event as a whole' into a number of oppositions, of which the first of each pair: completed vs attempted, active vs static, momentaneous vs durative, unique vs multiple, is mapped onto perfective aspect. Thus the passive construction which focuses upon the patient and which views the termination point of an event will show perfective morphology in Russian:

(24) Ėtót zëvëd byl postroen Iostrënnymër rabëčëšt
    this factory was bfrt-built foreign workers
    Instr
    "This factory was built by foreign workers."

as it does in (NL) Okanagan

(25) a. ț1 ěx'k ăt'zëd ăn țačf - ě țptl'max
      the ax-grown-up dir-choke-n-tw the old lady
      S3
      "The old men choked the old lady."

b. ěx' țptl'max ă 'păcăf n - tăm țt ț'kš' këp
   the old lady dir-choke-pfr-pass def, indef, old men
   choker marking
   "The old lady was choked by the old men."

7 From class notes, D. R. Perlmutter, Romance Linguistics, Spr. 1979, UCSD.
8 Predictable alveolar CC-simplification - n - t - s → s; similar to - n - t - a (pfr - t - Sl) → nn y n of previous tr examples.
(26) a. ʔuqilus-ə ʔi səfikʷə ʔi səbín\n  coll - pft the man the rope  
   tr
   "The man coil the rope."

b. ʔuqilus - n - təm ʔi səbín ʔi tə səfikʷə
  coll-pft-pass the rope def. indef. man  
   chō
   "The rope was coiled by the man."

(27) ʔuq - n - təm ʔı sədəxət
  see - pft-pass the blackbear  
   chō
   "We seen a blackbear. / A blackbear we/anybody seen./
   A blackbear was seen."

and in these passive constructions with unspecified final subjects:

(28) a. ʔuq xʷənd - s ʔi səwəl\n  you catch-pft the policeman  
   subj
   "You were caught by the policeman."
   (lit.: The policeman caught you.)

b. ʔi səwəl xʷənd n - təm  
   chō
   "The policeman catch (you)."
   (lit.: A caught by the policeman.)

As has already been pointed out, perfective aspect includes a
termination viewpoint of an event and of an agent-patient situation,
and thus tend to mark passive constructions in human languages.
Similarly, a construction marking the limited control of an agent-subject also necessarily emphasizes the termination viewpoint of a
situation. This offers a plausible explanation of why the limited-control
morpheme - nū - occurs with the - n - t perfective marking
rather than with the - s - t imperfective marking. (When - nū -
'limited-control' co-occurs with second consonant reduplication, for
accidental action with no intention or agency on the part of the
subject, an unintentional reading result.)

(29) k̕a - q̕a - nū - n - t - s - n
  slap-acid-tdC.-pft-t-S2 -S1  
   obj tr
   "I slap you unintentionally." (didn't mean to do it)
   (already done)

(30) ʔuq - sələlq̕uq - nū - n - t - xʷ ʔ?
  yes/no Q feel-tdC.-pft-t-S2 know  
   tr
   "Do you feel it?" (thunder hits and ground shakes)

(31) a. ca? - n - t - ʔa ʔigəstəm̕ıx\n  hit-pft - t - S1  
   female's name
   "I hit ʔigəstəm̕ıx."
Let us now examine each of the other two hypotheses in turn, the Control Hypothesis and the Customary Involvement Hypothesis, beginning with the latter. The Customary Involvement Hypothesis, with respect to the -e-t marking, states that the primary reference is to an actor who is customarily or purposefully involved. It can be seen that this notion of customary involvement is indeed compatible with an Aspect analysis since imperfective aspect may and does include reference to a customary, habitual situation or event. Also by shifting the analysis to event or action rather than to an actor, an undefined term, avoids including in the grammar explanations referring to secondary vs. primary goal in constructions which have previously been stated to be only two-place transitives. That -n-t does not have reference to a customarily or habitually involved actor follows from the statement for -e-t and is equally compatible with the Aspect Hypothesis.

Additionally, the Customary Involvement Hypothesis claims that the markings in question -e-t and -n-t occur only with transitive constructions, i.e., only with two-place predicates. I take this to mean that these predicates occur only with two nominals, one of which is a subject and the other a direct object. These aspectual markings do indeed occur most frequently in such constructions. It follows from this claim that the -e-t marking is not expected to co-occur with a subject pronoun which has been identified as intensive. Similarly, the -n-t marking is not expected to co-occur with this same 'intransitive' subject pronoun set in reciprocal
constructions which Mettine has also identified as intersive constructions. The following examples are pertinent to this issue of transitivity.

