0. INTRODUCTION. In two papers (Mattina 1994, Mattina and Mattina 1995) I have insisted that Okanagan has two prefixes, similar in form and function, but different in morphophonemic behavior, these being \( k\hat{t} \)- 'likely to be,' and \( ks- \) 'future.' And because, further, they attach to different stems to yield different kinds of words, we have argued that they are not allomorphs of a single morpheme, but rather separate entities. Here first I review the Ok facts; then I present my reading of the related facts in other languages of the Interior. I need to evaluate these more thoroughly before I can propose a historical reconstruction.

1. Ok \( k\hat{t}- \) to-be. This prefix participates in two different constructions.

1.1. Possessed To-be Nominals. In Ok there are nominal forms with \( k\hat{t} \)- 'likely-to-be' where the loss of \( t \) before \( s \) is clear:

- \( fi-kt-cits'\) my house-to-be
- \( fi-kt-s+qlaw' \) my money-to-be

1.2. To-be Predicate Nominals. A construction that for some time I considered aberrant, but that I now acknowledge as regular, is exemplified by the following cases:

- \( k\hat{t}.ct-ilmix;>m \) you will be a chief
- \( k\hat{l}i-ct-wapupx;>n \) You will be Lynx (myth: said by the son as he transforms his father into a lynx)

Out of context /d-/ is likely to be interpreted as 'you have a chief,' but /d-/ is less likely to be interpreted as 'you have a lynx.' The homophony of \( k\hat{t} \)- 'to-be' and \( ks- \) 'have' had me looking elsewhere for the interpretation that N. Mattina pointed out in Mattina and Mattina 1995. These forms are predicate nominals, and are interpreted as other nouns would be, e.g.

- \( k\hat{l}a-kstqam \) you are wearing a hat.

2. Ok \( ks- \) future. This prefix is added to verb stems, and the resulting forms are of two types: one is a verb conjugated with the possessive (and genitive) person marker set(s) in the singular, and with the ergative markers in the plural; the other a verb form conjugated with the absolutive person marker set.

2.1. Ok \( ks- \) future verbs with possessive person markers. These forms consist of a possessive person marker; \( ks- \) future; and a verb stem:

- \( iks\hat{k}fnam \) I am going to eat it
3.1. **s-intent**. In lesson three of our Okangan primer titled *na?x?lytx'cam*, Sarah Peterson and I introduce students to *s-intent* as follows:

*ix"xjde'am* is a word that consists of four parts:

i- *my;* s-intent; **'se' look at; {-Z} verb ending

An informal translation of the word is *I want to look at it*.

In a sentence like *hâma? i's' 'ac'-am*, the word *hâma?*, generally rendered in English with *please*, confers to the utterance a tone that is captured by the English *Please let me look at it*. Other examples with *s-intent* are:

- *ix"xjin-am* I want to try it
- *ix"xjdl'-am* I want to fix it.
- *istq'-m* I want to touch it.
- *isq'al'-am* I want to step on it.
- *ix"xja'-m* I want to bite it.
- *'xnt+wis+lx+st'am* I want to lift it.

Other than in this primer, I have not discussed this construction. My thinking at present is that the i-ks... forms discussed in 2.1. are *future* forms; the i-s... forms discussed in this section are *intent* forms.

3.2. **s- **-s **start to.** There is a construction in Ok that consists of a simple intransitive verb circumfixed with s-...-s, and conjugated with the absolutive personal markers (kan, **K**, 0, **K'**, p., 0-ks).

\[ ?axxtā ? ?k'u smoker'xix?x?x?x. \]

In a while we started talking to one another. (NB 25, p. 81)

\[ m'ayxita? ut K'u k'li- wi? x 1 o'clock wi? ix? k'u xkat?Hans. \]

I told stories, and we sat, and at 1 we ate. (nb 25 p. 82)

\[ ixt? apik'omax?x. \]

They started to hunt.

I have found these forms difficult to elicit— but they are common in the texts I have recorded. I don’t know the best analysis of these forms, but I am reluctant to identify this s- with s- **nominalizer**.

3.3. **s-nominalizer**. I do recognize constructions like the following as third person possessed nominals:

\[ {s-} which seems to mark *future, or intention*. Here first I review constructions with s- **inert**; subsequently I present a construction with s-...-s **start to**, which, similarly, points me away from s- **nominal**; finally, by way of contrast, I list some forms with s- **nominalizer**.

