Future in Colville-Okanagan Salish

Nancy Mattina
University of Montana

1. Introduction. Many languages of the world express future time with more than one grammatical device. Moreover, future markers (henceforth 'grams') tend to have functions that extend beyond the expression of future time (Bybee *et al* 1994). In Colville-Okanagan Salish, where tense is not an inflectional category, future meaning is expressed with 1) temporal particles and 2) a modal prefix. The particles are temporal conjunctions similar to English conjunctions 'when', 'once', and 'then'. The modal prefix marks several modalities which I describe below. What unites these diverse forms is their occurrence in simple predictions made by the speaker, i.e. the canonical use of future cross-linguistically. The diversity of form is not unexpected; futures frequently develop historically through pragmatic inferences rather than through formal oppositions. Similarly, the diversity of function shown by Colville-Okanagan future grams is in keeping with the finding that old, middle-aged, and new uses of a gram may coexist in a language as long as each function is sufficiently specialized (Bybee *et al* 1994:243).

The goal of this paper is to sketch the semantics and form of Colville-Okanagan futures to reveal the complexity of the situation. First I describe the temporal particles used as future grams and then the modalities of the inflectional future prefix. Finally, I consider the value of the term 'irrealis' in describing Colville-Okanagan future grams.

2. Particle future. Ok uses three preverbal particles to mark canonical future clauses: *n'ín'w'i?*, *mət*, and *mi*.[1] These particles function primarily to sequence non-past or non-perfective events. They appear to be temporal conjunctions with a future nuance that is made stronger by the addition of the epistemic particles *cəm'* 'probably,

[1]There are cognate forms in at least some of the other Interior Salish languages. For example, Moses-Columbia *n'n'áw'iya?* 'soon' is cognate with Colville-Okanagan *n'ín'w'i?*.

maybe, might' or *uc* 'possibly'. *n'ín'w'i?* and *mət* typically introduce main clauses but *mi* is limited to subordinate clauses. *n'ín'w'i?* is the most common future particle in the speech of Colville elder Pete Seymour from whom examples (1-8) come.[2,3]

(1) axá? i?_t_i-səxʷk'ʷúl'əm **n'ín'w'i?** c-k'ʷúl'ɬəm-s
deic art_prep_1sPoss-workman fut asp-fix(tr)-3sSub
My working man will care for them. GW:201

(2) **n'ín'w'i?** put ənk'ʷəspíntk kʷu_ɬcyáᶜp
fut exact one_year 1pSub_come_back
It will be exactly one year that we come back. GW:7

(3) way' **n'ín'w'i?** ixí? kn_x̌əltsqílxʷ
mod fut dei 1sSub_invite_people
I will invite people

ixí? mi kʷu c-mrim
dei fut 1pSub marry
then we will get married. GW:722

(4) way' **n'ín'w'i?** kn_mypnwítən,
pt fut 1sSub_learn
I will learn,

t_swit kʷu_m'áyaɬt-s
prep_someone 1sObj_teach(tr)-3sSub
anybody shows me,

[2]Most of the data in this paper come from texts collected, translated and published by Anthony Mattina and two generations of Colville-Okanagan speakers. The data is identified by an abbreviated source name and page or line number. The abbreviations are: GW = The Golden Woman; COD = Colville-Okanagan Dictionary; EC = Enow'kin Centre's axá? i? kʷu_suknaqínx i? scq'aq'áy'təɬ ta_nqílxʷcən (see References for full bibliographic entries). Data not from these sources is from Sarah Peterson, Okanagan elder and teacher.

[3]Abbreviations for the glosses are as follows: fut = future; tr = transitive; Sub = subject; Obj = object; Gen = genitive subject; prep = preposition; asrt = assertive mode; deic = deictic; asp = aspect; art = article; Poss = possessive person; neg = negative particle; Imp = imperative; ques = question marker; s = singular; p = plural.

uɬ	way'	məɬ	**n'ín'w'i?**	mypnú-n
and		likely	fut	learn(tr)-1sSub
and I'll learn.			COD:130	

While in the preceding examples *n'ín'w'i?* translates as an intentional future, its temporal (rather than modal) function is evident in other examples.

(5)

uɬ	**n'ín'w'i?**	ixí?	k^{w}u_wi?sk'^{w}ul'ənt-x^{w}	
and	fut	deic	1sObj_finish_fix(tr)-2sSub	
And when you finish taking care of me,				
lut	k^{w}u_a-ks-nk'^{w}ix^{w}kn'əm			
neg	1sObj_2sSub-fut-remove_saddle(tr)			
don't take the saddle off me.			GW:64	

(6)

n'ín'w'i?	wi?sm'ay?ncút-əlx	
when	finish_telling_about_self-3p	
When they're done telling about themselves,		
ixí?	**məɬ**	k^{w}u_c-mrim.
dei	fut	1pSub_asp-marry.
then we will get married.		GW:403

The particle *n'ín'w'i?* also occurs in conditional clauses, usually in combination with epistemic particles *cəm'*, *iwá* 'even (if)', or *cak^{w}* 'contrary-to-fact'.[4] The data in (7) suggest that *n'ín'w'i?* may have an epistemic interpretation along with its temporal one but it is a rare example of its kind in the corpus.

(7)

n'ín'w'i?	k^{w}_nx̌iɬ
if	2sSub_be_scared
If you get scared	

[4]A description of the epistemic particles in Okanagan is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this paper. However, some of them lend themselves to future interpretations through inference. For example *cəm'* is often translated with English *will*, but most contexts suggest that epistemic *might* is more accurate.

(i)

cəm'	way' k^{w}_?ácqa?
might	2sSub_get_out
You will get out.	EC:129

(ii)

cəm'	kn_c-náq'^{w}əq'^{w}
might	1sSub_be_robbed
(They) might steal from me. [lit. 'I might get stolen from']	GW:851

məɬ	way'	λ'ax^{w}t	y	a-sk'^{w}iλ'tm
fut		die	art	2sPoss-brothers
they'll die, your brothers.			GW:44	

Okanagan elder Martin Louie uses the particle *məɬ* to sequence non-past events.[5]

(8)

ixí?_uɬ	k^{w}u_cu-s,				
and then	1sObj_say(tr)-3sSub				
And he told me,					
"cəm'	x^{w}u·y	ɬ	a-(k)sc-x^{w}əlx^{w}ált		
maybe	go	that	2sSub-fut-be_alive		
"In the future if you are still alive,					
məɬ	wíkənt-x^{w}				
fut	see(tr)-2sSub				
you will see					
i?_ta?_nwíst	i?	sqilx^{w}	ka?	əc-tk^{w}tək^{w}?út.	
art_prep_sky	art	people	who	asp-travel(pl)	
people travelling in the sky.					
ta_nwíst	**məɬ**	x^{w}uy	i?	sqilx^{w}	
prep_sky	fut	go	art	people	
The people (will) travel in the air.					
atlá?	k^{w}_x^{w}uy_**məɬ**	k'əl_p'úλ'əm	i?	təmx^{w}úla?x^{w}[6]	
dei	2sSub_go_fut	prep_end	art	earth	
you (will) go from here to the end of the earth, (and)					
məɬ	k^{w}_ntx̌x̌qínəm.	k^{w}_wi?cín,		k^{w}_ɬcn?amtíkn	
fut	2sSub_lunch.	2sSub_finish_eating		2sSub_ride_back	
you (will) have lunch.		You get done eating, you can ride back			

[5]This may be a dialectal difference. I found little use of *n'ín'w'i?* in the texts prepared by the En'owkin Centre from Martin Louie, Sandy Lezard, Edna Jack, and Tommy Gregoire. More common was *məɬ*.

[6]This is a rare example of the modal *məɬ* following the verb in Colville-Okanagan. The cognate forms in Thompson, Shuswap, and Lillooet are enclitic.

ixí? la_ct'əx^{w}tlwís **məɬ** k^{w}_ɬcx^{w}uy.
dei prep_airplane fut 2sSub_come_back.
on the airplane (and you will) come back here.

məɬ alá k^{w}_ɬckicx
fut here 2sSub_come back
You (will) get back here, (and)

məɬ alá k^{w}_ɬk'lax^{w}m, **mi** way' k'əl_sp'uλ'əm
fut here 2sSub_spend evening, fut already prep_end
you will spend the evening here again, you will have gone to the ends

i? təmx^{w}úla?x^{w}
art earth.
of the earth. EC:10-11

Pete Seymour uses *məɬ* in the same way, as illustrated in (9).

