How I Interlinearize "Invaluable Stories" and Other Texts

Tony Mattina

In this paper I describe how and explain why I interlinearize Colville-Okanagan texts. First I describe the basic units of near-phonemic transcriptions; then how I analyze each word of the recorded utterance into stems and inflectional affixes, and how each stem and each inflectional affix is assigned an English gloss; and finally how each recorded utterance is translated into English. I explain how I treat phrasal words, amalgams, lexical variants, compounds and complex forms; and I explain how I treat non-inflectional material, and special cases of inflectional material.[1]

---

[1] "Invaluable stories" is how Okanagan elder Harry Robinson (now deceased), renders in English captíkʷɫ (cəpcaptíkʷɫ in the plural). In the first of a series of interviews with ethnographer Wickwire, tape recorded in 1977 (copies deposited at the archives of the American Philosophical Society) this exchange takes place:

[Robinson] "Coyote. You might did not know this, this cəpcaptíkʷɫ, the first, you know cəpcaptíkʷɫ, that means , that means *invaluable stories*.

[Wickwire] Oh.

[Robinson] cəpcaptíkʷɫ, that's an Indian word.

[Wickwire] Improbable stories?

[Robinson] cəpcaptíkʷɫ, that's, that's, this one here that

[Wickwire] Oh, yeah.

[Robinson] cəpcaptíkʷɫ sənk̓líp, that's Coyote, sənk̓líp

[Wickwire] Right, oh, yeah.

[Robinson] Yeah, cəpcaptíkʷɫ sənk̓líp, that means *invaluable stories* Coyote.

[Wickwire] So does that mean that they're true stories, or not? Are they true stories? Did they really happen?

[Robinson] That's *invaluable stories*, that's from way back that we can't guarantee if it's true stories or not. But it's the stories. The way I heard that stories

[Wickwire] yeah

[Robinson] is that I don't know if it's true

[Wickwire] ah ah

[Robinson] or may not. We cannot tell

[Wickwire] uh uh

[Robinson] that's too far back. *Invaluable stories* that's when they're animal instead of human. sənk̓líp at that time he's the leader and . See this one here cəpcaptíkʷɫ sənk̓líp are *invaluable stories* Coyote. That's what it is. And at this time…

1   The Transcriptions of the Texts

Here I describe how I write the texts. Each text is divided into lines; each line is a convenient discourse unit that may correspond to sentence, complex or otherwise, but only approximately. There may be lines that consist of fragments of sentences, such as lists, for example, if I saw fit to do so for such practical reasons as to constrain the length of a line. Each word of the line is divided into its stem and inflectional affixes, with some exceptions, as explained here. Each stem and each inflectional affix is given a gloss, and the whole Colville² line is translated into English. I enclose editorial comments, additions, or corrections in square brackets; and I enclose in curly brackets false starts, repetitions, unfinished words, and other intrusive matter.

1.1   Approximate Phonemic Transcriptions

Each Colville line is in approximate phonemic transcription. Three details make it approximate: (a) the use of schwa, which marks mostly predictable epenthesis; (b) the use of vowels in place of underlying semi-consonants; (c) the transcription of phonetic [c] as [ts].

I use schwa because the Colville and Okanagan speakers I have worked with approve of its use, inconsistent though it might (appear to) be. It hurts nothing to insert it, and it helps with the reading of the form, especially if it is long. Thus, for example, we prefer x̌ʾax̌əx̌x̌x̌áp to x̌ʾax̌x̌x̌áp *elders*.

The initial vowel of a form like [ilmíxʷum] is an underlying semi-consonant, as the plural [ililmíxʷum] demonstrates: the plural reduplicative prefix is C_1C_2-, not VC_1-. What to write? In my approximate phonemic line I write ilmíxʷəm and ililmíxʷəm; in the line below I write ylmixʷm and yl+yl=mixʷ+m (with morph boundaries marked as appropriate—more on the use of the symbol [+] below). Notice, incidentally, that the epenthetic vowel between xʷ and m is phonetically [u]. I write ə in the approximate phonemic line in an attempt to remind readers and writers of the language that this is an epenthetic vowel, the shape of which is determined by the rounded consonant that precedes (and/or follows) it. An analogous example with [u] (underlying /w/) is uksqílxʷ /wk+s+qilxʷ/ (√wik). These practices are subject to criticism, I realize, because they represent neither a phonetic nor a phonemic reality. The theoretically most consistent alternative would be to write underlying forms; the reason that is not acceptable can be summed up as follows: many underlying forms are too abstract to be recognized easily by the speaker / reader / writer (more on the subject later). In sum, I have compromised in a number of cases for the benefit of the Colville-Okanagan speaker / reader / writer.