---

3. Where *m* can be viewed as signaling an (indefinite) object.
I do not know, however, how these forms should be differentiated from other similar looking constructions, such as the following:

way’ lut kaws i? qaws i? kaws i? snaqile’.

Things that are going to happen to his people are not good. (nb 25, p. 87)

’sant i? sq’mats kws cm’ayaxm.

Look, it was a long time I told stories. (nb 25 p. 83)

sx’yic.

It’s really raining. (nb 25 p. 84A)

4. RELATED FORMS IN INTERIOR SALISH. The other Interior languages show constructions that parallel the Ok ones. Generally speaking, k- sequences have been analyzed as underlying k?-s-. When the s is not the root or stem-initial segment, this s- has been identified as the nominalizer s-.

I think that evidence can be found in all the languages of the Interior that the Ok situation, with k- distinct from k?, is not an innovation, but reflects a multiplicity of proto-Interior Salish forms, probably as follows: a particle *k, a prefix *s- ‘intent’, and a prefix k-??. In this paper I review the appropriate literature and data. I have yet to extend my inquiry beyond the Interior.

4.1. SUMMARY OF FORMS RELATED TO OK k?-. AND kS-. Cr has (a) a form icet /icet/ ‘cognate with Ok k?-. Cr also has (b) a prefix s- which Reichard labels ‘intentional’ and which is certain to be related to the Ok s-.

For the cognate forms in Kalispel, Vogt seems to have recognized two affixes (that would parallel the Ok q?- and (g)s-). V calls (a) forms with q?- ‘subjective nouns.’ He also reports (b) an alternation gs ~ s. V calls the forms with s- ‘semi-nominal forms’ that “have been integrated in the verbal system” (p. 41). These latter (b) forms parallel the Ok kS- forms.

Amongst what Kuipers calls Sh ‘hypothetical-indeterminate articles,’ one finds (a) k (not k?) ‘absolutive hypothetical-indeterminate.’ Such ‘hypothetical articles,’ says K, “are found especially in interrogative, imperative and conditional sentences, in negative sentences, and in sentences referring to the future” (p. 57). In addition, Sh has (b) a prefix ?s- which, K says, “may be translated (in order) so.” (The s- of this prefix is cognate with Cr s- ‘inten.’) and with the (k)s- prefixes of the other Interior languages, and I (not Kuipers) propose to not identify it with s- ‘nominalizer.’

Thompson, too, has (a) an ‘unrealized’ particle k (not k?), and (b) forms with s- where the s can be seen as performing the intentional or future function of the cognate s- in the other languages. Lilloyet has (a) a postclitic k(a)?? which van Eijk glosses ‘remote future, possibility;’ I find in van Eijk no mention of something that could be identified as s- ‘intentional,’ but in the midst of his discussions of forms with s-, I find evidence that Li, too, has (b) an s- the function of which parallels the Cr ‘inten.’

I have insufficient Cm data to discuss them here.4

Summary of forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>s-</th>
<th>k?</th>
<th>ks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>icet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-Fi-Sp</td>
<td>q?-</td>
<td>(q)s-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>k-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>k-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>k?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. COEUR D’ALENE. Reichard discusses a particle icet /icet/ ‘immediate or continuing future’ in sections 299 and 757-768 of her grammar. In section 299 R says:

299. s-, intentional. Most commonly this prefix is used to express intention in the immediate future in which case it is preceded by icet, which seems to be a free particle but which, because of its unstable ending, assimilates to the following sounds so intimately as to make it seem a prefix and so I have written it in many cases. However, the intentional may appear without icet, e.g., with hSt in which case it means “now I have decided to,” “now after consideration I intend ...” (p. 578).

In section 757 R says that icet “may be used of nouns or pronouns which are spoken of as existing in the future, or when implying a future relationship to the subject” (p. 666). In section 758 she adds that icet “modifies the meaning of verb-complexes and clauses in many ways and often requires the s-form of the verb.” In sections 759-768 R lists and exemplifies several uses of icet, independently, or in conjunction with other forms. My discussion pays special attention to the form of icet: (a) whether it occurs by itself; (b) as ges (which R analyzed < icet-s); and (c) as icet ... -s (where icet and s- are at some distance from one another).