(34) a. \(q^{\text{a}+1}\)
   S1 were-t intr
   "I'm warm/Heat." 

b. \(q^{\text{a}+1} - s - t\)
   S1 were-impft-t intr
   "I warmed myself/keep warm/warming." 

c. \(x^{\text{a}+1} \text{ wey } - x\)
   go - imp. eg, were-impft-t - imp. eg, intr
   "Go warm yourself!" 

d. \(q^{\text{a}+1} - n - t - x\)
   were-pft-t - 52 trans
   "You keep it warm (like the soup)." 
   "You warmed it (all night) (like covered with blankets)." 

e. \(q^{\text{a}+1} - n - n \text{ qLi eswukuk}\) 
   were-pft-t - 51 the baby trans
   "I warmed the baby." (I brought it close to the fire.) 

f. \(s - n - q^{\text{a}+1} - s - t n\)
   s - contained - were-impft - instrument
   "(a) heater" 

(35) kn \(q^{\text{a}+1} - n - \text{ temp}^\text{w}\) 
   intr 
   "He keep/kept each other warm." 

g. \(q^{\text{a}+1} - n - \text{ temp}^\text{w}\) 
   intr 
   "They keep/kept each other warm." 

h. \(q^{\text{a}+1} - n - \text{ temp}^\text{w}\) 
   intr 
   "They keep/kept each other warm." 

(36) k \(q^{\text{a}+1} - s - a - x\)
   distribute - weep - were-pft - imp. eg, the dead 
   "Cry for the dead" 

Thus, accepting Mettine's (1973) identification of transitivity/intensivity as distinguishing the matrix subject pronoun sets, one can conclude from (34) a,b,c,f,g,h and (35) that the aspectual morphemes - s - and - n - are not restricted to transitive constructions, although these are encoded most frequently with the 'transitive' set of subject pronouns. Moreover, examples (34) f,g,h, (21) a, and (22) b,c,g,h,w,y show that these aspectual morphemes are not dependent on the following - t, identified as 'stative' (Mettine, 1973). Furthermore, examples (22) q,o show that the
the imperfective - a - may co-occur with the benefactive - x - (t).
However, the Customary Involvement Hypothesis limits - a - (t) and
- n - (t) to transitive two-place constructions only and further states
that these do not co-occur with the benefactive. The following examples
may be compared (22)g, i vs (37) i:

(22) g. *ti-lÖème - e - x - t * gi hX - x - Xçep

dis-smile-redup-impt-bene-t the er-pl-grow.up

"Smiles for the elderly" (Yehoshu scato, Su 1978)
i. Denny xwu ti-lÖème - a - x - t - a

as smile-impt-bene-t-53 02

"Denny smile/smiling at/for me."

(37) x t hX Xçep na " - x - t - a t ant15t1Dááx? X pt151máxw

the old.man steel-bene-t-53 some horses the old.lady

"The old men stole a herd of horses for the old lady."

It is pertinent to note that 'smile' in other languages is an
intensive predicate Engl. *smile the people, *smile the banana
French. * sourire les gens, * sourire les bananes. In Oksangoz, the
benefactor in (22)g, i and (37) above is probably not an initial direct
object, in the same way that the indirective construction contains an object
nominal that is not an initial direct objects:

(26) x t hX Xçep na" - a - x - t - a x ke15fiç - a X pt151máxw

the old.man steel-Indirective-t-53 the horses-53 the old.lady
gan

"The old men stole (his) horses from the old lady."

The benefactives in conjunction with examples already cited in the
previous paragraph confirm that these aspectual morphemes are not
limited only to two-place transitive constructions. Moreover, the
- n- benefactive marking occurs in passive constructions which are
superficially at least intensive (cf. (25)b, (26)b, (27), (28)b,
(29)).

Although the Customary Involvement Hypothesis is compatible
with the Aspect Hypothesis with respect to the habitual reference
associated with the - a - marking and the lack of this association
with - n-, a strictly interpreted Customary Involvement Hypothesis
which rests on transitivity as characterized by Metting is not
supported by the data.

