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1. Introduction.

Coeur d'Alene clauses with imperative force may be indicated by particular imperative morphology or by the structure of the clause. Intransitive imperatives are formed by suffixation of an imperative marker indicating a singular (-s) or plural (-w) second person. Transitive imperatives are indicated by the omission of a subject argument from the standard transitive constructions. Negative imperatives are formed of a negative predicate followed by a fully inflected future predicate. In the following sections I will discuss each of these imperative constructions as well as phrasal imperatives, formed from future and irrealis constructions, and the use of imperatives in sequence.

2. Intransitive imperatives.

Coeur d'Alene intransitive imperatives are formed by suffixation of -s second person singular imperative or -w second person plural imperative to an otherwise uninflected intransitive base. Reichard (1938:579-309) provides the intransitive imperative constructions given in example 1; my analyses are given in current orthography:

1. a. -s, second person singular:
   xui-c  √x"uy-s  'go!'
   x'hot-c  √x"ist-s  'depart!'
   hsi-tscn-c  √hsi-cin-s  'be quiet!'

   b. -w, second person plural:
   xuy-ul  √x"uy=wi  'go you!'
   hsi-tscn-ul  √hsi=cin=wi  'be quiet you!'

I have reanalyzed Reichard's plural -ul as -w; y is not a systematic phoneme in Coeur d'Alene and semivowels regularly vocalize between consonants resulting in lax vowels that are never stressed.

2.1. Singular intransitive imperatives.

Singular intransitive imperatives are frequent in stories and elicited data. Examples are given in 2-6: in examples 4 and 5, the morphological sequence -1-s is phonologically -e, and in example 6, various directional particles are used to modify the basic imperative given in 6a.

2. a. √mi-cs'√mi-cs'√mi-cs'√mi-cs'√mi-cs'
   DIR /enter-imp
   Come in!  10.64

3. √si'oq-c's
   /go.out-imp
   Get out!  10.64

4. x"is'√si'on-1-s
   /x°'enter-1-imp
   Hurry!  10.20, 11.26

5. qi'h
   /qi-h-dur-imp
   Wake up!  s90.115

The Interior Salishan singular and plural imperative suffixes are mostly cognate. In the singular there are regular phonological correspondence of i and x (see Thompson 1979:703; Mattina 1980); the plural imperatives all include a sequence of a labial or labialized segment and a palatal, in most cases a (semi)vowel: Kalispel -iy, -iw; -iy (Speck 1980); Colville-Okanagan -lw, -wl (Matinna 1980); Colville -iy (Carlson 1972); Salishan -w, -el; -i (Kuipers 1974); Thompson -iy or -iy, -el; -e (Thompson and Thompson 1992; Littlecost -i (van Emde 1985); Columbia -a, -a, -in-ta? (Matinna 1980 Columbia addenda).

The origin of the i in the Coeur d'Alene plural imperative suffix -w is obscure. Coeur d'Alene l normally corresponds to y rather than z in Thompson and I rather than i/y in other Salishan languages, including Coeur d'Alene. Thus the Coeur d'Alene -w IMPERATIVE is not a regular historical development from the posulated protoform *-wy suggested by the remainder of the data.

Footnote:

1Coeur d'Alene is a Southern Interior Salishan language spoken by a small number of elders on or near the Coeur d'Alene Reservation in northern Idaho. My research on the language has been supported by the Jacobs Research Fund and an NSF dissertation research grant. The data presented here are based primarily on field work with Felix Aripa, Don George, the late Blanche LaSarte, Lawrence Nicodemus, and the late Margaret Steenbar. Examples are keyed to my notebooks by number and page. Other examples included in this paper are taken from Reichard's unpublished transcriptions of stories entitled "Coyote steals Sun's heart" and "Beaver."
6. a. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{y} - x^y\)
   \(\text{Go on; Go!}\)  s90.210

b. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{y} - x^y\)
   \(\text{Come here!; Come over!}\)  9.3; 8.1

c. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{y} - x^y\)
   \(\text{Get away!}\)  s90.123

d. \(u \sqrt{x^y} \bar{y} - x^y\)
   \(\text{Come back here!}\)  10.64

The forms in examples 7-10 have imperative force, though the shape of the imperative suffix is unexpected:

7. \(\sqrt{c^n} \bar{t} - c^n\)
   \(\text{Stay there!}\)  10.03, 10.07

8. \(\sqrt{d^n} \bar{t} - d^n\)
   \(\text{Lie down!}\)  10.03

9. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{t} - x^y\)
   \(\text{Get up! (out of bed)}\)  11.09

10. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{t} - x^y\)
    \(\text{Get up! (stand)}\)  11.09

The lax high front vowel that occurs with the imperative in examples 7-10 is unstressed and may be excrescent, in some cases a possible effect of a preceding glottal(ized) segment; however, these singular imperatives, like that in 11a, thus look similar in some cases to forms with the developmental suffix -is, as in 11b. The full vowel of the developmental suffix is stressable (11c), distinguishing it from the imperative where contrastive forms exist. Not all of the imperatives have corresponding developments, however.

11. a. \(\sqrt{\text{c'm}} - \text{c'm}\)
    \(\text{Sit down!}\)  s90.178

b. \(\sqrt{\text{c'm}} - \text{c'm}\)
    \(\text{He sat down.}\)

c. \(k^u \sqrt{\text{c'm}} - \text{c'm}\)
    \(\text{You sit down.}\)  s90.178

2.2. Plural intransitive imperatives. The plural intransitive imperatives are quite regular. Example 12 shows the plural imperative -\(\text{m}\)l in contrast with the singular imperative using the same stem. Example 13 shows the use of the plural imperative with locative morphology. The examples in 14 are taken from Reichard's transcribed texts; 14a includes an adjunct specifying the second person, and 14b includes a nonimperative command.

12. a. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{p} - x^y\)
    \(\text{Kneel down!}\)  n90.356

b. \(\sqrt{x^y} \bar{p} - x^y\)
    \(\text{Kneel down (pl)!}\)  n90.356

13. \(\sqrt{\text{c'g}} \bar{n} - \text{c'g}\)
    \(\text{Call them!; Invite them to come!}\)  n90.326

14. a. \(\sqrt{\text{k'm}} \bar{t} - \text{k'm}\)
    \(\text{Sing, little aunties!}\)  SunHeart

b. \(\sqrt{\text{t'a}} - \text{t'a}\)
    \(\text{Sing, little aunties!}\)  Beaver

2.3. Intransitive imperative middles. Reichard (1938:580.310) states that "[i]f the verb has an indefinite object, or needs a suffix to "complete" it, -\(\text{m}\) is commonly used." The single example Reichard provides is the plural form given in 15:

15. \(\sqrt{\text{pulut}} - \text{pulut}\)
    \(\text{kill an indefinite one you!}\)  /\(\text{kill-MDL}\)/\(\text{imp}\)

This suffix -\(\text{m}\) is one that is often labeled the middle in Salishan literature, and for the purposes of this paper, that label will suffice. However, the -\(\text{m}\) suffix is used in several different constructions in Coeur d'Alene and often functions to alter the role of the subject and suggests a change in valency of the stem (which may be what Reichard is referring to in her analysis). Mattina 1980 points out the ambiguity of this lone example, stating that it appears to be transitive, and in Coeur d'Alene transitive constructions are invariably marked with one of the applicatives or transitivizers, all of which include -\$ in this example, the identification of the root is essential in determining whether the -\$ that occurs prior to the other suffixes is the transitivizer, some other suffix, or part of the root. The root \(\sqrt{\text{pulut}} \text{ kill}\) is an unusual one in that it has two full (stressable) vowels and a final -\$ . Normally, roots are not affected by coronal sequence simplification rules; however, the final -\$ of \(\sqrt{\text{pulut}} \text{ kill}\) does delete before the \(\text{st}\(\text{u}\)\)- transitivizer: \(\text{pulustus he killed him}\). This suggests that the final -\$ (or -\(\text{u}\)) is a suffix, but the data indicate that it is not a transitivizer.
I have recorded examples of root-m-imperative constructions that confirm Reichard's analysis of these forms as intransitive imperatives, though all my examples are singular; these include the following:

16. c'akʷinams  Run!  10.44
   /c√kʷm-m-∅/run-MDL-IMP

17. Changes  Cut up [the meat]!  7.19
   /t'if-m-∅/cut-MDL-IMP

18. gʷc'qinams  Comb your hair!  11.04
   /gʷc'q=m-m-∅/comb=head-MDL-IMP

19. s'ičqinam  Listen.  11.29
   /s'ič=qin-m-∅/hear=-head-MDL-IMP

20. mcy'rniy'm  Tell stories!  11.44
   /mcy'rniy'm-∅/report+aug-MDL-IMP

2.4. Intransitive imperatives with -i/. In contrast to the intransitive imperative forms with "indefinite objects" marked with the suffix -m, Reichard discusses intransitive imperatives where the "object is definitely known" (1938:580). The three examples she provides are intransitive forms made up of a root followed by -i/ and an imperative suffix, which may be singular or plural (from Reichard 1938:580.311):

21. pūlut-cč-∅  kill the definite one you!
   /pūlut-∅/cč-∅/leave the definite one alone
   /uc''-∅/cč-∅/take back the definite one

I have found no examples of this construction in my data. The use of a suffix -i/ is a possible analysis for one form with imperative force, but this form includes the -m MIDDLE (Reichard's "indefinite object") as well as this "definite object" suffix:

22. t'aʔ' mcc  Stop it!  11.14
   /t'aʔ'=m-m-∅/

Further study is needed. Mattina 1980, for example, describes a "second-hand imperative" suffix for Colville-Okanagan transitive bases that may be cognate; its form is -i/ and it is attached to transitive bases (except those formed with -i/) with meanings such as to do again, do in sequence, or to repeat a request that some action be done.

2.5. Reflexive imperatives. Coeur d'Alene reflexives are detransitivized structures and thus employ intransitive morphology when they are imperative: the reflexive suffix -ut attached to the transitive base is followed by the intransitive imperative suffix -i.

23. xecmncutš  Get yourself ready!  3.67
   /xec-m-n-t-sut-∅/ready-MDL-D-T-REFLX-IMP

24. f'kʷmncutš  Lay yourself down!
   /f'kʷm-n-t-sut-∅/lie-MDL-D-T-REFLX-IMP

25. tušt'Cwncutš  Go lie down.  11.29
   /tuš/t'Cw-n-t-sut-∅/incert/lie-D-T-REFLX-IMP

I have not come across any reflexives marked with the plural imperative -wl.

3. Transitive imperatives. Imperative constructions are built on transitive bases using the lone -t- transitive (T), the -n-t- directive transitive (D-T), and the -s(i)-t- benefactive transitive (B-T). I have not found any -s(u)- causative transitive (CT) imperatives in my data, and no imperatives based on an applicative -f-t- stem either. Mattina 1980 points out the rarity of causative imperatives in Colville-Okanagan, but finds the -f-t- imperatives as common as the simple transitive imperatives.

The Coeur d'Alene transitive imperative forms presented by Reichard are listed in table 1. Reichard describes these imperatives as "Completive with definite personal object" (1938: section 337). The -/ of the forms as Reichard lists them is the -/ transitive suffix, not a part of the imperative itself. Next to Reichard's forms in table 1, I have isolated the sequences that follow the transitivizer in the forms that include it.

Table 1. Transitive imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p-1</td>
<td>(-te)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p-3</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p-1p</td>
<td>(-te)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms in parentheses are unattested.