I consider first the forms where icet (and not ges) is found. There are six examples in section 757. The second, third, and fourth examples of the group parallel the Ok likely-to-be forms (in all the examples to follow the hyphens are as found in Reichard, the transliteration is mine):

1. icet-hi-c’-hm my food to be

4 I still have not had time to study some Cm data that Dale Kinkade has made available to me.
A. Mattina 1996

2. a-čet-i-sín-ʻac-ʻac-än? made to be thy ear ornaments
3. na? ʻgiy-e-s-čet-ʔiš? when they finished getting what were to be eggs
Note that while in Ok the (genitive/possessive) person marker precedes kt-, the order of morphemes in Cr is čet - person marker. Synchronously in Cr the order of morphemes in forms with the possessive person markers is different from the order of morphemes in forms with the absolutive person markers, as follows: čet - possessive person marker
absolutive person marker - čet
and this might be a clue to the distribution of the allomorphs of the possessive prefixes (see Ok ḱn- ~ ḱn-; an- ~ a-). Note also that in 3. s- 'nom.' (R's analysis) precedes čet, and that čet is deeply embedded in the compound.

A fourth example (the first Reichard gives) shows čet separated from the person marker by another morpheme, al which she glosses 'belong:"

4. čet-al-iš-nikʷ-čal'mišexter are to belong to thy tribe
Reichard analyzes: "(in-s- = is; al- = belong; iš- = thy; s- = nom.; nikʷ, be made one; -čal'miš, person)."
The fifth example has two instances of čet in it:

5. čet-ʔe-čet-ʔe-xet-teʔa? in order for us to get what is to be fresh meat
Reichard analyzes: "(čet, fut.intent.; ʔe-; we; s- = inten. with čet; čet, fut. referring to meat; qet, fresh; -ʔe-xet, inside, meat). Here we have a form with absolutive (not genitive / possessive) person inflection, with the person marker occupying a different slot than in the previous examples. This example is repeated in the next page (and translated "in order that we may get fresh meat"), section 767, as one of two examples showing that čet functions as a verbal element as well as a nominal one" (p. 667). I give the other example that shows the "double function" of čet here, pointing out that, in fact, there are three occurrences of čet in the example’s two words:

5b. lute-čes-s-lút-s čes-tsey-ʔam-s-s, she must go, not the her woman would refusing to the future her going (sic)
Intentional "is formed from parts already familiar to us, and because of s- tends to become confused with the nominal form. It has nevertheless a distinct meaning." (p. 586). In the following 9 sections Reichard elaborates. In 347 she says that "[t]he intentional may be used without a modifying element but it is not common," and gives three forms:

17. s-ctiut-s-ênt-t-tetm let's go fetch it from him
18. s-cdin-êt-m-it-tam it was to be shown for him
19. k'-s-tuy-s-dct-s-t-tam it is to be looked at for thee

These three forms show a prefix s- which follows the subject proclitics, if present. In fact, in section 353 Reichard explains that "[t]he intentional transitive completive represents a simple form of the verb with s-prefix" (p. 587); she then gives a table of the complete paradigm, the first three entries of which are:

1-2 k'tis,—am, I intend to .... thee
1-3 hit,—am, I intend to .... him
1-2p k'pis,—am, I intend to .... you

The paradigm corresponds to the Okanagan paradigm that I call genitive. R also exemplifies a construction she calls 'intransitive completive,' consisting of "cât- fut. — pronominal subject — s- inten. — stem." The six examples she lists are:

20. cát-cèi-s-cèi—am, I am to go along (for cát-cèin-s-)
21. cát-ke-s-gèlč, thou art to see
22. cèb-s-nlc—aml, he is to cut (for cát-s-nlc —amnl)
23. cát-cèy'-átn, we are to eat (for cát-cè-s-átn)
24. cát-k'p-y'dc—acqe, you are to go out (for cát-k'p-s-dc—acqe, c before stem initial vowel > c)
25. cè-s-t-op-sènéi—üs (cè-s-t-op-sènt), they are to shoot something indefinite