(9) axá? cəm' t'i k^{w}_k?əmtíw's
dei if asrt 2sSub_mount_horse
As soon as you get on the horse

məɬ kn_nwísəlx
fut 1sSub_rise_up
I will go in the air. GW:491

When the narrative is in perfective past time, speakers use *uɬ* 'and', *uɬ ixí?* 'and then' or *uɬ way'* 'and then' to sequence events. Contrast the following passage in which the translators use English past tense and *məɬ* does not occur.

(10) uɬ ɬp'əlák'-əlx uɬ itli? ya^{ʕ}cín-lx i?_ta_nx^{w}ənɬk^{w}ítk^{w}
and turn_back-3p and deic follow-3p art_prep_Kettle River.
Then they turned back and followed the shores of the Kettle River.

x^{w}uy?ilx uɬ k'əl_sx^{w}nitk^{w} y^{ʕ}áp-əlx.
travel-3Sub and prep_Colville arrive-3p
They went and they got to Colville.

ilí? y^{ʕ}áp-əlx i?_l_sx^{w}nitk^{w},
deic arrive-3p art_prep_Colville
They got [to Colville]

uɬ_way' c-kmistim i?_t_sqilx^{w}.
and then asp-know_about(tr) art_prep_people
and the people already knew about them. EC:6

məɬ does occur in customary, non-perfective clauses where it may be translated as 'would' as in (11).

(11) atlá? i?_λ'axəxλ'xáp **məɬ** k^{w}úst-səlx i?_ttw'it
deic art_elders fut send(tr)-3pSub art_boy
From there the elders would send a boy...

t'i cənkxán i?_ttw'it **məɬ** ntrqpncút
pt by_foot art_boy fut run
The boy'd go on foot

k'a_n?iλ'ltk λ'?am t_sman'x^{w}.
prep_north get prep_tobacco
and he runs north to get some tobacco. EC:123

The particle *mi* occurs in environments similar to *məɬ*, also with a non-past sequencing function.

(12) **n'in'w'i?** ckicxst-x^{w} i? skək^{ʕ}áka
fut bring back(tr)-2sSub art birds
When you bring back the birds,

mi ?uk^{w}ɬt-x^{w} ya? ylmíx^{w}əm
fut take(tr)-2sSub art king
take them to the king. COD:95

(13) way' k^{w}_way'
already 2sSub_finish
When you quit

mi t_k^{w}úk^{w}a? kn_ɬk'^{w}úl'əm t_x̌yáɬnəx^{w}
fut prep_different 1sSub_make_again prep_sun
I'll make a different sun. EC:143

mi also occurs in the apodasis or consequent clause.

(14) axá? **n'in'w'i?** i?_t_skɬa?másq'ət
deic fut art_prep_along_sky
If right next to the sky

mi k^{w}u_x^{w}uy
fut 1pSub_go
we'll go

mi uc ɬ ks-pənhɬw'sənt-m
fut possible that fut-get_there(tr)-1pSub
we might get there on time. GW 491

(15) cəm' kn_ɬa?ɬa?t'xʔán **mi** kn_həhú?
might 1sSub_wet_feet fut 1sSub_catch_cold
Should I get my feet wet I'll catch cold. COD:95

The temporal particles *n'ín'w'i?*, *mət*, and *mi* link tenseless clauses to order events with respect to one another. Because Colville-Okanagan has an inflectional system of aspect that marks sentential aspect on the verb, the temporal linkage provided by particles may be best understood as narrative or discourse aspect.[7] The functional niche of *n'ín'w'i?*, *mət*, and *mi* , therefore, is above the level of the VP, and may be above the level of the sentence.

