I. In a working paper I presented at the 1993 Salish Conference, I outlined the aspect system of Okanagan. There I discussed two constructions, one absorptive, and one genitive, each containing a prefix k- which I labeled ‘future.’ The schema of the constructions are, respectively:

1. Absorptive: kn k-s...-mixaxh’x ‘inceptive’
2. Genitive: i-k-s... (mixaxh’x) ‘future’

Absorptive and genitive refers to the person referent sets each construction requires. It will be noted that some future constructions take -an, others do not.

As I said in the 1993 paper, the combination for k-s...-mixaxh’x is the inceptive aspect. And “[because I have called k-s... forms ‘future,’ I regard the label ‘future’ for the principal part of the circumfix, and call ‘inceptive’ the suffixal -mixaxh’x.” In casual speech the k is normally lost in all but the first person of the paradigm, but a careful repetition regularly restores it. The longer allomorph occurs with weak (unstressed) stems, the shorter with strong stems:

Weak stems:
1. k’-s-k-k’a-x’-mixaxh’x? i ti k’-spaxnt i ti t’-paynt?
   we fut-look for-incp the t’ to be-look-in-law the from Blackfoot the
t’ baxax”di’-hakh’x.
   from land-bis

We are looking for a daughter-in-law from the Blackfoot country.

Strong stems:
2. k-s-’h-a-qh’-al-mixaxh’x? i s’ax”-k’a-mark”-im’nax? i t’ wakt’saaxaxap’ i k’-al
   fut-discuss-incp the councilmen the on Friday the to
   almsg”-hax”.

hand-office

There will be a council meeting on Friday at the hand office.

3. k’-i?-’h-a-k’-mixaxh’x 6t’ I spagt.
   very many the fut-discuss-incp the in hastily
   They will be having many Chinook dances in January.

Strong stems:
4. k’-a-k’s-’awax’-ran-i’ x k’l naxanax.
   I fut-go-get groceries-incp to store
   I am going grocery shopping at the store.

5. k’-u k-s-’a-m-x”-s’ x 6n’-x’-takan i k’l p’-saxant.
   we fut-buy-incp I gas to our car
   We are going to buy some gas for our car.

Of the i-k-s...-future forms I said that “[these forms should not be confused with the inceptive forms (kn k-s...-mixaxh’x). These latter are conjugated with the absorptive reference set (ik), the genitive future forms are conjugated with the possessive and genitive sets.” I gave several examples, and I repeat a few here:

6. way” k’-a-t’-m’-s’-s’ i i-k’-ka-k’-x’-nap.
   yes I hope that that win
   I hope I will win.

7. i t’-a-k’s-’a-dy.
   not year-fut-go
   Don’t go.

8. i t’-a-k’s-’a-dy.
   not year-fut-go
   Don’t go.

9. i t’-a-k’s-’a-dy.
   not year-fut-go
   Don’t eat.

Section 1 is A. Martina’s; section 2 is N. Matina’s.

10. i t’-a-k’s-’a-dy.
    not year-fut-go
    Don’t ask me.
11. but a-ka-puh-um not your-fut-act-in
   Don't eat.

12. k’a i-ku-’kie’-it-um a-ko-k’-dil.
    my-fut-look-it-in your-perf-do
    I'm going to see what you've made.

13. i-ku-wilk-am tarids.
    my-fut-see-m Theresa
    I'm going to see Theresa.

14. ks-wilk-am tarids.
    my-fut-see-m Theresa
    We're going to see Theresa.

15. ks-wilk-am m-dak.
    my-fut-hide-m my-money
    You're going to hide your money.

16. ks-wilk-am m-sqaw.
    my-fut-hide-I my-money
    We are going to hide your money.

17. ks-wilk-um am ? sqaw-tot
    my-fut-hide-I the money-your
    We are going to hide your money.

14, 15 and 17 are transitive forms (with -m and ergative subjects)—they have neither absolute nor genetic referents. I explained the allomorphy of ks- 'future,' which I repeat here:

a. ks- loses its s before another s: k’a i-ku-puhwam 'I am going to ask you.'

b. ks- retains its s before a tag that is part of the stem: k’a i-ku-puhwam 'I am going to leave you.'

c. ks- loses its s before a prefixal m (→-back, s-→-again) as in the following cases:
   k’a k’a-ku-sa ‘I am going,' k’a k’a-ku-xa ‘I am going back (home),' k’a k’a-ku-’su ‘I am going to eat again.'