In sum, R's data suggest that there is a morpheme cèt (R calls it a 'particle, but she writes it as a prefix). There is also s- 'intentional.' The data further show that 'intentional' and 'future' often co-

The suffix -amf corresponds to the -mix- of Ok -mix-a'r. I have not been able to find a section in Reichard's grammar where the suffix is discussed in full. There are various references to it, though, as, for example, the following: 350. If an indefinite object is implied the form is exactly the same except that verbs which take -am in the preceding case take -amf... (p. 587).
Note 93 of the Muskrat Trespasses text refers to the form cèy'ilec'pmf 'about to bathe' (a form which, incidentally, contains the cèt- prefix):

(93) cèt-s- vowel stem initial before accented syllable > cèy'—; see note 9; ucè bathe; -amf inten. with indef. obj.

Speaking of 'many particles difficult to classify,' R says: "They often stand alone seeming to be independent and again they influence the form of the verb, assimilate to its parts, and in so doing, lose their unsupported identity. Some of these I have written as affixes (prefixes chiefly). Others which stand midway between independence and affixes I discuss here once more, since they at times seem to hold the occur, normally at some distance from each other, occasionally continguously, thus causing some reinterpretation on the part of speakers, and eventually, problems of analysis for linguists. Both the "double function" (nominal and verbal) of cèt and the presence of two cèt-like morphs in a single form, suggest two prefixes, ces- and cet- one a future (with verbs); the other a to-be (with nouns). Historically it will probably be possible to connect Cèt ces with a full-fledged "independent" particle *k found in Proto Interior Salish.

4.3. Kalispel-Flathead-Spokane.
4.3.1. Vogt. Vogt lists two affixes that correspond to the two Okanagan affixes, k'-, ks-. Instead of the expected e, each of these has q. This signals either an irregular development, or borrowing from Ok. First I discuss qf-. In his discussion of Nouns Vogt explains that 'The nouns have a subjunctive, formed by the prefix qf-, or q- before initial s- ' (p. 27). He gives examples based on the two stems citè- 'house' and ilamètum 'chief' as follows:

citè- house
qfècitè- Lat. domus sit

qfèlitamètum I am going to be chief
k'qfèlitamètum Thou art going to be chief

qfèlitamètum he is going to be my chief
qfèlitamètum he is going to be thy chief

Two observations. First, these examples do not show the equivalent of Ok k'-u_klmètæms 'I am his chief-to-be.' Second, qfèlitamètum 'I am going to be chief' is the exact equivalent of Ok k'nm_klmètæm 'I am going to be chief' (see section 1.2).

There are in this section no examples of q(f)- before s-. One such can be found in section 47, where Vogt refers to another, related, alternation, that between qe- and qa. As he explains "that final glottalization is "lost in the personal prefix qa- before the particles qa- (q) and s- " (p. 22) he gives: qa-citè our house qfècitè this is going to be our house qfèesamèn ç'ti we are smoking qfèesamèn ç'ti we are going to smoke

The lowering of e to a is attributable to the adjacent post-velar; the difference between the two forms invites two interpretations, one that posits a single prefix qf- and leaves the presence of s- unexplained; the other that posits two prefixes, qf- and qa- and recognizes two different forms based on (different) class membership.

Such forms are found again in sections 106-108 where Vogt discusses 'Semi-nominal Forms,' "nominal forms with the prefix s- [that] have been integrated in the verbal system" (p. 41). In section 108 Vogt states that "There is a close relation between the pure s- forms and the forms with the expanded prefix qf- < verb-complex together; still others are independent" (p. 664).

More than unexplained, it should give those who want to interpret the following s- as 'nominalizer' pause to discover the s- present in the least noun-like constructions, and absent from the most noun-like constructions, but this is in fact what has usually been done.
forms are interchangeable: *gesanen* 'it and *qaqsanen* 'it let us smoke' (p. 41). The last form is the one discussed above. The "interchangeability" of these forms may parallel the Ok *ks*- future -s- intent forms.

Immediately after the "Semi-nominal Forms," in section 109 Vogt discusses "Subjunctive Forms" and the affix -s-. Vogt interprets all -s- as -st- "always combined with -s-." The section in its entirety reads as follows (line numbers inserted for reference purposes):

**Subjunctive Forms**

1. 109. The subjunctive forms are not all -s- forms, but they will be dealt with here as they form one morphological unit.
2. The prefixes are *qts-*, always combined [emphasis mine] with -s-, to give *qs-*, and -qe-. The aspect-suffixes remain unchanged.