According to Reichard's description, the 2(p)-1 imperative forms take intransitive morphology; that is, they don't include the -t transitive suffix, but instead use the suffix -te (as is the case in all the
2(p)-1p paradigms). Thus like the regular intransitive imperatives, they take -s following the stem. As is the case throughout the language, overt indication of a plural agent is optional, resulting in the two possible forms given by Reichard for the 2p-1p imperative.

In the following sections, each of the transitive imperatives involving a singular first person or third person object (i.e., the reanalyzed forms in table 1) is discussed.

3.1. 2-1 (-s) forms. The 2-1 imperatives apparently are formed by suffixing -s to a transitive base, with no other pronominal information. Most likely, this suffix is a reduced form of -se(I), the first person object (ACCUSATIVE) suffix.

Example 28 is interesting in that it includes the CAUSATIVE transitiveizer sequence -st(u)-; however, the form is one that has been retransitivized with the DIRECTIVE transitive, and the CAUSATIVE is not adjacent to the imperative morphology; there are, in fact, no examples of (nonnegative) causative imperatives in my corpus.

The following simple transitive (29) and benefactive (30-34) forms are shown with their imperative analyses, as well as with their nonimperative 3-3 transitive glosses:

3.2. 2p-1 (-sel) forms. I do not have data verifying the imperative 2p-1 forms Reichard describes (table 1). The suffix sequences Reichard provides suggest that the 2p-1 forms are also constructed from a transitive base by suffixing only the appropriate object pronominal (-sell)). However, the 2-1 forms (section 3.1) show that the first person singular accusative suffix -se(l) is reduced to -s in final position. A possible analysis is that the intransitive plural IMPERATIVE marker -wi is affixed to the transitive imperative base with the first person object to indicate the plural agent (see the description of the 2p-3 forms described in section 3.4). If such were the case, the sequence -sel-wi would have to reduce, maintaining the suffix vowel e but simplifying the sequence -e-wi to -i. Until such forms can be verified, the analysis remains one of speculation.

3.3. 2-3 (null suffix) forms. Where a second person subject is commanded to act upon a third person object, the form is one of a transitive base with no (non-null) pronominal suffixes; the transitive suffix -/ is word final. The third person object pronominal suffix in regular transitives is zero.

3.4. 3-1 forms. Where a first person subject is commanded to act upon a third person object, the form is one of a transitive base with no (non-null) pronominal suffixes; the transitive suffix -t is word final. The third person object pronominal suffix in regular transitives is zero.

---

2) Coeur d'Alene is not tolerant of final vowels in roots and stems, though they are permitted in particles and affixes.
40. \( \text{p'ac'nt} \)  
\( /\text{shit-D-T-3ABS} \)  
Shit (on) him!  
\( \text{s90.101} \)

41. \( \text{cn'sit} \)  
\( /\text{help-B-T-3ABS} \)  
Help him!  
\( 5.20 \)

Plurality of a third person object is indicated with the standard plural suffix -ilS; in 2-3 imperatives this plural suffix appears immediately following the transitivizer since the third person object is a zero morpheme and the regular second person subject morpheme is omitted.

42. \( \text{cn'sitlS} \)  
\( /\text{help-B-T-3ABS-pl} \)  
Help them!  
\( 5.20 \)

3.4. 2p-3(p) (-wI) forms. Transitive imperatives with second person plural subjects acting on third persons take the plural imperative suffix -wI on a transitive base with zero third person object marking:

43. \( \text{k"intul} \)  
\( /\text{take-T-3ABS-imp} \)  
Take it!  
Beaver

44. \( \text{Htul} \)  
\( /\text{give-T-3ABS-imp} \)  
Give him!  
SunHeart

45. \( \text{tu-y'ac'J.(antul} \)  
\( /\text{incep/look-at-D-T-3ABS-imp} \)  
Look at him!  
SunHeart

4. Negative imperatives. Negative imperative constructions begin with the simple negative predicate \( \text{lut} \) followed by a FUTURE construction (see section 5.2.2).