Let us now turn to the discussion of the Control Hypothesis
which has two elements that - a - (t) marks a lexical causative
and that - n- (t) marks a control transitive. To support such
an analysis as lexical causative, one would expect to find
productive processes such as that in Turkish:

(39) a. John buz - u eìj - t - ti

ice-ACC melt-C-PST

John melted the ice.

b. buz eìj - di

ice melt-PST

The ice melted.

This Turkish data and explanations were provided by
İnci Özkereçler (UCSD).
The function of the causative morpheme is clear in (39) above. It is less clear in (49) a where it may be a transitivizer instead. Nevertheless the point remains that in a language which encodes lexical causatives, one expects the appearance of an indicative morpheme. In (NL) Dikemegen, however, the -s-t morpheme does not occur as expected, on a comparable predicate 'thaw's:

(40) a. kn s - ts - ʕɛŋx - x t ʃɪq
   S1 s-actual-thaw-prog. indef. meet
   intr
   "I'm thawing out meat/some meet."

b. ʃɪq s - ts - ʕɛŋx - x
   def. meet s - actual-thaw-prog.
   "The meet thawing out."

In other constructions where a lexical causative analysis is tempting, other translations more readily reveal the imperfective aspect consistently encoded in the event:

(41) Inhal - ʔɛ - s - t - n
work - s = impf - t = S1
   "I make him work/I working him."
   (like he's working now)
also takes the -n- marking, thus -n- in itself cannot refer to the full control of the subject. Moreover, -n- occurs as part of the verbal morphology in passive constructions. Examples (28)b and (29) have no specified final subject which is problematic for a Control Hypothesis. In (26)b, the usual passive construction, the final subject is an unlikely candidate for a controller since it is an inanimate rope, and, as for (27), is semantically a patient undergoing the action.

It can further be noted that the Control Hypothesis and the Customary Involvement Hypothesis contradict each other. The former states that the subject of the -n- construction is in control whereas the latter states that the actor (the underlying subject?) is in control in an -e- construction. Since the -n- construction lacks the customary/purposeful reference of the -e- one, then by extension, the -n- marks a construction where the actor is not in full control or not purposely involved. Example (29) repeated here is pertinent.

(29) (trace)  
\[ \text{His friend bruised him up.} \]  
\[ \text{(on purpose)} \]  
\[ \triangle \text{bruised by his friend.} \]

This sentence does not support the Control Hypothesis since it contains no specified subject to be in control. Nor does it support the Customary Involvement Hypothesis since it was identified as a purposeful action which is supposed to be associated with -e- marking.

Thus it has been shown that the Control Hypothesis and the Customary Involvement Hypothesis cannot be stretched to account for all the data. The Aspect Hypothesis (a) offers an explanation for the lexical causative of the Control Hypothesis, (b) includes the assignment of 'customary' reference to -e- (t) of the other hypothesis, (c) accounts for the data presented herein, without depending crucially on transitivity, and (d) allows an explanatory statement of the viewpoint in common to passive and limited control constructions.

The -t morpheme has been frequently referred to in this paper. Although not specifically germane to the identification of -e- and -n- as imperfective/perfective aspect, let us diverge sufficiently to allow a discussion of this morpheme since it frequently occurs alongside these aspectual markings.

According to Mattei (1973, 1974), the -t morpheme encodes stative aspect. The internal structure of the aspectual system appears to support this identification. Let us examine briefly the interaction of stativity with imperfectivity, with inchoatives, with progressives, and with inceptivity.

1) The -t versus -e- t has already been noted for 'were', illustrating stativity with and without imperfectivity. See (42)a and b.
11) Some inchoatives also support this: thus stativity, i.e.,
being in a given state or inchoativity, i.e., getting to or becoming
to that state;

(43) a. kn q'ect [q6'et]     \"I\'m fat.\"
    S1  fat-t
    intr
b. kn q\textsubscript{3}q\textsubscript{6}c \[q0\tilde{e}\tilde{e}] \textsuperscript{10} \"I\'m becoming fat.\"
    S1  fat
    intr

(44) a. \text{\textquoteright}n in-
the-see contained-cold-t now
"My tea\'s really cold."
b. \text{\textquoteright}n in-
the-see contained-cold
"My tea getting really cold."