I then stated that ks- 'future' "should not be confused with ks- 'to be,' in spite of their semantic equivalence. While ks- 'to be' loses its s before stems that begin with s (see [s-ku’-sia] 'my child-to-be,' and [s-ku’-sia] 'my husband-to-be,' etc.) and t (s-ki’un ‘my power-to-be,' i-ku-’sia ‘my older...

[Note the parallel behavior of i-ku- 'future' and im- 'my,' with: 'your.' The t is in -m, -o- is lost before kin terms that begin with T (all of which are historically segmentable), but not before other stems that begin with T: t-ku’-sia ‘my younger sister,’ a-ku’-sia ‘your younger brother,’ but a-ku’-sia ‘your dress.’]

What is k’a? How does it work? Typically k’a- participates in simple possessive constructions:

18. k’a-ku-xa m-sqaw.
    my-fut-see-I the money-your
    We're going to see your money.

19. k’a-ku-xa m-sqaw.
    my-fut-see-I the money-your
    We're going to see Theresa.

20. n’m-w’a x’um-xa t-ku-xa kap.
    n’m-w’a x’um-xa t-ku-xa kap.
    if and when you give it to you I will give to you coffee
    I'll eventually give you some coffee. (I plan to...)

21. i-su? a-ku-’sia, s-ku’-y’-sin.
    i-su? a-ku-’sia, s-ku’-y’-sin.
    this will be your-arrow, and this will be your-name, Coyote.

In all these cases the i-su- 'my-to-be X' is a nominal construction. Each time the form occurs in a sentence it can be analyzed as a nominal complement or adjunct.

**Note:** Martina argues that this is only a superficial semantic equivalence in section 2. There she suggests a more appropriate gloss.

"As I said in my aspect paper, '[n]membership in a grammatical class is not determined by the root or stem, but by the defining affixes or combinations of affixes, such as the verbal morphemes, the transitive morphemes, the aspective person markers, the genitive person markers, etc. Furthermore, stems can undergo layers of affixation, more than one change of membership. Finally, the interpretation of each word in a sentence depends on syntactic factors. It should be noted that I have found reasons for and I have sought ways to classify stems as verbal or nominal according to some morpho-syntactic criteria; and that I have similarly sought syntactic clues for distinguishing NPs from VP's as a VP can function as an NP in Okanagan as it can in other languages.' I hope to have a working survey of the Ok sentence types for the next Salish conference."
Cases of k- before s, as I said above, and as I repeat here, are resolved as ka:, but these should not be confused with k's 'future'.

But all cases of k- are then susceptible to more that one analysis—or mis-analysis, once the correct interpretation is demonstrated—k(+)s or ka:. What might such cases be? Consider the sentence

23. k'ot k'c'eth + ax, l' j-kspok'ak'ast...
   me-give t-my-?_wisdom...
   Give me wisdom.

Is the correct analysis i-kx-pa:k' + pa:k' 'my-future-smart' or i-kx-s + pa:k' + pa:k' 'my-to-be-wisdom'? I think the latter, and analogously

24. k'ot k'c'eth + ax, l' j-kx + k'o:k'oc'ax
   me-give t-my-to-be-strength
   Give me strength.

The nominals of these sentences then are parallel to the nominal of

25. k'u p'ili +it i-ket-xwit
   me-light my-to-be-road
   Light the way for me / light my way.

26. (kan ta? frick) t'p l'kax sqal'c'cao i-kx-ak'sqal'tlan.
   (I when return home) - only Indian language m-to-be-language
   (When I go home) I'm going to speak only Indian.

In this last example the nominal construction is particularly clear, where n-qal'il-lam is 'Indian language,' with nominal n-... in (cf. k'an qal'il-lam 'I sound off,' qal'il-stam 'I talk to him,' etc.)