---

² This is what Madeline called the language she spoke natively, and I retain the label.

My approximate phonemic transcription of a form like [wíkəncən] (where c is somewhat palatalized), is wíkəntsən, a compromise in the interest of morphological tranparency. All sequences of /ts/ are realized as [c], indistinguishable from /c/[3]. The make-up of this word, and of every other conttstruction like this is /wik-nt-s-n/ *I saw you*, with wik *see*, -nt[4] *transitive*, -s *2sgObj*, and -n *1erg*. Analogously, I write iʔ skʷists /s+kʷist-s/ *his name*, (-s *3rd poss*) and not iʔ skʷisc.

Whatever the inconsistencies and the shortcomings of the approximate phonemic transcription, each form is given its underlying composition in the second line of the interlinearization, morph by morph. This, too, is an approximation, because I try to stay as close to the surface as possible, as it were. I can explain with this example: I write surface uksqílxʷ and approximate underlying form /wk+s+qilxʷ/. This is only approximately an underlying form, because I don't write the vowel of the strong root /wik/. Writing the vowel would make it less transparent to the reader that the stressed vowel is the /i/ (of sqilxʷ) that follows. One of the alternatives, to expect one to know strong and weak stems and affixes, imposes an intolerable burden on the reader because the stress valence of a stem does not fall from the valence of the lexical root and its interplay with the valence of the affixes. Otherwise stated, the stress valence of roots is only of relative value: some otherwise identical roots behave as strong in some forms, and as weak in others, and similarly with some affixes. Therefore I have adopted the transparent orthographic convention: I do not write stem vowels that reduce to zero.

1.2   Phrasal Words and Amalgams

Constructions that consist of more than one independent word, yet function as single words, are phrasal words. Amalgams are next in the cline, then, presumably, come words, then clitics, and then affixes. The difference between phrasal words and amalgams is a difficult one to pinpoint. In English phrasal words and amalgams abound, as they do in Okanagan and in other languages I am acquainted with. English spelling conventions vary: *nobody* is usually written as one word, *no( )one* is spelled either way. *Nevertheless* and *inasmuch* are written as single words; many folks write *cannot* as a single word —and the status of each of these forms falls somewhere in the cline. These forms may be lexical items, however complex (*forget me nots, wherewithal*); they may be idiomatic complex modifiers (*as it were*); and they may be discourse functors (rhetorical substitutes for simpler conjunctions), (*nevertheless = but / still*).

---

[3] However, the phonemic reality of /c/ distinct from the sequence /ts/ is undisputed. Thus, for example, citxʷ *house* reduplicates as ct+citxʷ with C_1C_2-.

[4] It is not my practice to segment this and other transitivizers further.

As I interlinearize texts, I link with underscore(s) two (or more) otherwise independent words that I want to represent in the dictionary of the language as a single entry. Here, in tabular form, is a list of such multi-word forms found in the texts of the DeSautel collection.

Forms written as separate words		
incá kn	*I*	lnx1 89, lnx2 323
kmix k̓am	*all but*	lnx1 216
kʷul̓+l̓ t	*turn into*	dry 35
lut cmay	*everywhere*	lnx1 350
lut pn̓+kin̓	*never*	lnx1 46, lnx2 54
lut s+tim̓	*nothing*	lnx1 62, lnx2 84
lut swit	*nobody*	dry 33, lnx1 153, lnx2 330, fb 77
mi sic	*then*	lnx2 253
t̓xʷ mat	*maybe*	fb 129
t̓i kʷm̓il̓	*at once*	lnx1 165, lnx2 156
t̓i kmix	*only*	dry 33, lnx1 114, lnx2 108, fb 45
t̓i lut	*in no time*	lnx1 103
yaʕ+yáʕ+t stim̓	*everything*	lnx2 235
yaʕ+yáʕ+t swit	*everybody*	dry 30, lnx1 224

Table 1 – Phrasal words

All the phrasal words in Table 1 consist of two separate words, and each can and does occur without the other. Three of these, mi, t, and kən, are clitics, and must occur in construction with an immediate constituent. mi and t are proclitics, as is kən, but the latter, in construction with incá, is also an enclitic.[5] In spite of their including clitics, I consider incá kn, kʷul̓+l̓ t and mi sic phrasal words because Okanagan speakers view each member as a different word.