111) Progressive aspect has been defined by Comrie (1976) as the
combination of continuous meaning and non-stativity. It is notable
then that in (NL)\textquoteleft Okanagan, the progressive aspect morpheme does not
apparently co-occur with the -t morpheme, thus supporting its
identification as stativity;

\textsuperscript{10} The second consonant glottalization for inchoative meaning
here has been described as glottal stop infiltration by Ketina (1973),
these differences reflect different phonological analyses; we are
however describing the same phonetic phenomena.
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(45) kn  e - ts - \text{\textquoteleft}ce - mf - x
  S1  a-actual-count-t-prog.
  intr
  \"I\'m counting.\" (like figuring out the numbers,
balancing the books.)

(46) \text{\textquoteright}n - c\textsubscript{6}k - x
  eggs contained-fry-prog.
  \"eggs frying\"

(47) kn  e - ts - bl\text{\textquoteright}m - x
  S1  a-actual-fish-trap-prog.
  intr
  \"I\'m fish-trapping.\"

(48) n - xalt\text{\textquoteright}e - n - t - s - n
  S1  k\text{\textquoteright}m - ce\text{\textquoteright}g\text{\textquoteright}m - x
  contained-challenge-pft-t-S2  -S1  S2  unrealized-
  obj tr  -stick-game-prog.
  \"I challenge you to play stick game.\"

(49) k\text{\textquoteright}u  e - ts - \text{\textquoteleft}f\text{\textquoteright}m - x
  P1  a-actual-set-progressive
  intr
  \"No eating.\"

(50) a. kn  e - ts - m\text{\textquoteright}ks - x
  S1  a-actual-lie-prog.
  intr
  \"I\'m lying.\"
Interestingly, the imperfective and the progressive may co-occur but without the -t markers:

\[(51)\]
\[\text{kn s - ts - sīlxa?} \]
\[\text{always SI - s-actual-lla} \]
\[\text{intr} \]
\["I always lie."} \]

\[\text{c. mīlxa? - n - n} \]
\[\text{lie - pft - t - SI} \]
\[\text{trans} \]
\["I lied (to him)."} \]

Thus, the encoding of inceptive, progressive and inchoative semantic features without the co-occurrence of -t supports the identification of the letter as stative. If this is the case, then, the encoding of stativity vs activity in Okanagan would be as follows. The internal development characteristic of actives is readily observed in the inchoatives, progressives and inceptives, while the stative which lacks this internal development does not usually co-occur with these morphemes. Hence, the imperfective/perfective distinction appears to exist alongside the active/stative distinction. The two prefixes \(\text{kn-}\) unrealized action and \(\text{te-}\) actually occurring action again tend to cluster themselves with one of the opposition, i.e., with the active rather than with the stative, such as they clustered with the imperfective rather than the perfective.

However, two arguments may be given against the identification of -t as the stative marker. First of all, it occurs in imperatives:

\[(54)\]
\[\text{kn ks - cīsīlxa - sīlxa} \]
\[\text{SI unrealized-bathe-inceptive} \]
\[\text{intr} \]
\["I'm gonna take a bath."} \]

\[(55)\]
\[\text{kn ks - sīgīsīm - sīlxa} \]
\[\text{SI unrealized-sharpen-inceptive} \]
\[\text{intr} \]
\["I'm gonna sharpen." (like a bunch of knives) \]
\[\text{(just before I start).} \]
Since punctual situations automatically involve a change of state, they are automatically dynamic. There can be no such thing as a punctual state. (p. 50)

If states are viewed from within, then they can be referred to as ongoing situations, i.e., as dynamic. So stativity correlates well with imperfectivity but not so well with perfectivity. Thus it is bizarre that, if the - t morpheme marks stativity, that it should occur with both - s - and - n -.

Unlike Russian, iterativity in Okanagan is probably independent of the imperfective/perfective aspectual opposition (cf. Timberlake 1979 for Russian data and analysis). Instead, there is a possibility that the placement of stress may be a means of encoding a repeated event or action, although it is not yet known how widespread and productive this encoding may be.

It is very difficult to see how stativity is compatible with such imperatives.

Secondly, - t occurs regularly with both - s - and - n -.