Slightly more complex are cases such as

27. ... mi wit-an i-koe-ay.
   ... fut see-I my-?going.
   ... so I can see where I am going.

i-koe-ay is a nominal too, in the genitive paradigm, outwardly parallel to a past perfect in the absolute paradigm, as I pointed out in my aspect paper:

28. kan kas-wik t sp'ata?,
    I pperf-see t monster.
    I have seen a monster.

29. inka kan t'a? kas-wik t sp'ata?.
    I t that pperf-see t monster
    I'm the one that has seen a monster.

30. way' kan kas-k'lan':
    yes I pperf-take
    I have tried it already.

31. way' kan kas-cut.
    yes I pperf-say
    We are the ones that wrote it.

32. kan' man-k'it k'u t'a? kas-q'ay',
    this we we that pperf-write
    We are the ones that wrote it.

33. kan' man-k'it k'u t'a? kas-q'ay',
    this we we that pperf-write
    We are the ones that wrote it.

34. let' sunq'u l'ka: kas-k'il: in t' qal'il-s sunq'u,
    that Coyote that pperf-do, that pit-house-3 Coyote
    That's Coyote's work, that's Coyote's pit house.

A comparison of these examples with other forms with kas confirms the analysis of (1) the absolute kas- as a past perfect, and of (2) the genitive kas- as a future perfect.

35. k'u kas-ak'si k'oe-q'ay',
    me help-get my-fut-perf-write
    Help me with what I am going to write.
36. kən kəkʰiʔ-kʰiʔ-m t i-ko-s-kʰiʔ-m+ix. ñač i-sπiʔ-2 k’i-š-kʰiʔ-ay,
i search-m t my-fut-perf give the on Xmas to my-m’s mother
I went looking for something to give my mother for Christmas.

37. iʔ? i-ko-s-kʰiʔ-naʔ,
this my-fut-perf-type
This is what I am going to type.

this sacred the us put_down-tiít-m t fut_perf-do-our
What he gave us to work with is sacred.

Consider now some potentially confusing cases:

39a. iʔ? ut kʰiʔ-iiʔ t kəs-kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tit-taʔ-s,
there be built his nest.

39b. iʔ? i-ko-s-kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tiít-iiʔ t kəs-kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tit-taʔ-s,
i am going to build them a nest there.

Note first that kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tiít-iiʔ is an intransitive form, conjugated in the absolutive set (zero in the third person), and that kəs-kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tit-taʔ-s is the nominalization of a transitive form–intransitive form in the passive paradigm—literally ‘pull_future-building for_them-m.’ The difference in the interpretation of the adjuncts2 (‘a nest (for himself)’ vs. ‘a nest for them’) should be attributed to the absolutive vs. genitive construction and not to the adjuncts themselves. In other words, here we do not have a pair that shows contrast between kəs- and k’h-; but another case of morphological indeterminacy—cases where speakers alternate between two forms, often hesitating between the two, often trying to assign a significance to each of the forms. Cf. such analogous cases as:

40a. way’ʔ and? kəs-kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tiít-taʔ-s.
Sit here (this is your sitting place to-be).

40b. way’ʔ and? i-ko-s-kʰiʔ-iiʔ-tiít-taʔ-s.
Sit here (this is your sitting place to-be).

More problematic are cases like

41. kʰiʔ-kʰiʔ-limix-taʔ-iiʔ-s
The form in isolation is invariably interpreted as ‘you have a chief,’ and consultants prompted for ‘you will
be chief’ produce

42. kʰ-ko-limix-taʔ-iiʔ-s
Why then did Pete Seymour more than once utter

43. amit kʰ-ko-limix-taʔ-iiʔ-s
and Madeline DelSontz translate ‘You will be chief’? My interpretation is that the narrator was stretching
the morphosyntax of the language—producing interpretable but idiosyncratic constructions.

2.0. In the previous sections, the first author has described kəs- and k’h- as being phonologically
and morphologically distinct. I provide here some semantic evidence that buttresses the morphological
distinction. It is a relatively clear and important point that kəs- and k’h- do not mean the same thing, although
English translations have tended to obscure their differences. k’h- is not an aspectual marker, while kəs-is.
This becomes apparent when we have a definition of aspect. Cross-linguistically, aspect encodes ‘different
ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation’ (Comrie 1979:3), or ‘a temporal
perspective which focuses all or part of the situation’ (Smith 1991:25). The question then is whether k’s-
and k’h- both provide this temporal perspective. The answer in Omani is ‘no’ in at least one clear case,
the interpretation of referential NPs. I review the evidence, and then reconsider the cases in which the
semantic difference between k’s- and k’h- appears to be neutralized for some speakers.