3. Inflectional future. The inflectional future in Colville-Okanagan expresses a range of modalities in addition to canonical future meaning. The form of this future gram is *ks-*, which is prefixed to a verb stem.[8] The modalities it expresses are included in Joan Bybee's typology of modality, summarized as follows:

1. **epistemic**: expresses the degree of commitment of the speaker to the truth of the proposition;
2. **agent-oriented**: specifies conditions on agents with respect to the completion of the predicate;
3. **speaker-oriented**: signals that the utterance is a directive or mand;
4. **subordinate**: signals that the clause is not asserted.

(based on Bybee 1998 and Bybee and Fleischmann 1995)

In Colville-Okanagan, epistemic modality is marked by preverbal particles and speaker-oriented modality is expressed chiefly through imperative suffixes (see A.

[7]In elicitation, a perfective predicate with no accompanying temporal particles has a past time interpretation.

[8]A. Mattina 1993, 1996, Mattina and Mattina 1995, and N. Mattina 1996 have claimed that *ks-* is the future marker for verbal predicates. A second prefix, *kɬ-*, is found on noun phrases and predicative nominals with atemporal interpretations. I hope to provide a complete historical and synchronic discussion of *ks-* versus *kɬ-* in a future paper.

Mattina 1980). I describe below the several types of agent-oriented and subordinate modality that are expressed with the verbal prefix *ks-* in 3.1-3.4.

3.1 Agent-oriented modalities. Agent-oriented modality denotes conditions of 1) desire or intent, 2) obligation, or 3) ability that obtain over the agent of a proposition. This modality differs from simple future in not functioning primarily to mark a speaker's prediction. It is common, however, for grams that mark agent-oriented functions to develop into future markers. This appears to be the case in Colville-Okanagan where the agent-oriented uses of *ks-* co-exist with the future use. Examples (16)-(18) show main clauses with intentional future interpretations marked by the prefix *ks-*.[9]

(16) cús-əlx: way' uɬ ʷəl?ɬw k^{w}_ylmɬx^{w}əm
say-3pSub father 2sSub_chief
They said: "Father, you are the chief,

uɬ ks-m'áya?ɬt-s-t i? sck'ətpá?x̌-təɬ
and fut-tell(tr)-2sObj-1pSub art thinking-1pPoss
and we are going to tell you what we are thinking. GW:4

(17) way' náx̌əmɬ k^{w}_i-ks-q^{w}əlq^{w}ɬstəm."
but 2sObj_1sGen-fut-speak(tr)
but (first) I want to talk to you. GW:636

(18) t'ax^{w} náx̌əmɬ t_anwí? λ'a?nt-ɬx^{w},
asrt but prep_you fetch(tr)-2sSub
But you go after it,

lut k^{w}_t'_i-ks-x^{w}ɬc'əɬtəm
neg 2sObj_asrt_1sGen-fut-give(tr)
I'm not going to hand it to you. GW:289

A second subtype of agent-oriented modality encodes the obligation or necessity of an agent's action. This modality falls short of imperative mode and is best translated with English 'ought to/have to' constructions.

(19) uɬ ixí? i-ks-λ'a?ɬtím
and deic 1sGen-fut-fetch(tr)
And then I'm supposed to go after them. GW:211

[9]Predicates inflected with *ks-* may be transitive or intransitive; person-marking is from the intransitive, transitive, or genitive (i.e. nominalized) verbal paradigms. *ks-* is *k-* before *s*.

(20) uɬ ixíʔ nixʷ a-**ks**-tíxʷm, ixíʔ nixʷ a-**ks**-txt'ám,
and deic also 2sGen-fut-gather deic also 2sGen-fut-care for(tr)
You can gather this [food] also, take care of that too,

a-**ks**-ǎaʔx̌ʔám ixíʔ, lut a-**ks**-k'ʷlʼɬtanm'úsm
2sGen-fut-respect(tr) deic neg 2sGen-fut-squander(tr)
treat it with respect, don't squander it. EC:18

(21) way' a-**ks**-k'ʷúl'm a-sqʷəsqʷsíʔ
2Sub-fut-work(tr) 2sPoss-child
You should work with your child

ɬə sx̌aʔx̌áʔs iʔ siwɬkʷ
that sacredness art water
about the sacredness of the water. EC:15

(22) uɬ lut kʷu_t'ə a-**ks**-ʔaǎlíkstəm[10]
and neg 1sObj_asrt 2sSub-fut-guide(tr)
You don't have to guide (steer) me. GW:493

Another subtype of agent-oriented modality expresses the inherent and/or situational conditions that constrain the actions of the agent. That is, this modality comments on the ability of an agent to perform the event named in the proposition. In each of the following examples, the context makes clear that a physical or mental limitation impedes the agents.

(23) cakʷ iwáʔ ɬ kt'áq'əxnəm
if even that stretch-3sSub
If even she stretched,

uɬ lut t'ə **ks**-k'əɬkɪcs-s
then neg asrt fut-reach(tr)-3sSub
she can't reach it. GW:357

[10]A negated agent-oriented clause can be distinguished from a negative command by the optional presence of the epistemic particle *t'* (sometimes *t'(ə)* or *t'x*ʷ) which signals an assertion by a speaker. Contrast the negative command in (i):
(i) lut kʷu_a-ks-ʔaǎlíkstəm
neg 1sObj_2sSub-fut-steer(tr)
Don't guide me! S. Peterson

(24) lut kʷu_t'ə **ks**-cənkcníkən'təm
neg 1pObj_asrt fut-overtake(tr)
Never will she overtake us. GW:223

(25) lut t'ə_**ks**-k'əɬwíkxənt-əm k'la nwist
neg asrt_fut-track(tr)-1pSub prep sky
We can't track him in the sky. GW:679

3.2 Future. Future is distinct from agent-modality in that its core function is to indicate a prediction rather than the conditions obtaining over the agent. Example (26) is a prophecy, just the pragmatic environment in which a future gram would yield a prediction but not agent-oriented modality.

(26) cut iʔ scutx "kʷu_**ks**-ckícəntəm iʔ kpiqc'aʔ
said art one_who said 1pObj_fut-arrive(tr) art white_ones
The one who said it said, "The white skinned ones will arrive among us.

ks-ckícxst-s iʔ cnq'ʷəyknʕálxqən
fut-bring(tr)-3Sub art black-horned cows
They will bring black-horned cows.

kʷu_ks-ʔíɬtəm iʔ stím'təɬ iʔ spəqic'aʔ
1pObj_fut-eat(tr) art stuff-1pPoss art white ones
The white skinned ones will eat (up) our food.

kʷu_**ks**-ʔíɬtəm kʷu_**ks**-tər'qxnmíɬtəm iʔ stəxʷcəncutət
1pObj_fut-eat(tr) 1pObj_fut-trample(tr) art wild_food-1pPoss
They are going to eat and trample the food that we would gather." EC:27-8

Although interrogative, the first clause of (27) does not have intentional, obligational, or abilitative mode but does express a likely future event, i.e., a prediction.

(27) uɬ lut haʔ a-**ks**-ənstils **n'ín'w'lʔ** kʷu_cmrim,
and neg ques 2sSub-fut-think if 1pSub_marry

mɔɬ taʔlíʔ kʷ_cpaʔpaʔsínk
then much 2sSub_feel_bad
And won't you think if we marry, very much you will be sorry? GW:638

3.3 Immediate future. Ok also has an aspectual future which is marked with the prefix *ks-* and a suffix *(-mix)-aʔx*. The longer form of the suffix occurs following

'weak' stems, i.e. those stems that lose stress to certain suffixes, including *-(mlx)-a?x*. These aspectual futures inflect with the intransitive person markers. They are often translated by Colville-Okanagan speakers as 'about to V' or 'going to V'. The following examples occur in contexts where neither a prediction nor agent-oriented modality are appropriate interpretations.

(28) **ks**-m'ayncút-a?x-əlx axá? i? k^{w}ək^{w}r'ɬt i-skək^{ʕ}áka?
fut-story_tell-asp-3pSub deic art golden 1sPoss-bird(s)
They are going to tell a story these birds of mine. GW:411

(29) qiɬt-x way' k^{w}u_**ks**-ƛ'əx^{w}t-mɬxa?x^{w}
waken-Imp 1pSub_fut-die-asp
"Wake up! We are going to die!" GW:538

(30) kn_**ks**-x^{w}úy-a?x
1sSub_fut-go-asp
I am going to go/I'm leaving (now). S. Peterson

As Bybee *et al* (1994) point out, immediate futures are not true futures, since they function less as predictions than as indicators of temporal phase. The next example, (31), highlights the phasal (aspectual) nature of Colville-Okanagan immediate futures; no prediction or agent-oriented modality can be attributed to the clause

(31) cus i? q'sápi? **ks**-ənt'ək'^{w}t'ək'^{w}u?sɬkən'-a?x
said art long ago_ones fut-travel_towards_noon-asp
As they said long ago, it was going towards noon. EC:52

The functions of *ks* range over modality, future, and aspect and there are examples in which more than one function of *ks* is exploited. Intentionality and desire appear to be combined with immediate future in (32) and (33).

(32) lut t'ə cmyst-ɬn,
neg asrt know(tr)-1sSub
I don't know anything

uɬ kn_**ks**-m'i?m'ya?ncút-a?x
and 1sSub_fut-teach_self-asp
but I would like to [start to] teach myself. GW122

(33) lut pən'kín k^{w}u_t'ə **ks**-nc'əspúla?x^{w}-a?x[11]
neg always 1pSub_asrt fut-empty_earth-asp
We will survive [lit. We are never going to vacate the Earth.] EC:218

3.4 Subordinate modality. While all of the functions of *ks-* described above occur in main and subordinate clauses, there are two functions of *ks-* that are limited to subordinate contexts. First, *ks-* marks purposive subordinate clauses.

(34) k'^{ʕ}ás-əlx, ya^{ʕ}yá^{ʕ}t i?_l_təmx^{w}úla?x^{w}
pray-3pABS all art_on_earth
They pray (to the salmon) on the whole earth,

lut **ks**-tɬlx^{w}i?-s-əlx i?_**ks**-tx^{w}cəncút-s-əlx
not fut-be_difficult-asp-3pSu art_fut-get_food-asp-3pl
so that it may not be difficult to get food

a? nsiwɬk^{w} ixɬ?
art_in_water deic
from the water EC:21

(35) way' i?_t_xƛ'ut miy-s sənt'əpt'páqs-əs
art_prep_rock place(tr)-3sSub corners-3sPoss
Rocks he put on the corners

lut i?_t_sniw't **ks**-nɬw'ənt̓əm
neg art_prep_wind fut-blow(tr)
(So) the wind won't blow it away. GW:283

(36) uɬ p_cut x̌mɬnk-əmp p_**ks**-k'^{w}ul'-a?x
and 2pSub_say desire-2pPoss 2pSub-fut-make-asp
And you say you want to make

c'x̌iɬ t_snm'a?m'a?yatn
be_like prep_school
something like a school

ks-m'a?m'áya?nt-əp i? səcm'ɬlt-əmp
fut-teach(tr)-2pSub art children-2pPoss
for teaching your children. EC:211

---

[11]The semantics of this sentence make the label 'immediate future' infelicitous. Perhaps the label 'prospective' which I have used elsewhere for this construction would be better suited to it.

(37) **n'ln'w'í?** kn_symscút lut k^{w}u_**ks**-k'ɔɬ?anwɪntɔm
fut 1sSub_do_best neg 1pObj_fut-sense(tr)
I will do my best (so) that they won't hear us. GW215

(38) ixí? uɬ k^{w}_s-ɔnʕacúsɔm-s **ks**-púlstɔm-s
deic and 2sObj_asp-bait-asp fut-kill(tr)-3sSub
But she is baiting you [in order] to kill you. GW:503

(39) uɬ ɬwa? **k'ɔɬ?ɔx^{w}?ɔx^{w}k^{w}úkstɔm** **ks** ɔnx^{w}stitk^{w} a?x
and in_vain beg(tr) fut-enter water asp
She kept begging him to go into the water. GW:354

(40) uɬ_ixí? t'i? k^{w}_sc-q^{w}ílm-s x^{w}us k^{w}_**ks**-?itx-a?x
then asrt 2sSub_asp-trick-asp hurry 2sSub_fut-sleep-asp
But (she's) just faking you in a hurry to put you to sleep. (lit. 'But you are being tricked so that you fall asleep in a hurry.) GW:899

Subordinate reason clauses in Coylille-Okanagan lack *ks-*, as shown by (41).

(41) kɔn_**ks**-λ'ɔl-míxa?x aɬí? k^{w}u_ɬ málx̌a?nt-x^{w}
1sSub_fut-be_killed-asp because 1sObj_that lie(tr)-2sSub
I am going to be killed because you lied to me. GW:305

A second specialized function of *ks-* is to indicate the verbal complement of certain complement-taking predicates. These complement-taking predicates are of two major types. The first is a psychological predicate type, typically expressing the experiencer subject's desire or fear with respect to the complement proposition. The common theme of such predicates is that they express an emotional attitude toward a possible outcome. A main predicate of *desire* (42)-(43) has the same complement type as a predicate of *fear* (44).[12]

(42) lut t' **ln-x̌mínk** ɬ i-**ks**-siwstɔmstɔm
neg asrt 1sPoss that 1sGen-fut-water(tr)
I don't want to water him. GW:66

[12]Expressions of the type 'X wants [to V]' are typically expressed with the main predicate nominalized, as shown in the examples here. These constructions may be understood as having a null copula with a structure more like 'X's desire is [to V]. However it is best to analyze this construction, the *ks-* clause is a complement to a higher predicate.

(43) uɬ **spu?ús-ɔmp** p_**ks**-tɔk^{w}tɔk^{w}?út-a?x
and wish-2pPoss 2pSub_fut-travel-asp
And your wish is to travel around. GW.11

(44) uɬ_aɬí? s-**ks**-k^{w}ɔl't-míx in-kɔwáp
because asp-fut-sweat-asp 1sPoss-horse
(because) my horse was sweating

uɬ_aɬí? **kn_sk'lnt** ɬ i **ks**-ɔnk^{w}a?cnux^{w}
because 1sSub_fear that 1sGen-fut-be_late
and I was afraid that I'd be late

kɔm' ɬ i-**ks**-ɔnsl'íp.
or that 1sGen-fut-be_lost
or that I'd get lost. GW:516

The second type of complement-taking predicate that requires *ks-* on its verbal complement can be characterized as 'achievement' predicates. These complement-taking predicates characterize the ability of the agent named in the main clause.

(25) uɬ náx̌ɔmɬ **tílx-s**
and however not_be_able-3sPoss
but he couldn't

ɬɔ **ks**-ɔnma?ípí?-s i? sk'^{w}íλ'tɔm-s
that fut-tell_on-3sPoss art brothers-3sPoss
tell on his brothers.
[lit. But it's hard for him to tell on his older brothers.] GW:252

(26) uɬ **kɔn** **tɔlx^{w}míst** ɬ i-**ks**-x^{w}t'ílx
and 1sSub struggle that 1sGen-fut-get_up
and I can't lift myself up. [lit. I find it difficult to get up.] GW:484

(27) way' lut **qínú-s**
neg be_able(tr)-3sSub

ɬɔ **ks**-qáqcɔlx-s axá? i? snkłc'a?sqáx̌a?
that fut-trot-3sGen deic art horse
His horse is not even able to trot. GW.640

(28) k'^{w}ín'-n i-**ks**-q^{w}ɔl'q^{w}ílt
try(tr)-1sSub 1sGen-fut-talk
I tried to talk. S. Peterson

The function of *ks-* clauses after *desire/fear-* and *ability/inability*-predicates shares with the purposive clauses their non-asserted character. While the subordinating particle *t* optionally occurs between the main predicate and its complement, the *ks-* on the lower predicate is sufficient to mark subordination and semantic dependency in the lower clause. In subordinate contexts, *ks-* does not mark future time or a prediction. Its functions in subordinate clauses are modal and may be historically related to main clause modal functions of *ks-*.[11]

4. Future vs. Irrealis. The diversity of form and function of future grams in Colville-Okanagan frustrates attempts to isolate an invariant shape associated with a single morphological category 'future'. In Colville-Okanagan, future time can be indicated grammatically with temporal and modal devices; some of the grams that are used to indicate future time have other non-future uses. This situation begs the question of whether 'future' is a grammatical category of Colville-Okanagan. Some analysts have applied the label 'irrealis' to organize this diffuse area of Salish grammar but as M. Dale Kinkade (1998) points out, there has not been much attention paid to irrealis in Salishan linguistics.