The semantic features of the - n - perfective includes punctual

However, as Comrie (1976) says:

\[ (57) \]

a. \[ \text{giving-bene-t} \]  
\[ \text{imp. sq. trans.} \]  

b. \[ \text{giving-bene-t} \]  
\[ \text{imp. pl. trans.} \]  

\[ (58) \]

a. \[ \text{clean-pft-t} \]  
\[ \text{the house} \]  
\[ \text{(said to one person)} \]  
\[ \text{imp. sq. trans.} \]  

b. \[ \text{clean-pft-t} \]  
\[ \text{the house} \]  
\[ \text{intr} \]  

\[ (59) \]

a. \[ \text{remove-medio} \]  
\[ \text{intr} \]  

b. \[ \text{remove-medio} \]  
\[ \text{(off the car)} \]  

\[ (60) \]

a. \[ \text{remove-pft-t} \]  
\[ \text{intr} \]  

b. \[ \text{you 51 contained-remove-head-medio} \]  
\[ \text{intr} \]  

"You're taking your hat off."
The complexities of the Okanagan aspectual system have just barely been touched upon. We have seen (1) that the imperfective/perfective distinction includes the semantic features of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>Non-durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-punctual</td>
<td>Punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Non-continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-completive</td>
<td>Compleative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual, customary</td>
<td>Non-habitual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) that the -t morpheme may co-occur with both of these, however progressivity, inchoativity and possibly inceptivity as well, cluster around the absence of this morpheme; (3) the prefixes ke = 'unrealized' and te = 'actually occurring' may occur with imperfectivity and with the absence of -t, the former of which at least looks at and encodes the internal structure of an event or situation; (4) iterativity appears to co-exist with the imperfective/perfective distinction, although this identification is still tenuous.

Much remains to be discovered about aspect in Okanagan. Although it has been shown that imperfective/perfective aspect does not depend crucially on transitivity, there is nevertheless some significant interaction with the constructions and subject pronoun sets previously identified as transitive. This near-limitation is unusual since cross-linguistically, basic aspectual categories are usually obligatory on intransitive and transitive constructions alike. In order to work out the constraints on the use of -s- and -n-, considerable syntactic analysis will be required, especially with respect to subjecthood, its interaction with transitivity and strata or levels of derivation, depending on one's theoretical framework.

The syntax of aspect within complex and compound constructions, especially with respect to sequential or simultaneous action, has not been examined. The discourse function of imperfective vs. perfective aspect has not been considered. For Hopper (1977) discusses the foregrounding function of the perfective, for example, signalling serial events, relating the main story line, and the backgrounding function of the imperfective, for example, narrating on-going events, commenting on the main event and drawing the descriptive background for these chief occurrences. In a similar vein, but for Inuktitut, Kuleff (1979) examines the semantic functions of verbal moods in narrative texts. These will be productive areas for future work in Okanagan.
In Thompson River Salish, \( \text{sy} \) is the surface realization of both underlying \( /\text{i}/\) and \( /\text{I}/\). This involves a quite natural rule \( /\text{i}/ \rightarrow /\text{I}/ \) under stress, actually part of a more general accommodation of \( /\text{i}/ \) under stress to various following consonants (to \( \hat{u} \) before a rounded velar, \( \hat{a} \) before a plain uvular, \( \hat{\delta} \) before a rounded uvular, \( \hat{\theta} \) before a laryngeal). However, when, in the common diminutive 'reduplicative formation, the underlying vowel is separated from the semivowel, the surface vowel reflects \( /\text{I}/\) in both cases, rather than \( /\text{i}/\). There are a few exceptions: those and some cases of variation are usually, if not always, traceable historically to earlier etyma with \( \hat{\theta} \). \( \hat{\theta} \) is not otherwise affected by this replacement, and the diminutive pattern is otherwise describable as involving insertion of a copy of \( \hat{\theta} \) of the stressed syllable directly after that syllable, with regular phonological adjustments. (See examples below.)

While the first accommodation \( (\hat{\theta} \rightarrow I/\text{y}) \) is easily seen as a natural development in a rule-oriented model of historical change, and restitution of \( \hat{\theta} \) is natural enough when the \( \text{y} \) is isolated from it, it seems difficult to formulate a natural rule dynamism to account for the shift of \( \hat{\theta} \) to \( \hat{\text{y}} \) in the parallel forms from \( \hat{\text{y}} \). On the other hand, classical analogical change directly accounts for the forms and the dynamics as well: the large number of cases where diminutives with etymological \( \hat{\theta} \) correspond to simplexes in \( \text{sy} \) provide the model for conversion of those involving etymological \( \hat{\theta} \). The forms exhibiting variation further support this analysis. The case is interesting because it supports the notion of this sort of change operating on the surface, in performance.

In the following examples the infixed diminutive: reduplication is enclosed in brackets; resulting forms are "baby-talk" words where they are not otherwise glossed. The formative also involves glottalization of posttonic resonants.