Different from phrasal words are the amalgams I list in Table 2 in that only one member of the amalgam is an independent word. Okanagan speakers view these forms more as single words than those listed in Table 1, and this criterion overrides formal considerations.

While most of these amalgams consist of a stem and a clitic, it may be in order to spell out these details: several include an enclitic iʔ, otherwise analyzable as an article; one includes the proclitic iʔ; several others include the proclitics la(ʔ), ta, tla, variants, respectively of l, t, tl; two have an initial t̓s, a

---

[5] The cognate intransitive person markers can be proclitics or enclitics in the other Interior languages. In Moses-Columbian they are both; in the other Southern languages they are proclitics, while in the Northern Interior languages they are enclitics.

form with still unconfirmed connections; and laʔx̌c+x̌ʔít+iʔ has some other unidentified material.

Forms written as single words (with + boundaries)		
iʔ+lút+iʔ	*not yet*	lnx1 43, lnx2 192
laʔ+c+x̌ʔít+iʔ	*first*	dry 14, tan 4.
la+ʔkíṅ	*when, whenever, wherever, how, from time to time, sometime*	tan 16, lnx1 162, lnx2 96, fb 33, bj 18
laʔx̌c+x̌ʔít+iʔ	*at first*	bj 155
lút+iʔ	*not yet, before*	bj 35
lut+t̓	*neg emph*	bj 40
ta+c+ʔx̌íɬt	*do so*	fb 28
ta+ʔkíṅ	*from where*	lnx2 401
ta+n+yʕip	*keep on*	lnx1
tla+ʔkín	*from there*	fb 178
t̓s+x̌ʷuy	*forever*	lnx1 393
t̓s+x̌ʷuy+s	*forever*	lnx2 436
uɬ+iʔ	*and then*	lnx1 119, fb 187, bj 88

Table 2 - Amalgams

Over the years, as I have become more confident that constructions like the ones of Table 1 should be analyzed as phrasal words, and that constructions like those of Table 2 should be analyzed as amalgams, I have tried to regularize their representations accordingly: the orthographic representation lút+iʔ has developed from lut iʔ; and I hope I am progressing toward a consistent and coherent orthographic representation.

1.3   Alternate Forms

Alternate forms are of several different kinds. First, there are dialectal or idiosyncratic differences with words that differ in one or two sounds, as the examples I chart in Table 3.

yutlxʷ	yutlx	*raven*
kmix	kmax	*only*
uníxʷ	unáxʷ	*true*
limlmtx	limlmt	*thank you*
níkxna	níkna	*goodness*
nstils	ntils	*he thinks*
taʔxʷ–	taw–	*get (in compounds)*

Table 3 – Forms that differ in one or two sounds

In my less than systematic survey of the matter, yutlxʷ is the prevalent pronunciation, but I have heard more than one speaker from Douglas Lake insist that "they say" yutlx. kmix and uníxʷ are typical of Southern Okanagan speakers (as are all pairs of words that show the i/a difference), and so are limlmtx, níkxna, nstils, and taʔxʷ–, while the other forms prevail among the Northern Okanagan. But there is also significant idiosyncratic variation, not least because of the common interactions, travel, and intermarriage among members of all Okanagan groups.

Second, there are basic (uninflected and underived) lexical items with resonants (laryngealized or not) that differ in the pronunciation of individuals: one hears, for example, sĺax̌t and slax̌t *friend*, skm̓xist and skmxist *black bear*, sqĺtmixʷ and sqltmixʷ *man, husband*, and I have detected no regional or other correlates of the variants. I have remarked that speakers are fickle when it comes to the laryngealization of resonants, and the fact that laryngealization of resonants is one of the mechanisms that mark diminutive and hypocoristic forms, contributes to the matter. Many kin terms contain laryngealized resonants, and an analogous phenomenon is well known: in Shuswap first person forms of reference are diminutivized. I record the forms as I have heard them in their context, and all variants are in the glossary.

Third, the word-internal glottal stop of several common items often disappears in casual speech, so that one hears caʔkʷ and cakʷ *if, should*, taʔlíʔ, talíʔ (and taʔlí, talí) *much, many*. In such cases the near-phonemic transcription reflects what I heard, and the morpheme line reflects the standard form.

