

Anthony Mattina
University of Montana

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 *kt-* '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 *kt-* *to-be*. This prefix participates in two different constructions.

1.1. POSSESSED *TO-BE* NOMINALS. In Ok there are nominal forms with *kt-* 'likely-to-be' where the loss of *t* before *s* is clear:

//i-kt-citx//	iktčitx	my house-to-be
//i-kt-s+qlaw//	iksčlāw	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 ^w kt-ilmix ^w əm	you will be a chief / are a chief-to-be
anw ^l k ^w kt-wápuxən	You will be Lynx (myth: said by the son as he transforms his father into a lynx)

Out of context *k^wkt-ilmix^wəm* is likely to be interpreted as 'you have a chief,' but *k^wkt-wápuxən* is less likely to be interpreted as 'you have a lynx.' The homophony of *kt-* 'to-be' and *kt-* '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^wq^wácqən* 'you are a hat' (*k^wc-q^wácqən-əm* '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:

iksʔitnəm	I am going to eat it
-----------	----------------------

¹I thank Dale Kinkade and Aert Kuipers for important comments and suggestions. All errors are mine alone.

iksk ^w ínəm	I am going to try something
iksk ^w úłəm	I am going to fix something.
ikstqám	I am going to touch something.
iksčəl'wítəm	I am going to step over something.
iksk ^w ám	I am going to bite something.
iksk ^w aʔk ^w ám	I am going to chew something.
iksnwíslxstəm	I am going to step over something.

They can further take genitive inflection as in the following examples:²

k ^w jikstqám	I am going to touch you.
k ^w uakstqám	You are going to touch me.

All these are verb forms that, with singular referents, are what I have shown; and with plural referents include transitive suffixes and ergative markers:

kswfkəntəm	We are going to see it.
kswfkəntəm iʔsqłáw'tət	We are going to hide our money.

Note that the forms discussed so far mark person reference with the same set of affixes that nouns and *to-be* nouns take, as in these examples:

k ^w jnl'íw	You are my father.
k ^w uánl'íw	I am your father.
k ^w jnxmínk	I like you.
k ^w uánxmínk	You like me.
k ^w jiktkətmílx ^w	You are going to be my wife.

Negative request verb forms also take *ks-* *future*, and these words can be based on intransitive, middle, or transitive stems, e.g.

lut aksʔitnəm	don't eat
lut aksʔitnəm	don't eat it
lut akstwínəm	don't leave him/her/it
lut k ^w uakstq ^w əlq ^w ílstəm	don't talk to me
lut k ^w uakskəm'títim ístətəm'tím	don't take away my clothes

2.2. Ok *ks-* *future* verbs with absolutive person markers. *ks-* 'future' together with *-(míx)aʔx* make future intransitive forms which are conjugated with the absolutive person reference set, as in these examples:

²What I call the *genitive* marker set differs from the *absolutive* set in the 1st sg form. *Genitive*: k^wu, k^w, 0, k^wu, p, 0 -lx; *absolutive*: kən, k^w, 0, k^wu, p, 0 -lx.

(strong stems)

kən_ksʔitxaʔx	I am / will be going to sleep.
kən_ksxʔaʔxʔistaʔx	I am / will be going to walk.
kən_ksxʔúyaʔx	I am / will be going to go.
kən_ksqʔəlqʔiltaʔx	I am / will be going to talk.

(weak stems)

kən_kskʔaymíxaʔx	I am / will be going to fall hunt
kən_kskʔlpmíxaʔx	I am / will be going to stop
kən_kskʔəwpmíxaʔx	I am / will be going to shut up
kən_kskʔawcnmíxaʔx	I am / will be going to get quiet
kən_kskʔaʔaʔmíxaʔx	I am / will be going to look for something
kən_kskʔaʔmíxaʔx	I am / will be going to fetch something
kən_kskʔqʔmíxaʔx	I am / will be hitting
kən_ksəpʔmíxaʔx	I am / will be hitting

Of some interest is the allomorphy of ks- with the second singular proclitic kʔ you: the k of ks- is lost in normal speech, though it is restored in careful speech:

kʔsʔitxaʔx	kʔksʔitxaʔx	you are / will be going to sleep.
kʔsxʔaʔxʔistaʔx	kʔksxʔaʔxʔistaʔx	you are / will be going to walk.
kʔsxʔúyaʔx	kʔksxʔúyaʔx	you are / will be going to go.
kʔsqʔəlqʔiltaʔx	kʔksqʔəlqʔiltaʔx	you are / will be going to talk.
kʔskʔaymíxaʔx	kʔkskʔaymíxaʔx	you are / will be going to fall hunt
kʔskʔlpmíxaʔx	kʔkskʔlpmíxaʔx	you are / will be going to stop
kʔskʔəwpmíxaʔx	kʔkskