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0. Introduction. Once again the preprint system of the Salish Conference is producing the desired effect of meaningful exchanges. Whereas usually a paper in the preprints prompts a note from another participant, this time my paper on the Colville Imperatives prompted a different kind of response from Professor Kinkade. On July 19, 1980, he sent me a substantial list of Columbian (On) imperatives. The list consists of 129 items, subdivided into the following groups:

Columbian Imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrans.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. intrans + -t</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. intrans + -m</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. intrans + -tl</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. intrans. - double predicates</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. trans. - 3rd sg. obj.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. trans. - 1st sg. obj. (stressed)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. trans. - 1st sg. obj. (unstressed)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. trans. - 1st pl. obj.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. trans. - reflexive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. trans. - -min (stressed) (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. trans. - -min (unstressed) (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. trans. - -min (unstressed) (1st sg. obj.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. trans. - -min (unstressed) (reflexive)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. trans. - -min (-ms-) (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. trans. - -min (after -xjx)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. trans. - -min (after -xax)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. causative (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. causative (1st sg. obj.) [irregularities?]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. causative (-stma)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Redirectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. -xj- (stressed) (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. -xj- (stressed) (1st sg. obj.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. -xj- (unstressed) (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. -xi- (unstressed) (1st sg. obj.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. -x- (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. -x- (1st sg. obj.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. -xj- (1st pl. obj.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. -xj- (3rd sg. obj.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. -xax</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. -s-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Plural imperatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Intrans.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. intrans. - -m</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. intrans. - -tl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. -min (reflexive)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Negative &quot;imperatives&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kinkade's headings and sub-headings suggest a straight-forward analysis of the On imperative system, based on a less transparent analysis of the transitive/intransitive system of the language. In the note that accompanied the list, Professor Kinkade made only two remarks to clarify points of analysis in the list: (1) "the
1st or 2nd person possessive (both are the same) is put in the middle of kas- replacing the a." (2) "As to the imperative [marker], I guess I have to consider it a clitic, rather than a suffix."

In order to incorporate the Om data into my larger paper on Interior Salish Imperatives, I took the following minor liberties (the intent, of course, is not to re-analyze, but to make my discussion of these data more understandable): (1) I have ignored Kinkade's suggestion that the imperative marker is a clitic, except to point out at the appropriate place why I think he made the suggestion; (2) I have relabeled Kinkade's 10th and 14th groups to read intransitive rather than transitive; (3) in all cases where Kinkade analyzes -min- (stressed or unstressed) I have segmented out the n, and assigned it to the transitive -nt. What follows, then, is a description of the Om imperatives as I induce from the Kinkade data (all 129 forms will be accounted for).

1. Columbian Intransitive Imperatives. The Om intransitive sg impv suffix is -ta? added to any intransitive stem. For example,

1. k'ip-ta? don't cry 8. t'mk'U-m-ta? pump water
3. cq'sna?ta? listen 10. 1kw-1lx-ta? get away
4. x'ús-as-ta? hurry up 11. lÁq-lx-ta? sit down
5. cnóx'-t(t)a? come here 12. poq'-n-cú(t)-ta? powder yourself -n-cut2
6. cmáqín-m-ta? come in 13. xalk-m-n-cú(t)-ta? move in a circle -m-n-cut2
7. ciátk'p-m-ta? start a fire 14. ýax-m-n-cú(t)-ta? move (over) a little -m'n-cut2

I presume that, as in Colville, forms 1-14 constitute full impv sentences. Again, as in Cv, they may occur in (longer) imperative constructions. The Om data show that intransitive impv's are followed by what I judge to be either (1) inflected transitive predicates in the indicative mode, or (2) uninflected intransitive predicates:

15. ?inwi-ta? ?ani-nt-x' ťá take him over -x'
16. " c'q'U-nt-x' ťá you read it "
17. ?ixa? ?inwi-ta? x'wy-nt-x' here, you hold him "
18. " " k'â(n)-nt-x' you'd better take it "
19. " " ?ack'â-st-x' hold it "
20. lóplápst-ta?3 saw-nt-p you guys ask him go
126. húy-ta? nóx'w' walk/go fast
127. k'ex-ta? nóx'w' you'd better go to sleep
128. tiì-ta? tìx
129. ?itx-ta? til
The Cm intransitive plural imperative suffix complex is -wan-ta’, as in the following examples:

22. ?ucacqa?-wan-ta? get out of here
23. m¹tm-wan-ta? rest
24. lik’-iyinx-wan-ta? get out of here
25. lix-mn-ct-wan-ta? lie down
26. cîk-mn-ct-wan-ta? stand up

2. Cm (Di)transitives. (Kinkade’s transitives and directives). A sparkling example of a parallel phenomenon in two related languages (another will be pointed out presently) is the conspicuous scarcity in Kinkade’s Cm data of -st imperative forms matching the Cív case where “the -st imperatives are seldom recorded in texts and [are] difficult to elicit.” There is no Cm example of -st suffixed directly to a root, and only seven examples of -st following the transitive stem formative -m. And while Kinkade analyzes (at least four of) these forms as containing -mín- (cf group 15), the fact remains that -st follows an extended stem only in rare instances (if the list is indicative of all of actual frequency). Examples of -m-st, with 3rd sg. obj. are:

27. xat-m-s(t)-ta? lift it
28. nœqin-m-s(t)-ta? take him in
29. tjom-áp-m-s(t)-ta? straighten out the rope
30. wäl-m-s(t)-ta? tilt it
31. ‘váist-m-s(t)-ta? pack it

Examples of -m-st with 1st sg. obj. are:

32. tâx’-m-st-ux’-ta? leave me alone
33. kâ-n-ux’-ta? listen to me

2.1. -nt Imperatives. The Cm transitive imperative is formed by adding -ta? to a (di)transitive stem. In its turn, -ta? may be preceded by an object pronoun:

(1) -cx’ 1st sg. obj. with -nt and -it paradigms; (2) -ux’ 1st sg. obj. with -st and -x(i)t paradigms; (3) -1- 1st pl. obj. 3rd person object is θ.

Examples (with 3rd person obj.) following -nt:

34. ³ácx-n(t)-ta? look at him
35. k’á?o-n(t)-ta? take a bite
36. cîk’-n(n)-ta? pull it
37. púx’-n(t)-ta? blow it
38. k”už(n)-n(t)-ta? lend it to him
39. xɕq-n(t)-ta? pay it
40. x”aw-n(t)-ta? pierce it
41. k-tq-ik(n)-n(t)-ta? put the brake on
42. k-tx’- ánå-n(n)-ta? add some more
43. katxénqî(n)-n(t)-ta? cover it
44. čamí-n(t)-ta? bring it
45. k”h(n)-n(t)-ta? take it
Examples (with 3rd person object) following m-nt:9

46. n-ckⁿ-ⁿp-m-n(t)-ta?
drag it

47. saí-m-n(t)-ta?
let him be

48. nalt-m-n(t)-ta?
forget him, forget about it

49. káix-m-n(t)-ta?10
give it away

50. 'cxⁿ-mí-n(t)-ta?11
throw/spill it out

Examples (with 3rd person obj.) following {xix} - m - nt12

51. xolt-xix-m-n(t)-ta?
ask him for that

52. kⁿ-xóx-m-n(t)-ta?
lend him s.t.

53. kⁿ-xós-xáx-m-n(t)-ta?
show it

Examples (with 1st person sg. obj. -cxⁿ) following -nt:

54. 'acxⁿ-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?14
look at me

55. c-na-múl-c(n)-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
bring me water to drink

56. kⁿúl(n)-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
lead it to me

57. n-qs-íkⁿ(n)-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
scratch my back

58. n-?áwt-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
come with me

59. ?áwt-áp-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
follow me

60. t-kiⁿ-pla?a-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
pray for me

61. ?ani-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
take me

62. kⁿ-cxⁿ-ús-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
put drops in my eye

63. kʷáw-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
get out of the way

64. t-xap-áws-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
cover me

65. k-tp-áña?a-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
cover me

66. kⁿ-?ám-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?
wait for me

Examples (with 1st sg. obj. -cxⁿ) following -m-nt:

67. lkⁿ-íylx-m-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?15
get away from me

68. xák-naⁿ-m-n(t)-cxⁿ-ta?15
listen to me

Examples (with 1st pl. obj. -l-) following -nt:

69. ?ácx-nt-l-ta?
look at us

70. kⁱⁿ-nt-l-ta?
bless us

71. kⁱⁿ-pla?a-nt-l-ta?
bless it for us
2.2. **-it Imperatives.** -it imperatives are formed as follows:

Examples (with 3rd person obj.) following -it:

72. qiıy-ıt(t)-ta? write it to her
73. khā-ıt(t)-ta? take it from him
74. ?anî-ıt(t)-ta? take it to him
75. ki-ıy-ıt(t)-ta? change it for him

Examples (with 1st sg. obj.) following -it:

76. canî-ıt(t)-cx”-ta? bring it to me
77. n-miy-ıı-ıt(t)-cx”-ta? translate it for me
78. çq”-ıı-ıt(t)-cx”-ta? read/name it to me

Example (with 1st pl. obj.) following -ııt:

79. kiş”-pîa-ıt(t)-1-ta? bless it for us

2.3. **-x(ıt) Imperatives.** -x(ıt) imperatives are formed as follows:

Examples (with 3rd person obj.) following -x(ıt):

80. qiıy-xı(t)-ta?16 write to her stressed
81. kai-xı(t)-ta? give him something unstressed
82. n-xı-çı-x(t)-ta? ask for food for your friend unstressed

Examples (with 1st sg. obj.) following -x(ıt):

83. q’ol-xıxt-ux”-ta?17 roast it for me stressed
84. kiş”-xıxt-ux”-ta? pray for me
85. qiıy-xt-ux”-ta? write for me
86. t-kîş”-xt-ux”-ta? pray for me unstressed
87. t-xol-k’ol”-xt-ux”-ta? roll me a cigarette
88. t-pulk”-ıı-xt-ux”-ta? roll me a cigarette

2.4. Other ditransitive imperatives. Similarly to Cv, Om ditransitives with -tuit may be imperatives with the suffixation of -ta?:

89. k’un-s-tuit(t)-ta?18 show it
90. k’un-tuit(t)-ta? lend him that

Whereas I still do not know if/how Cv makes imperatives of -xix forms, Kinkade gives two examples of -xax impvts:19

91. saw-xix-ta? you ask
92. kiwan-xax-ta? get out of his way

3. Negative imperatives. The Om negative impvts work in ways reminiscent of their Cv cognates. As in Cv, the predicate lut 'not' is followed by an unrealized intransitive form. A second person possessive infixed (homophonous with the 1st person possessive) is added in the unrealized prefix. I presume that all these forms are ambiguous, e.g. lut kishint would translate both 'don't get mad' and 'I won't get mad'. While most of Kinkade's examples are intransitive stems,
93. kü-can-ta? lút kis-wwáwlx be quiet, and don't say anything
94. " " kis-acíwo't " " " " " "
95. lút kis-ʔiʔín don't you eat
96. " kis-wwáwlx " " run
97. " númas kis-yúpa? " " play any more
98. " kis-ʔímt " " get mad
99. " kis-xóst " " lost
100. " kis-ʔúʔc " " fat
101. " kis-taʔáʔtxa " you get your feet wet
102. " kis-iaʔaʔincút " get wet
103. " kis-sawxás " ask

three of them are (probably) middle stems:
104. lút kis-ʔíšíl-m don't you dare
105. " kis-ptíxʷ-m " " spit
106. " númas kis-ʔíšíl-m quit stealing, don't you steal any more

Kinkade's list has no examples of Om forms equivalent to the elaborate system of four Cv middle unrealized stems.

4. Conclusions. We have a Om imptv system that approaches the complexity of the Cv system. Its salient features are: (1) the imptv suffix is -ta? for both transitives and intransitives; (2) a trace of the original intransitive plural marker *-wy remains in the forms -wuʔ-ta?. The Om system lacks any parallels to (1) the Cv "second hand imptv", and to (2) the elaborate Cv middle unrealized forms. Additional data would clarify whether or not the Om "double imptv" pattern like their Cv counterparts.

A number of forms in the Om list remain unexplained and/or deserve individual comments:

(1) How do we explain the five forms that Kinkade labels 'causative (3rd sg. obj.):
107. 'can-m-stúxʷ-ta? tighten it
108. tłam-stúxʷ-ta? straighten out the rope
109. 'xalκ-m-stúxʷ-ta? crank the car
110. 'pəlκ-m-stúxʷ-ta? turn it over
111. kòʔ-m-stúxʷ-ta? change it

What is -stúxʷ? (It is not to be identified as -st-uxʷ, where -uxʷ '1st sg. obj.' because it is stressed.)