2.1. Omani has two three-place predicate types, the possessional and the dative. The possessional
requires that the theme be possessed; the dative cannot have a possessed theme, as shown in 44.

44. Possessinal: apidišt-n (k’t)-ʔaʔ-ʔaʔ/siʔ-s. I boiled his eggs.
apidišt-n ʔaʔ-ʔaʔ/siʔ-s. I boiled (him) the eggs.

Dative: apidišt-n (ʔaʔ)-ʔaʔ/siʔ-s. I boiled eggs for him.
apidišt-n ʔaʔ-ʔaʔ/siʔ-s. I boiled his eggs for him.
The dative predicate can, however, take a theme that is probably or possibly possessed, with the prefix **kη-**, as shown in 45.

45. **mpixtat- n l kη-t'yu&u2d5a?-s**. I boiled eggs that will be for him.

**ki-**, by contrast, is incorrect in these contexts.

46. **mπixtat- n mpixtat- n l kη-t'yu&u2d5a?-s**

In 45, **kη-** does not imply any imperfectivity of the theme, as would be implied if the complement were translated as 'eggs-to-be'. The **kη-t'yu&u2d5a?-s** or any theme is not coming into existence or understood as consisting of temporal phases. Rather, **kη-** modifies the nature of the relationship between the theme and its possessor. In 45, the eggs have not yet been served or consumed yet, so that from the speaker's perspective, the eggs are not yet 'his'. A more representative English translation of **kη-t'yu&u2d5a?-s** is (the) 'likely-to-be-his eggs', where the notion of 'unrealized possession' is expressed. This interpretation also holds for citation forms of nouns in isolation such as **kη-t'yu&u2d5a?'qum** 'likely-to-be-mine hat' where the hat simply exists, atemporally. Since no perspective on the internal temporal structure of the stem is marked by **kη-**, it is more accurate to label it a marker of mood. Alternatively, it is mood but not aspect which encodes, among other things, 'the degree of commitment the speaker has to the truth of the proposition' (Bybee 1985:165).

Although mood, like aspect is generally associated with situations (grammaticalized as verbs), it is helpful to think of mood as arising from tense-aspect in that mood 'deals with events and worlds rather than with events and time' (Chung and Timberlake 1985:256). That is, it is possible to express mood without aspect when a linguistic expression references a relation, but not temporality. The world over, atemporality motivates the categoriality of nouns, so we should expect aspectual marking of nouns to be anomalous. **kη-** does not contravene the cross-linguistic pattern since it is not an aspectual marker. Rather, (46) demonstrates that the aspectual marker **kη-** cannot attach to nouns, as expected. In sum, the data strongly suggest that **kη-** obtains with atemporal stems (events) while **ki-** obtains with temporal stems (verbs).

2.2. Let's now turn to the role of **ki-** and **kη-** in nominalizations of the type in examples (35-38). I repeat 35 here for convenience.

47. (reprise of (35))

[Content not provided]

Should the future-perfect marker **kη-** be analyzed as **ki-** or **kη-**? The translation shows that the complement expresses an imperfective event, with internal stages. Further, the future-perfect marker is not compatible with the class of stems that may combine with **ki-**, stems which are, aspectually-speaking, nouns. The distribution is exemplified in 48.

48. **kη kη-t'yu&u2d5a? u2a39 is-nu-k't'yu&u2d5a?u2a39.**

Help me with my saddle.

**kη kη-t'yu&u2d5a? u2a39 is-nu-k't'yu&u2d5a?u2a39.**

Help me with my saddle. (or, 'with (the) likely-to-be-mine saddle')

**kη kη-t'yu&u2d5a? u2a39 is-nu-k'τu&u2d5a?u2a39.**

Help me with what is going to be my saddle.