4.1. Intransitive negative imperatives. In intransitive negative imperatives, the future construction following the negative predicate is a FUTURE GENITIVE, formed by following morpheme sequence: the FUTURE particle \( \text{c} \), the second person GENITIVE pronoun \( \text{st} \), an \( s- \) prefix, and an intransitive stem which may include the \( -\text{m} \) suffix (identified here as the MIDDLE).

46. \( \text{lut cef i'iq} \)  
\( /\text{in-s/-i'q} \)  
Don't eat.  
\( 10.71 \)

47. \( \text{lut cef i'iqxminam} \)  
\( /\text{in-s/i'iq=min-m} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut 2o-en-nom/heart=head-mod} \)  
Don't listen.  
\( 11.09 \)

48. \( \text{lut cef in-s-hn/Tcy=ilg'es} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut 2o-en-nom-loct/heart} \)  
Don't get mad.  
\( 5.258 \)

4.2. Transitive negative imperatives. Negative imperatives are also built on transitive predicate bases, including the CAUSATIVE transitives. The structure is similar to the intransitive negatives: the negative root \( \text{lut} \) is followed by \( \text{c} \) FUTURE and \( s- \), all preceding a transitive with a second person subject.

49. \( \text{lut cefwi\text{n}ex'x} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut nom/yell-D-T-1acc-2erg} \)  
Don't yell at me!  
\( 11.49 \)

50. \( \text{lut cef u\text{n}ex'x} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut again nom/look-D-T-3ABS-2erg} \)  
Don't look back.  
\( 12.17 \)

51. \( \text{lut cef t\text{q'aq'a}velmists'x\text{x}c inuk'\text{a}\text{q}nt} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut loc/talk-rel-CT-3ABS-2erg def 2o-en-fellow-nom/person} \)  
Don't talk about your people.  
\( 50.19 \)

52. \( \text{lut cef c\text{k'uk'sus'x} lut c ise'x} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut nom-cust/say-CT-3ABS-2erg /neg art 2o-en-nom/good-stat} \)  
Don't tell them they're no good ("you're no good").  
\( 50.258 \)

53. \( \text{lut cefpu\text{h}u\text{x}x} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut nom/kill-CT-3ABS-2erg} \)  
Don't kill.  
\( b90.106 \)

54. \( \text{lu\text{c} cefpu\text{h}u\text{x}x} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut nom/kill+Aug-CT-3ABS-2erg} \)  
Don't punish them (the children).  
\( 50.85 \)

4.3. Negative imperatives with articles. In some cases, the negative imperative constructions include an article following the negative \( \text{lut} \); the first two examples (55 and 56) include FUTURE GENITIVE similar form which I have not been able to analyze:

5. \( \text{lut cef in\text{n}y\text{qyl'g'es}} \)  
\( /\text{neg fut 2o-en-nom-loc/angry=heart} \)  
Don't get angry.  
\( 90.18 \)

\( ^{5} \) A similar form which I have not been able to analyze.

---

\( ^{9} \) This \( s- \) is either a NOMINALIZER, as it is identified in the examples, or an INTENTIONAL prefix (see Reichard 1938:586f/566).
intransitives; example 57 also includes a future construction, but it is one based on a transitive predicate; the final example (58) is transitive but is apparently not a future form. None of the negative imperatives include the imperative suffixes.

55. lut e čeṭ irstu lut e sčēs ič sčī tš čsmlčm ...

56. lut e ?irč u čeṭ mhn Don't eat too much.

57. lut e čeṭ“uqnts xč iqftmṭm

58. lut e čeṭ in-s?iḥn

59. tŚa“anstdț

60. cčr“idnts xčcsn/2m

61. ēhōč" Give it to me!