**Continuous**

3. The prefixes *qs- and -qe- are both used, apparently without appreciable difference of meaning.

4. The continuative prefix *es- is dropped after -qs-.* Before the preverb *et*, only -qe- is used. We get thus, from *cinesamit* I am getting mad: *ciqesamit* I am going to be mad or *ciqesamit*.

5. *Ciqesamit* or *ciqesamit* I am going to be mad again; *cinesamit* I am pushing > *ciqskamit*.


7. The *cf- forms of class II and III are inflected as the independent nouns: *ciqesamit* *k*esamit *a*.

8. *Qs-*, *qs-*, *qs-*, *qaqskamit*, *qskamit*, *esamit*. The *qts- forms of class IV* as the dependent nouns: *ige*.

9. *Qamit*, *iqesamit*, *gskamit*, *qskamit*, *gskamit*.

10. The subjunctive forms have the same characteristics [of the first class of verbs]" Post lists:

**Pres.Cont.** CHIKES; KUKAES; KAES; KAKAES; PKAES; KAES

In Flathead Egesdal has implicitly assumed the former composition (by regularly interpreting Fl *qs* as *qts-"irrealis - nominalizer"); similarly Thomason. [Check Carlson].

The forms with *qe* may be the reflexes of constructions with a particle *qe* and the aspect prefix *es-;* XI21 shows how *qe* came to vary with -qs-, the particle merging with the 'intent' prefix (my analysis); the lone case of *qe*- is regular (see lines 7-8), and parallels the morphophonology of the equivalent Ok forms.

4.3.2. Post. In subsection c) of section C, "Remarks about moods and tenses," Post says that "When it [the imperative] conveys the absolute will of the commander ... the Subjunctive is to be used, e.g.

**AKS GISLITEM, thou must give it to him" (p. 37). The section continues with the following:

"The Subjunctive is also used to express the Latin gerundive, e.g.

CHIKES KOLKUELTI, I have the wish to talk" (p. 37).

In P's grammar I see no section that deals with "subjunctive," but in a section titled "The personal characteristics [of the first class of verbs]" Post lists:

**SUBJ.Fres.** - CHIKES; I; Ku KS; thou; KS; he; KAES, we; P KS, you; KO, they.

**Pres.Cont.** CHIKES; KUKAES; KAES; KAKAES; PKAES; KAES

Later in this sentence, V writes "su"su tuqatsik k"at e? (qaqskamit e?* e?* *e?*). This is interesting because it shows the sequence of tentatively emended (in V's word a "conjecture") to eliminate the *f*, which, apparently, he had recorded. The phrase means 'lots of firewood-to-be,' a noun phrase, *tuqatsik k"at e?* 'our firewood-to-be.'
The characteristic of the subjunctive, KS, becomes KE before a definite verbified noun, e.g. Chiks ilimigui, I want to be a chief.
Child ilimigum, I want to be the chief.

Child ilimigui, I want to be a chief.

(1) reading is suggesting is appropriate for s-.

The parenthesized reference is to the Giorda Dictionary. The translations with "want" accord with the "inten." saying that he states "Final E of Subjunctive and Future is likewise dropped before S not radical" (p. 26). In summary, as we have seen, Post says that qS- becomes qS-, and that qS- becomes qS-.

In section 4.1.4. of her edition of father Post's grammar, Speck synthesizes P's discussion and gathers all the pertinent examples as follows:

4.1.4. qS- 'subjunctive'

qS- 'subjunctive' occurs in both transitive and intransitive constructions. t of qS- is deleted before s- 'nominal', es- 'actual', et- 'back', and er et- 'have'. n of en- in- and an- deletes, and qS- 'first person plural' to qS- before qS-.

Subjunctives translate into English as two fairly distinct types of constructions, the first expressing 'wishing; obligation; future', and the second a 'dative of advantage'.