(2) What is the make up of
112. τəxʷ'xstíνxʷ-ta? take me across the river

(Kinkade labels the form 'causative (1st sg. obj.) and questions it: 'irregularities?').
(3) What is the make up of

Kinkade includes it in a list of 'intrans. - double predicates', but that does not explain (1) where the second predicate might be; (2) why this is intransitive. It seems to me that this is sa-wnt-p 'you pl. ask him', a simple transitive, followed by -ta. This might be (one of the) reason(s) why Kinkade would call -ta a clitic.

(4) What conditions the loss of 1 (\(-ilx>-ix\)) in

Kinkade lists these as 'intrans. - ilx', but does not elaborate on the absence of 1.

(5) \(\text{tax}"\text{man}-ta?\) is glossed by Kinkade as 'leave me alone!' (?) and listed as a 'trans. - min (unstressed) (1st sg. obj.)', but no explanation is offered why the form is what it is and not the expected *\(\text{tax}"\text{man-cx"-}ta?\).

(6) \(\text{?amc}ax\text{w}ta?\) 'feed me' is listed by Kinkade as the only example of 'trans. - 1st sg. obj. (stressed)' i.e., -\(\text{cx"}\) is analyzed as the stressed variant of -\(\text{cx}^w\). -\(\text{cx"}\) might just be an exceptional form. Note that it occurs with \(\text{?am}t\) 'feed', a root that is problematic in other respects. For example, its Shuswap cognate is one of only three roots that comprise Kuiper's Class A of Sh transitive verbs (verbs that take -t, not -\(nt\), in the transitive). Cf. J. Shapard's paper in the preprints, p. 231.

(7) Several forms, all based on the root \(\text{y}kai\), are aberrant in an interesting way.

Except for 121, these forms do not seem to have a transitivizer in their surface phonetics. Of course, it is possible (and desirable) to show that these forms have -t in their underlying structures, as follows:

The -t is justified by 121. \(\text{c-kai-t-}1-\text{ta}\), where it shows up in the surface. On the other hand, the absence of -\(n\) (-\(n-t\) 'trans') is not explained— but interestingly enough, the Sh root \(\text{y}kox\) 'give to' belongs to the 3-member class (just mentioned) that take -t, not -\(nt\), to form a transitive stem. The roots are probably related. Finally, note that this root is extended to \(\text{kaim}a\) to form a transitivizable stem, to form

122. \(\text{kaim}a-n(t)-\text{ta}\) give it away

(8) Finally, I do not know how to analyze these forms:

\begin{align*}
123. \text{ik}^w-\text{I}1\text{x}-s-\text{ta}\ \ & \text{take it away} \quad -\text{s} \ '7' \\
124. \text{x}^w\text{y}a-\text{g}-s-\text{ta}\ \ & \text{get after him} \quad " \\
125. \text{x}^w\text{y}a-\text{a}-\text{sn}-\text{ta}\ \ & \quad -\text{sn} \ '7'
\end{align*}
FOOTNOTES

1. Here I am not addressing the question of how many transitivizers with -m Om has (-mi- and -min-; or, -m- and -min-; or some such). I am segmenting the n so as to isolate -nt- 'trans' which is pan-interior.

2. Kinkade analyzes 12. as 'trans. reflexive'; 13. and 14. as 'trans. -min+ reflex. Of course I can't disagree with an analysis of which I don't know the arguments. However, the Cv cognates raise two points of contention: (1) pronominal reference in the Cv non-imperatives is accomplished with the intrans pronominals, so that one would call these intransitive; (2) since in Cv there are forms

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{-\text{cut}\} \\
&\{-\text{scut}\} \\
&\{-\text{mncut}\} \\
&\{-\text{mscut}\}
\end{align*}
\]

which parallel forms with

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{-\text{nt}\} \\
&\{-\text{st}\} \\
&\{-\text{mnt}\} \\
&\{-\text{mst}\}
\end{align*}
\]

one would naturally segment the n away, rather than identifying it with -min.

3. I take note of the fact that in this instance /t-t/ > [tt]. This differs from the 3rd person obj. impv forms where -nt-tna? or -nta?. Cf below for further discussion.

3b. Items 25 and 26 comprise Kinkade's set No. 36.

4. Kinkade analyzes these forms as containing -min (-ms-) with 3rd sg. obj.

5. This root seems to behave like Cv 'wit', with two allomorphs.

6. Kinkade simply calls these 'causatives (1st sg. obj.)' but questions them as 'irregularities?'. The allomorphic distribution of 1st sg. obj. is discussed below.