Fourth, the initial or final glottal stop of several common words also disappears in casual speech, and one hears such variants as iʔ and i *article*. In such cases too, the near-phonemic transcription reflects what I heard, and the morpheme line the standard forms.

Fifth, paragogic a is attached to a number of proclitics before words that begin with resonants, and the grammatical prefix c– habitual. The relative marker kiʔ has the variant kaʔ in these environments. I list some other examples in Table 4

.

/iʔ t ylmixʷm/	i ta ylmíxʷəm	*by the chief*
/ǩ nspilm/	ǩa nspíləm	*to Nespelem*
/kiʔ cwix/	kaʔ cwix	*where he lives*
/iʔ ylmixʷm/	ya ylmíxʷəm	*the chief*
/iʔ lʔiw–s/	ya lʔiws	*his father*
/t nqilxʷcn/	ta nqílxʷcən	*in Indian*

Table 4 – Paragogic a

Finally, there are several cases where I am unsure of the phonetics of the variants. One such is the repetitive infix, which may be -a- or -aʔ-. Another is my uncertainty about the presence of a pharyngeal in such forms as lṗ+la(ʕ)ṗ=qn. My transcriptions reflect my uncertainties, and I list some of these in Table 5.

ya	yaʔ	*article*
hɬ=	haɬ=	*group*
ɬ	aɬ	*comp*

Table 5- Other indeterminacies

1.4   Inflectional and non-Inflectional Material

No less challenging than the analysis of phrasal words and amalgams is the analysis of all Colville words into stems and inflectional morphemes. Over the course of my work with Colville-Okanagan I have grown more and more concerned with the appropriateness of interlinear representations that discriminate between inflectional morphemes and other morphemes. In my interlinearization I focus on inflection because I consider texts important for the study of syntax, and I shun oversegmentation. Except as noted below, I use hyphens for inflectional affixes, and plus signs for all other bound forms. To explain what I am doing and why, and what I am guarding against, I will discuss briefly some cases from English.

While it is clear that words like *nevertheless* and *wherewithal* consist of several recognizable morphs each, it would be a waste of space, ink, and analytical effort to insist that, for example, the first word be analyzed as *neg-ever-DefArt-little-comptv*. Yes, the make-up of the word may be just that, and is a matter of some historical interest and no synchronic morphological relevance. Synchronically, the word is a conjunction, a discourse functor similar to *but*. The syntactic and discourse features of the word are independent of its morphological make up.[6]

[6] This isn't to say that the study of complex forms, including amalgams and lexicalization, as well as phenomena that are referred to as gramm(aticaliz)ation, isn't a

Slightly more interesting cases are afforded by such examples as those charted in Table 6 below.

ákyupàyd	prìákyupàyd
líbərèt	dìlíbərèt
klem	proklém
səlúšən	rɛzəlúšən
?	ɛksklúd
?	kəŋklúd
?	priklúd
?	kəmpít
?	ripít

Table 6 – Some English false pairs

What would one gain by segmenting (and glossing) the various pri‑, di‑, pro‑, and rɛ‑? What fancy gloss could one provide that connects each of these morphs with other (homophonous) morphs? What sense does it make to insist that a separate gloss be provided for ɛks‑, kəŋ‑, pri‑ and ‑klud? It's worse with kəm‑, ri‑, and pit. Similar questions could be asked about the parts of forms like kəntén, ditén, mentén, ritén, and many others.

There are, of course, highly productive derivational affixes. But to insist on providing glosses in the appropriate line of an interlinearization would deflect the attention of the student from the syntactically important inflectional matter: cases like dífrənt / ɪndífrənt don't require a footnote about the function of ɪn‑ as much as they need to be listed as separate lexical items. Similarly for pairs like féməs ímfəməs, krédɪbəl ɪŋkrédɪbəl, əpóynt dìsəpóynt, and many others.

In an effort to arrive at a meaningful typological classification of a language as somewhere on the analytic-synthetic cline, I don't think it makes sense to give all affixes equal weight. The fact that English has words like rì‑di‑ǽkt‑ɪv‑èt‑əd, analyzable as consisting of six recognizable morphs, does not entitle one to claim that English is a synthetic language, and an agglutinative one at that. Nor should glosses for each morph clutter the interlinearization. My transcription of that item would be rì+di+ǽkt+ɪv+èt‑əd, and I would keep out of the interlinearization information about the layered bracketing of the non-inflectional morphemes that make up the word.