4.1.4.1. qS- 'wishing; obligation; future'

'ci qS-ksi-ti' 'I want to be good.'
'ci qS-es-ksi-ti' 'I want always to be good.'
'qS-ksi' 'I want to do it.'
'qS-esksi-s-ti-n' 'I wanted always to do it.'
'i-qS-ksi'-nit' 'I want her for my wife.' (D II p. 430)
'ci qS-esksi-ksi-ti' 'I have the wish to talk.'
'ci qS-es-ksi-m' 'I want always to be a chief.'

'tu? i-qS-esksi-ti u ex-qS-ksi' 'On account of my wishing to start, he is crying.'

'a-qS-xSksi-ti-m' 'Thou must give it to him.'
'kS-u a-qS-xSksi-ti-m s-ksi-n' 'You must give me some food.'
'ta qS-esksi-n-ti-x' tu? es-xi' 'Don't eat those ripe.'
'kS-u a-qS-xSksi-ti-m qS-esksi-mn' 'Make me a whip.'

See footnote 1.
It is for thee.'

These examples show:

1. Noun forms with \(qt\)- 'to-be' (and my paraphrases):
   - \(i-qi-n\).x\' -nox'
   - \(qa?qt-n-xs-e\)ice?
   - \(a-qi-ac-sqaxe?-tn\)
   - \(i-qi-citx'\)
   - \(a-qi-sf-c\)m
   - \(qi-q"ac-qi-s\)
   - \(a-qi-n-x.s-tfn\)
   - \(qi-xc-numt-s\)
   - \(qi-qe?-sf-s\)
   - \(qi-qix"-mn\)

2. Transitive forms with \(qs\)-:
   - \(q-s-l{\ul}'-n\)
   - \(q-es-l{\ul}'-s-t-n\)
   - \(ta q-s-\)
   - \(q-s-l{\ul}'-n-t-x\)

3. Intransitive forms with \(qs\)- and absolutive person markers:
   - \(Ci q-s-lts-t-i\) 'I want to be good.'
   - \(ci q-es-xs-t-i\)
   - \(ci q-s-«I-qwelt-i\)
   - \(ci q-es-ilmsx'\)
   - \(I{"} q-s-ici-m\)
   - \(I{"} q-s-c'aw-i\)
   - \(I{"} q-s-n-mi-p-m-ist-i\)
   - \(q-s-Xl-m-i\)
   - \(ne q-s-m6s-qt-m\)

4. Some intransitive forms all representing a construction that remains unclear to me:
   - \(q-s-nI{"} ,)?-i\)
   - \(q-s-c-nq-naqs-i\)
   - \(q-s-?esel-i\)
   - \(q-s-C' -esel-i\)

The forms \(P\) labels 'dative of interest' are unfamiliar to me. They are reminiscent of the \(Ok\) constructions of the type \(ilmix\)'m ia? kitkimt\(t\x' where I have identified \(\sim\) with 'have:' 'The chief (is the one who) has a wife. The \(Ok\) construction (and its equivalents elsewhere) deserve more study.

As for the other forms, they show \(qt\)- 'to-be' morpheme regularly added to nouns; they show a \(qs\)-morpheme regularly attached to verb forms

4.4. SHUSWAP. Sh has a morpheme \(k\) that Kuipers calls a "hypothetical-indeterminate" article, in opposition to some 'actual-determinate articles. The distinction hypothetical-indeterminate versus actual-determinate," K says, "hinges on whether the thing meant is uniquely determined for the speaker--in the case of physical object: whether he could conceivably point it out" (p. 57). As I have already reported in section 4.1, K explains that "hypothetical articles are found especially in interrogative, imperative and conditional sentences, in negative sentences, and in sentences referring to the future" (p. 57). So 'future' and 'to-be' are subsets of 'hypothetical-indeterminate.' All the negative commands listed on page 82, in fact, show \(k\). These commands are "expressed with the 3rd pers. suffixal form of ta?: t\(\sim\)was k-\(s\)k\(x\)\(x\)\(t\) don't let go!, t\(\sim\)was k-\(s\)k\(x\)\(x\)\(t\) don't believe h\(\sim\)!, t\(\sim\)was k-s\(s\)k\(x\)\(n\)\(c\)\(x\)\(m\)\(x\)\(m\)\(x\)\(m\) don't tell on me!, t\(\sim\)was fy\(\prime\)? k-\(s\)k\(f\)\(m\) don't do it!, t\(\sim\)was f\(\prime\)? k-s\(k\)\(f\)\(m\) don't do it that way!" Not only do they show \(k\), they also show \(s\) (and in two
cases? 13 Aert Kuipers writes to me that in these two cases "we have 2nd pers. possessive ?r- (sect. 11.4), and the following ?r- is simply the nominalizer... In Sh there is no prefix ?r- referring to future or intention" (p.c.), and he directs me to the explanation that "As is the case with simple nominalizations, the possessive paradigm is characteristic of ltr. verbs only" (Kuipers 1974:43). In other words, K identifies the ?r- found in these forms as the nominalizer because these forms are inflected with the possessive person markers, and possessive person markers are typical of nominal constructions.