7. Note how this distribution parallels the distribution of the Cv 2nd person obj. pronouns, where

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{-nt-}\text{s-(i)n} \quad \text{vs} \quad \text{-st-}\text{um-an} \\
&\text{-it-}\text{s-(i)n} \quad \text{vs} \quad \text{-xit-}\text{um-an}
\end{align*}
\]

This isn't just a coincidence. It is proof that -nt and -it pattern together, as do -st and -xit, in both languages.

8. I don't know if this is the best possible segmentation. But it makes sense comparatively and seems to me preferable to either -n-ta? or -nt-a?.

9. Kinkade analyzes all these forms as transitive forms containing unstressed -min. In my Cv impv paper I gave no examples of m-nt to keep my focus on the impvts. Cv m-nt forms are grammatical as I describe them elsewhere.

10. For a discussion of this root, cf. section 4. (?).
11. Kinkade analyzes this form as containing stressed -mín.

12. For a discussion of CV -xix cf...

13. Kinkade gives one form with -caxw (stressed) 1st sg. obj. Since it is the only example with stressed -caxw I would consider it exceptional. Cf section 4. (6).

14. This would be set up as ?acx-nt-sxw-t.

15. Kinkade analyzes these forms as containing the unstressed form of -mín.

16. Compare this form with ex No. 72.

17. Refer to footnote 7 for a comment on the distribution of -cxw/-uxw.

18. Kinkade questions '[includes causative?] referring to the s preceding -tuit. Note that s is likewise present in the CV cognate. Preprints, p. 213.

19. These may turn out to be intransitive.
FOOTNOTES

1 My research on Colville has been sponsored by NSF, NEH, the Jacobs Fund of the Whatcom Museum, and the Universities of Hawaii and Montana. I gratefully acknowledge their support. My thanks to my informants, principally Mrs Helen Toulou, Mr Peter Seymour, Mrs Madeline DeSautel (all deceased), and Mrs Dora DeSautel.

1 Occasionally -xa?xa reduces to the stylistic variant -x.

2 An alternative would be to analyze the imptv suffix as -a?nt (and middle forms such as x'a?am could be analyzed similarly xalkam--likewise non-control k'ap). Interestingly, several of the roots that require a in the imptvs and middles occur in attested ablaut pairs that function outside the imptv and middle constructions: x'ic / x'ic; iixp / iixp; iik / iik; x'ak / x'ak.

The other roots that take a in the imptv have either i or a in them: (pa?)pin, xalak, cak, x'ia, k'ia (but, for the last root, cf also k'ap). When I understand better CV ablaut I'll be able to see what the relationship between it and these forms with a is. I suspect that at one time two imperatives could be based on each of these roots, with different meanings (possibly indefinite (a) vs definite (i) goal).

3 The last example is semantically odd, but grammatical. It may be impossible to comply with a request to swallow pills for someone else, but the request might actually be made.

4 For a discussion of these cf Mattina and Springer's "A Note on Colville -xix and -(?)uit." MS.

5 'Middle' may not be the best label for these Colville forms, and certainly isn't a very helpful label in general. In Greek, for example, John Hay tells me middle forms have reflexive or purposive ('do something in one's own interest') import, while in Sanskrit middle forms have active meaning. Sanskrit grammarians' efforts to find a difference in meaning to match the difference between the active and middle forms is an effort in historical reconstruction, not helpful/useful to clarify the synchronic situation. I explain my reasons for retaining this label in the concluding paragraph of the section.

6 In her paper 'A Note on Aspect in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan', XIV Salish Conference, 1979, Hebert remarks that "the prefix k's-'unrealized action' may not co-occur on predicates which accept either the -s-t or -n-t marking." She also notes that k's- occurs in what she calls the medio-passive construction. The latter observation is correct, but the former is not. The incompatibility is between k's- and the transitive pronoun affixes, not the transitivizers, as I explain here.

7 Sources for these languages are: Vogt, Hans The Kalispel Language. Oslo, 1940 (Ka); Carlson, Barry F. A Grammar of Spokan: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington. UWPL 4:4, 1972 (Sp); Spock, Brenda J. An Edition of Father Post's Kalispel Grammar. UWPL 1, 1980 (Ka); Keilchard, Gisela A. Cour d'Alene. TAIL 3, 517-707, 1938 (Cr); Kuipers, Aert H. The Shuswap Language. Mouton, 1974 (Sh); Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson Thompson. MS (Th).


9 This is just the indicative.

Some of these plurals are not attested.