While I am making progress towards a consistent segmentation of

valuable subject of study.

words into stem and inflectional affixes (where stems may include non-inflectional material), I am still not true to my own precepts in several cases, as I now discuss.

By my reckoning, affixes that prepare stems for transitivization are derivational suffixes. (Variants of at least) two such are commonly recognized for the (Southern) Interior languages, +min, and -nu(n), which I mark as shown here: the former with a plus sign, the latter with a hyphen. The meaning of the former is unpredictable; that of the latter consistently *success, manage*. Similarly, all transitivizers are derivational suffixes, but I have been marking them as though they were inflectional—except as described below.

Verb stems may have intransitive, middle, and transitive forms as I exemplify here: ʔiɬn is an intransitive stem, conjugated with the intransitive person markers (kʷ ʔiɬn *you ate*); it can be transitivized, (ʔiɬn+(n)t-xʷ *you ate it*); and, in certain constructions, can be intransitive or middle (lut a-ks-ʔíɬn *don't eat*; lut a-ks-ʔíɬn+m *don't eat it*). The root √tx *comb* can be transitivized (tx-nt-in *I combed her*)[7], and it can occur as a middle stem (tkən txa+m[8] *I combed (my hair)*). Here, too, I mark these affixes inconsistenly, as I have shown, the transitive suffixes with a hyphen, and the middle suffix with a plus sign.

The transitivizer -st / +st has three functions. Together with the prefix c- it marks the *customary*: c-wik-st-xʷ you always see him (cf. wik-nt-xʷ *you saw him*); in a number of specific stems which have no other corresponding simple transitive stems, it functions as a simple transitivizer (wẏ-st-ixʷ *you finished it*; miy-st-xʷ *you are sure of it*; *wẏ-nt-ixʷ, *miy-nt-xʷ)[9]; and, in a number of specific stems it marks *causative*: xʷuy+st-xʷ *you took it (there)* (kʷ xʷuy *you went*; *xʷuy-nt-xʷ); ʔácqaʔ+st-xʷ *you took it out(side)* (kʷ ʔácqaʔ *you went outside*, *ʔácqaʔ-nt-xʷ). I have begun writing with the plus sign the affix of the causative stems, but not so the affixes of the other two stems, as I have shown.

The productive prefix kɬ- derives verb stems from nouns, yet, in most cases, I write its boundary with a hyphen. Table 7 lists the stems that derive "have verbs".

---

[7] This form, based on a weak stem, is suffix-stressed.

[8] The vowel /a/ of this and other weak stems is analogous to the paragogic /a/ mentioned above.

[9] Here I have given an example of a form based on a weak (suffix-stressed) stem, and one based on a strong (stem-stressed) stem.

k	–ɬwis+tn		k	–s+tiṁ
have	*-aunt*		*have*	*-thing*
k	–s+ɬw=ilt		k	–s+tik'l
have	*-niece*		*have*	*-grub*
k	–s+qʷsi?		k	–s+?iɬn
have	*-son*		*have*	*-food*
k	–s+qʷs+qʷsi?		k	–sc+?iɬn
have	*-child*		*have*	*-food*
k	–s+tm+tíma?		k	–s+lk'=íċa?
have	*-grandmother*		*have*	*-bundle*
k	–s+qʕt=mixʷ		k	–s+ɬiqʷ
have	*-man*		*have*	*-meat*
k	–s+qʕ+qʕt=mixʷ			
have	*-men*		k	–s+kʷal+t
			have	*-sweat*
			k	–s+t'a?+tík'ʷa?=xn
k	–s+k'lxʷ=ína?		*have*	*-cracked feet*
have	*-evening*			
k	–s+xlp=ína?		kɬ	–x̌w̓+aw̓
have	*-daylight*		*have*	*-dried*
k	–s+q̇m=ilt+tn			
have	*-hunger*		k	–s+t'aʕpá+m
k	–s+q̇ṁ+m=ilt+tn		*have*	*-shot*
have	*-pl_hunger*			

Table 7– "have stems" in the texts of this anthology

In Table 7 I have grouped together stems with congruous semantics (kin terms, atmospheric conditions, possessions, body conditions), and I have isolated the bottom right example as a possible error. The context of the other example can be seen in fb 86.[10] In the DeSautel anthology there are also two cases of have-verb that I have not segmented with a hyphen: k+s+qʕt=mixʷ of "Blue Jay" 152, where the verb occurs in the inceptive, and k+s+?it+x of "Lynx" version2, 108. I have glossed the latter as *sleepy, literally, has sleepiness*.

I list separately (and use + as morph boundary) stems that include one or more of several highly productive directional (non-inflectional) affixes, as I exemplify in Table 8.

---

[10] This abbreviates the 86th transcription unit of the text "The boy with a fat belly".

xʷuy	*go*
c+xʷuy	*come*
ɬ+xʷuy	*go back*
ɬ+c+xʷuy	*come back*

Table 8– Directional stems based on xʷuy

I treat diminutives (with reduplication and/or resonant laryngealization) as stems, listed separately from their simple counterparts. I treat plural stems with -C_2 reduplication similarly, listing them separately from their simple counterparts.

(ɬ+)xʷuẏ+y	*go (back) pl*
s+q̇ṁ+m+ilt+tn	*hunger pl*
suxʷ+xʷ	*leave pl*

Table 9 – Plural stems with –C_2 in texts

While there are some discernible patterns in stems with +C_2 reduplication (ʔickn: ʔicckn *play: pl play*; ʔácqaʔ: ʔáccqaʔ *go out: pl go out*, xʷl+xʷalt: xʷl·+xʷalt *alive: alive pl*), the reduplicative suffix is stem-specific. I write the variants of such plural stems with plus signs, for example, kl+kil+l+x and kl+kiĺ+l+x[11] *hands*. The referent of suxʷ(+xʷ) is always plural, but the distribution of the two variants is not straight-forward. Nor is the distribution of the other two stems listed in Table 9.

The well-known C_1C_2+ plural prefix is also a derivational prefix, with various references such as repeated action or plural participants. Likewise for C_1a+, that signals repeated action.

I segment lexical affixes with an equal sign, but because these are stem-forming affixes, I do not gloss them. I am unsure whether to classify a number of other stem-forming affixes as lexical or not.

I gloss compounds as single stems, even though some stems participate in many such, as wẏ *finish*,[12] as shown in Table 10.

---

[11] Here and in many other forms, especially diminutives, the laryngealization of resonants is not as regular as one might wish it to be. Many lexical items have alternate pronunciations, with and without laryngealization of resonants. In the glossary I list separately such forms as ckʷ=ink and ckʷ=iṅk *bow,* c+yaʕ and c+yaʕ *all, lots.* See also my discussion of alternate forms, above.

[12] This root participates in such transitive forms as wẏ-st-in *I fiished it*, and may be on its way to becoming a gram (or *gramming*) in compounds.

wẏ+s+ʔiq̇	*finish_scrape*
wẏ+s+n+kʷx̌̓=ink	*finish_bleaching*
wẏ+s+n+x̌ʷaqʷ+qʷ	*finish_work_in*
wẏ+s+wic̓	*finish_dig*
wẏ+s+n+pkʷ+mn=itkʷ	*finish_throwing_in_water*
wẏ+s+kʷúl̓	*after_born*
wẏ+s+t+kʷaxʷ=lqʷ	*finish_untie*

Table 10 – Compounds with wẏ

I do not write any morph boundaries in the independent personal referents, which are otherwise transparently made up of four separate stems, the amalgamated markers that belong to what I call the in– set (possessive), and, in the third plural, the plural marker, as shown in Table 11.

in–cá	*1sg*
an–wí	*2sg*
cni⁴–c	*3sg*
mnim⁴–tt	*1pl*
mnim⁴–mp	*2pl*
mnim⁴–c–lx	*3pl*

Table 11 – Independent personal markers

The most complex of my current transcriptions of verb forms have six fillers: (1) a prefix (most commonly the customary, also the future), (2-3) a stem with a transitivive marker, (4) an object marker, (5) a subject or (anti)passive marker; and (6) the plural suffix –lx. Examples of the most complex forms in the DeSautel anthology have all but (6), the plural suffix, as shown in Table 12.

bj 102   ksck̓ə⁴xʷíc̓xtəms

         ks   –k̓⁴+xʷic̓   –xt   –m   –s

         futT   *-send*   *-benf*   *-2obj*   *-3erg*

         he will send X to you

lnx2 367   k⁴   –⁴+xʷuy+st   –m   –t

         futT   *-take_back*   *-2obj*   *-4erg*

         we'll take you back

Table 12 – Examples of complex forms in the DeSautel anthology

As can be seen, I have marked the transitivizer with a hyphen in the first example, and with a plus sign in the second, for the reasons that I have explained.

1.5   Other Unresolved Cases

It's difficult not to wonder what connections obtain among certain forms.[13] I have not formed a strong opinion on the connections between =ut, +iwt, and =wit, and I have marked them in the texts as I have here.[14] I have tentatively identified) =tk of such forms as pintk *always*, as a lexical suffix.[15] I don't know if it is better to represent the sequence =(a)qstxn as =(a)qs+t=xn, or =(a)qst=xn, or =(a)qs=txn. I have adopted the first of the three choices because I feel the t is an intrusive element.[16] The sequence –ípuʔstxn *step* is probably =ip=ẇs+t=xn with a similarly intrusive t. I have identified =mixʷ of ylmíxʷm and sqĺtmixʷ as a lexical suffix, however tentatively. I have marked =ilxʷ of tkɬmilxʷ *woman* and s+nqs=ilxʷ *relative* as a lexical suffix, and this is possibly, if not probably, the same element as the ilxʷ of sqilxʷ *person*. I have marked as a lexical suffix the form =ɬtiɬn of sw=ɬtiɬn *ask for information*.[17] I have analyzed kʷəkʷínaʔ *a little* as kʷ+kʷy=ínaʔ, but I have not done an analogous segmentation of skʷəkʷím̓əɬt *baby*.

The texts of the DeSautel anthology include eight examples of the suffix –ẏ, in six different words. I think this suffix –ẏ is cognate with Kalispel –i of such forms as kúpis *he pushed it*, and that it is an allomorph of the transitive –nt. The first construction listed in Table 13, ksm̓ipnúẏsəlx *they are going to learn it*, consists of a weak (unstressed) root, followed by the stressed suffix –nu *manage, success*, followed in turn by the suffix –ẏ and the transitive subject marker. In the third form, kswíċiʔs *they are going to dig it*, also a future form, the strong (stressed) root is followed directly by the suffix –ẏ. The forms əċíq̓iʔs *they scrape it*, ċaʔúkʷiʔs *she brought it*, kaʔkíciʔslx *they (didn't) find him*, and nkʷaʔkʷíniʔs *he picked one* are not in the future.

---

[13] And equally difficult not to realize that speakers of all languages approximate, aiming for less than precise grammatical targets.

[14] Vogt lists Kalispel –út and –éʼut as "isolated suffixes" (p. 59).

[15] Cognate forms occur in the other Southern Interior languages, and, possibly, in Thompson and Shuswap.

[16] See Vogt's "–áqsčən (< –aqs–šən? or aqstšən? …) (p. 56).

[17] See Vogt's "–ɬtúmš *people*. su·ɬtúmš *he asks people for information*" (p. 54). The first part of the suffix is identical in both languages.

ksm̓ipnúẏsəlx (tan 2, 16, bj 35)

ks	−m̓ẏ+p	−nu	−ẏ	−s	−lx
futT	*-learn*	*manage*	−ẏ	*-3erg*	*-pl*

əċíq̓i?s (tan18)

	c	−?iq̓	−ẏ	− s
	hab	*-scrape*	−ẏ	*-3erg*

kswíċi?s (dry 33)

	ks	−wiċ	−ẏ	−s
	futT	*-dig*	−ẏ	*-3erg*

ċa?úkʷi?s (lnx2 248)

	c+?a+?úkʷ	−i?	−s
	bring_pl_cisl	−ẏ	*3erg*

ka?kíci?slx (lnx2 341)

	ka?+kíc	−ẏ	−s	−lx
	find	−ẏ	*-3erg*	*-pl*

nkʷa?kʷíni?s (bj 55)

	n+kʷa?+kʷín	−ẏ	−s
	pick	−ẏ	*-3erg*

Table 13 – Forms with ẏ

2   Person markers

Having laid out my analytical and presentational choices, I now list in tabular form the paradigms of the person markers. Details of other inflectional categories such as aspect and tense are beyond the scope of this essay.[18]

The intransitive subject markers include four proclitics and a suffix:

kən	*1sg*		kʷu	*1pl*
kʷ	*2sg*		p	*2pl*
Ø	*3sg*		Ø …-lx	*3pl*

Table 14 – kn set

---

[18] Pertinent information is available in such publications as "Okanagan and Salishan languages," *Dora ɬa? kɬcaptíkʷɬ*, and others.