It should also be noted that the future perfect marker has a non-future counterpart, and a non-perfect counterpart exemplified in 49a and 49b, respectively.

49. **ki-u2a39 u2a39-pik i u2a39τu&u2d5a?u2a39.**

That my-mother the deer

That is the deer I hunted. (or, What I hunted (successfull) is that deer)

**ki-u2a39 u2a39-pik i u2a39τu&u2d5a?u2a39.**

always are deer my-mother hunting

I always hunt deer. (or, Always deer is my hunting.)

The future perfect and the aspectual markers in 49 are found only with nominalizations, and nominalizations are based on time-sensitive stems (i.e. verbs). Nominalization function to individualize situations, making

---

In other words, **kη-** modifies the determiner, not the noun.
them 'objects of discourse' which have no allocutionary force or truth value (Jelinek and Demers 1982).<ref>1</ref> Virtually all verb stems may be nominalized, and in all cases they show genitive person-marking and the prefix -k-, which is implicated in a number of (non-nominalizing) aspectual formations (see A. Mattina 1993). Given the phonological distribution of k- (i.e. that it is k- before k-) if the future-perfect marker were k-ß-n, it would be consistently realized as k-ß-n, making it impossible to say that k-ß-n does not occur with nominals. However, because the future-perfect is aspectually associated with verbs, and nominalizations involve verbs stems only, I conclude that the future-perfect patterns with k- rather than k-ß-n which is not an aspectual marker.

2.3 Finally, we have to consider the apparent semantic overlap between k- and k-ß-n that seems to be possible for some speakers, as in k-½ k-ß-n "you will be chief." In k- we have the English equivalent of the predicate nominal, or a noun in predicate function. Nouns in predicate function may show aspect in Okangan, but their aspectual range is quite limited compared to that available to verbal predicates. The same is true for nouns in predicate function in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k-½a-ux</td>
<td>k-ða-ux</td>
<td>I am a mailman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sleep</td>
<td>I am chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-½a-k-½a-ux</td>
<td>k-½a-ux</td>
<td>I am going to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm going to sleep</td>
<td>I'm going to be chief</td>
<td>will be a mailman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-½a-ux</td>
<td>*I am mailman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am sleeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-½a-ux</td>
<td>*I mailman/I did mailman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am asleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-½a-ux</td>
<td>*I have mailman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have slept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...k-½a-ux</td>
<td>*(his future) mailman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my (future) sleeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that predicate function relates the usual constraints on aspectual marking of nouns somewhat, but a predicate's basic lexical category is still detectable by its aspectual range. Predicate nominals, like nominalizations, show a mix of nominal and verbal morphology in many languages. This creates a sizable gray area between the categories 'noun' and 'verb' that is especially open to alternate analyses by speakers. If an Okangan speaker focuses on the basic nominalhood of the predicate, he may use the nominal marker that is closest in meaning to the verbal marker, extending it to aspectual use as in 41, possibly as the first author suggests, as a stylistic variant. As far as we can tell from examining The Golden Woman, Seymour's longest published narrative, Seymour did not use any other aspectual affixes in predicate nominals. Further, predicate nominal constructions were the only environment in which Seymour used k- without possessive person marking, which suggests that Seymour simply substituted k- for k-½a-ux (the aspective aspect marker in predicate nominals). The general point is that the phonological and semantic similarities (but not identity) of k- and k-ß-n lead themselves to errors, reanalysis or stylistic variation just where the distinction between noun and verb is the weakest, i.e. in predicate nominal constructions and in nominalizations (e.g. 39b, 40a). In other contexts, we would not expect, and do not find, such confusion of the two markers.

**Literature Cited**


---

<ref>1</ref> Of course I am excluding lexical nominalizations, the creation of new lexical items. I refer to syntactic nominalization, although it is not clear how such nominalizations fit into standard syntactic theory (Zucchi 1993).

<ref>2</ref> Cross-linguistically, it is common for statements of identity or the relation to be expressed with 'quarly' morphology (Amith and Stark 1994). See also Beck 1995 for examples of languages that use nouns as predicates without an overt copula.

<ref>3</ref> All the speakers interviewed recently preferred the k-½a-ux with predicate nominals, an aspectual variant which is possible with all verbal stems.