62. nc? k“u dēx“iī You get down. 11.45

63. nc? c u twa tčē“ Let's go home! 11.18

64. nc? k“u tīs Then you go to sleep. s90.102

65. nc? k“u tay“emī You go sit down. s90.230

Irrealis imperatives appear to be most common with intransitive predicates, but also occur with transitives:

66. nc? čck“nstx* le Lolo čēčič“uy s90.230
nc? čck“n-stu-Φ-x* le Lolo čē-s-čic“uy
IRR/say-CT-3ABS-2ERG ART Lolo PUT-NOM-LOC/go Tell Lawrence to come over.

5.2. Phrasal imperatives. Second person subject pronominal arguments are omitted from intransitive and transitive imperatives that employ overt imperative morphology. However, there are two constructions with imperative force (other than the negative) built on fully inflected predicates that are accompanied by the irrealis particle nc? or the future particle čeṭ.

5.2.1. Irrealis imperatives. Reichard calls one of these phrasal imperative constructions the "exhortative", which she describes as "expressed by the particle nā "nc? which has weak imperative,
as well as a future dubitative significance." The morpheme nc? I will call IRREALIS; in the following sentences it precedes a simple intransitive predicate:

62. nc? k“u dēx“iī You get down. 11.45
nc? k“u ėdēx“iī IRR 2NOM /desend=curved.motion

63. nc? c u twa tčē“ Let's go home! 11.18
nc? c u twa tčē“ IRR 1NOM again with obl /house

64. nc? k“u tīs Then you go to sleep. s90.102
nc? k“u tīs IRR 2NOM /sleep

65. nc? k“u tay“emī You go sit down. s90.230
nc? k“u tu?=t?=emī IRR 2NOM INCEP/kit-dev

5.3. Imperatives in sequence. Mattina (1980:209) describes Colville-Okanagan constructions wherein "following a first imperative, a second parallel imperative may occur," either transitive or intransitive.

Note that the imperative suffix -j is not used in IRREALIS constructions; the final j's in examples 62, 64 and 65 belong to other morphemes.
Similar constructions occur in Coeur d’Alene. In the following example, a simple intransitive imperative is followed by a simple transitive imperative:


/CONJ/IRREALIS


/say-CT-3ABS-3ERG ART obl nom child /go-imp 2nom dir again /look for-D-T-3ABS

She told her son to go look for them.

Generally, within a sentence, like imperatives (i.e., intransitive/intransitive, future/future, etc.) do not occur in sequence; most common is a simple (in)transitive imperative followed by a phrasal (FUTURE or IRREALIS) imperative (69, 70) or by a nonimperative predicate (71).

Intransitive imperative - Irrealis

69. s?x?as ne? k?u mihi

FUT 3ERG ART

/say-Cf-2ACC-3ERG

Go on, now you smoke!

Intransitive (reflexive) imperative - Irrealis


IRREALIS 2NOM

/say-CT-1ABS-3ERG ART obl Laura /secure -CONN-3ERG -D-T-REFLX-IMP 2NOM /rest-MDL

Laura told me, go lay down and rest.

Intransitive imperative - Nonimperative

71. a. s?x?en k?u tax?hsqiftmx

IRREALIS

/say-CT-3ABS-3ERG ART obl Laura /secure -CONN-3ERG -D-T-REFLX-IMP 2NOM /rest-MDL

Hurry up and get a husband!


IRREALIS

/say-CT-3ABS-3ERG ART obl Laura /secure -CONN-3ERG -D-T-REFLX-IMP 2NOM /rest-MDL

I told you [sic] to hurry up and get a man!

c. s?x?en t teg’mi

IRREALIS

/say-CT-3ABS-3ERG ART obl Laura /secure -CONN-3ERG -D-T-REFLX-IMP 2NOM /rest-MDL

Hurry up and buy!

The future and IRREALIS constructions are also used in juxtaposition:

Future - Irrealis (transitive and intransitive)


/CONJ/IRREALIS


/say-CT-3ABS-3ERG ART obl nom child /go-imp 2nom dir again /look for-D-T-3ABS

You believe in that, have faith in that and pray.
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