These markers accompany stems that in English translate as intransitive verbs, nouns, and adjectives, as in kn ʔitx. *I slept*; kʷ sqilxʷ. *You are an Indian / a person*; ʔayx̌ʷt (axáʔ). *This one is tired*.

A subset of these markers, identical in all persons except for 1sg kʷu, co-occurs with the possessive set of person markers, and is reserved for double possessives and verb nominalizations, as in kʷu an–lʔíw. *I am your father* (*man speaking*); kʷ in–x̌mínk. *I like you*.

kʷu	*1sg*		kʷu	*1pl*
kʷ	*2sg*		p	*2pl*
Ø	*3sg*		Ø ...–lx	*3pl*

Table 15 – kʷu subset of kn set

The possessive sets, used with nouns, psych verbs, and verb nominalizations, consists of these markers (prefixes and suffixes; parentheses abbreviate variants):

i(n)–	*1sg*		–tt	*1pl*
a(n)–	*2sg*		–mp	*2pl*
–s/–c	*3sg*		–s–lx / –c–lx	*3pl*

Table 16 Possessive markers

The forms of the in– set lose their nasal in before s and ɬ, and, in kin terms, before s and ɬ: an–lʔíw *your (man) father*; in–x̌mínk *I like / want it* a–spuʔús *your heart*, an–ɬ+ɬáxʷ *your dress*, a–ɬ+sí+sncaʔ *your younger brother*. Third person –c occurs after s or ɬ: iʔ spuʔús–c *his heart*, iʔ s+miʔɬ–c *his uncle*. I refer to the morphologically-conditioned nasalless variants of the possessive markers as the i– set of possessive markers, and to the other forms as the in– set. The i– set occurs before ks– *future*, and k– *to be*, as in these examples: kʷ i–kɬ–tkɬm=ilxʷ *you are my wife-to-be*; kʷ i–ks–kxá+m *I'll follow you*. The i– set may, in turn, combine with members of the kn set (kʷu subset) to yield forms such as kʷ i–ks–ʔam–t–ím an–lʔíw *I am going to feed your father*.

The transitive subject set, also called the ergative set, consists of the following suffixes (parentheses abbreviate stressed and unstressed variants):

–i(n)	*1sg*		–(í)m / –t	*1pl*
–(í)xʷ	*2sg*		–(í)p	*2pl*
–(í)s	*3sg*		–(í)s–lx	*3pl*

Table 17 – Transitive subject markers

The -t variant of the first plural occurs after -m *2obj*. These markers follow the object markers, which, in turn, follow one of several obligatory transitive markers (see below).

The (transitive) object set consists of the following markers (one proclitic and suffixes):

kʷu	*1sg*		kʷu...-m	*1pl*
-s / -m	*2sg*		-ɬ(úl)m	*2pl*
-Ø	*3sg*		-Ø...-lx	*3pl*

Table 18 – Object markers

The allomorphy of the second singular object is transitivizer-dependent. The disambiguation of number in the first person object is accomplished by the suffix -m and such forms are interpreted as *3rd indef subject - 1pl object*: kʷu səṗ-nt-is[19] *He whipped me*. (-nt *transitivizer*); kʷu səṗ-nt-im *They whipped us / We were whipped*. -(í)m occurs also with Ø, and the interpretation of these forms can be indefinite subject, or passive: səṗ-nt-is *3rd person whipped 3rd person*. səṗ-nt-im *3rd person indef whipped 3rd person / 3rd person was whipped*.

All transitive forms take transitive person markers. As mentioned above, Okanagan has two transitivizers, -nt and -st; a causative -st. It has three so-called applicatives or ditransitive markers – ɬt, -x(í)t, -tuɬt; and three suffixes that prepare stems for transitivization: -nun, -min, -xix.[20] Customary transitive forms are marked with the circumfix c-...-st, as in c-wik-st-n *I always see it*.

Reference Cited

Vogt, Hans 1940. *The Kalispel language*. Det Norske Videnskaps - Akademi i
    Oslo.

---

[19] The schwa of this and the following forms, not contiguous to resonants, are not predictable.

[20] Not all of these occur in the texts of the DeSautel anthology.