The data I have presented here for Colville-Okanagan suggest that the label 'irrealis' applied either to the morph *ks-* or to the category of future notions is not an improvement over other proposals. First, it is far from clear what comprises the category irrealis generally, although it is usually associated with events or situations that have not taken place. Chafe (1995:363) argues that the realis-irrealis distinction may be thought of as "a covert semantic pressure that emerges in different languages in different ways". This observation brings to mind the way in which time--grammaticized as tense or aspect or both--is expressed in all languages. In the absence of a cross-linguistically tested theory of 'irrealis', it is not yet possible to test for it as a grammatical macrocategory.

Second, As Bybee (1998:265) notes, the application of the broad concept 'real vs. unreal' may miss the sometimes contradictory, polysemous details of lexical and grammatical items. In Colville-Okanagan, for example, *ks-* occurs in asserted, future main clauses while some subordinate *ks-* clauses are non-asserted non-futures. Further, there is nothing unreal about agent-modality: if an agent intends, is responsible for, or is able to perform an act, those conditions are present in the situation. Only true futures and clauses with subordinate modality involve events that have not taken place. Although Colville-Okanagan *ks-* would appear to be a candidate for the 'irrealis' label, the details of its functions counsel against it.

For many languages 'irrealis' may be a handy morphological label with little theoretical import. Even in Colville-Okanagan, the subordinate modality marked by *ks-* could be described alternatively as 'irrealis' or 'subjunctive'. However, the data show that in Colville-Okanagan 'irrealis' is a narrow subtype of modality and not the

[11]In Mattina (1999) I argue on the basis of comparative data that main clause uses of *ks-* developed from subordinate clauses.

reverse. 'Future' is a slightly broader subcategory in Colville-Okanagan and elsewhere and therefore is the better descriptive label.

References

Bybee, Joan. 1998. "Irrealis" as a Grammatical Category. Anthropological Linguistics 40: 257-271.

Bybee, Joan and Suzanne Fleischman. 1995. An Introductory Essay. Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Typological Studies in Language 32. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bybee, J., Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, Wallace. 1995. The Realis-Irrealis Distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian Languages, and English. In, Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Typological Studies in Language 32, p. 349-365. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

En'owkin Centre Okanagan Language Project. 1994. axá? i?_k"u_suknaqínx i_scq'aq'áytət ta_nqílx"cən (Okanagan Writings). Penticton, B.C.: En'owkin Centre.

Kinkade, M. Dale. Is Irrealis a Grammatical Category in Upper Chehalis? Anthropological Linguistics 40:234-244.

Mattina, Anthony. 1980. Imperative Formations in Colville-Okanagan and in the other Interior Salishan languages. Glossa 14:212-232.

_____. 1985. The Golden Woman: The Colville Narrative of Peter J. Seymour, translated by Anthony Mattina and Madeleine de Sautel. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

_____. 1987. Colville-Okanagan Dictionary. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

_____. 1993. Okanagan Aspect: A Working Paper. Papers from the Twenty-eighth International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, 233-263. Seattle: University of Washington.

_____. 1996. Interior Salish *to-be* and *intentional* Forms: A Working Paper. Papers from the Thirty-first International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, 239-248. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

_____ and Nancy Mattina. 1995. Okanagan *ks-* and *kt-*. Papers for the Thirtieth International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages. Victoria: University of Victoria.

Mattina, Nancy. 1996. Aspect and Category in Okanagan Salish. Ph.D. dissertation. Simon Fraser University.

_____. 1999. Toward a History of the Inflectional Future in Colville-Okanagan Salish. Paper presented at the Second Workshop on American Indigenous Languages, May 14-16. University of California, Santa Barbara.