13 Aert Kuipers writes to me that in these two cases "we have 2nd pers. possessive ?r- (sect. 11.4), and the following ?r- is simply the nominalizer... In Sh there is no prefix ?r- referring to future or intention" (p.c.), and he directs me to the explanation that "As is the case with simple nominalizations, the possessive paradigm is characteristic of ltr. verbs only" (Kuipers 1974:43). In other words, K identifies the ?r- found in these forms as the nominalizer because these forms are inflected with the possessive person markers, and possessive person markers are typical of nominal constructions.

16 K writes to me that "the notion 'intention' is ill-suited to e.g. the example they seem to be reluctant to come in, where you have the opposite of an intention (or an intention of the opposite). I would therefore stick to 'a fact, often with a shade of goal-directedness'... I think this is not too different from the use of Eng. 'to', which often has a shade of destination..." (p.c.). N. Mattina advises that lexical aspect should be kept separate from sentential aspect. She tells me "Assuming that s-intent is an inflectional mood that expresses the attitude of the speaker towards a proposition, the translation 'they seem to be reluctant'... conveys the apparent intent... There is no need for a negative intent" (p.c.).
'will you go?'
c/ke'e k s-Xcy'-cp /q?clyx
'are you people about to leave?'
as are two of the examples listed in 35.32:
s/te m s/te? k s/k'w-ên-t-n-e
'I will not step on it
s/te m s/te? k s/te[f]-a-s-ix-s
'he couldn't stand up'

and most of all, all the examples listed in 35.33 PROHIBITIVES:
/sm us th'e k e? s-(e)s/kâ+xà'n
'don't go barefoot!'
/ç/çk' us k s/k'i-t-ix-m-cm-x'
'don't come near me!'
/ô/ôk' us k e? s-yu?/yu?x'sxà'n
'don't trip!'
/ô/ôk' us k s/k'ên-x' xè'e k e? s/níq"
'stop taking this that you'd be stealing!'
/ô/ôk' us /qas-t-ôx'
'don't scratch (that particular place you're scratching)!' (cf. /ôk'êk' us k e? s/qas-çit 'don't scratch (yourself)')!

I would argue that in all these examples s- is not to be identified with s- NOM, but with s- cognate in form and function to Cr s- 'inten.'

4.6. LILLOOET. Lillooet has a postlithic - A(s) which van Eijk glosses 'remote future, possibility;' I find in van Eijk no mention of something that could be identified as s- 'intentional,' but it's appropriate to follow his discussion of other forms with s-. His dissertation treats the "nominalizer s-" (section 9), and the "stative prefix s-" (section 10.1.2). The latter, added to a stem, "indicates a state resulting from an action. Intransitive stems with stative s- are best translated by a present (active) or past (passive) participle" (p. 61).

All examples, disappointingly, are single words. In lesson 37 of his pedagogical grammar one finds the following:

When we want to tell somebody not to do something, we use the forms for "you did not ..." and "you folks did not ..." we learned in lesson 27; however, instead of s?nâx we use s?x?xas, so we get s?x?xas k? snâx s?nâx "don't you help him!"; s?x?xas k? sx?tenâl?k "don't you folks whistle at him!" etc. (p. 56-57).

The s- prefix is in all these forms, but is not discussed. Similarly, in all the forms of lesson 27, the s- is there, but is not identified. Note, however, that all the forms in lesson 27 are of the kind 'X did not ...,' aspectually different from those one could label "prohibitives;" it does not therefore seem appropriate to identify this s- with either the "nominalizer" or the "stative," but an interpretation "Inten." fits the facts.
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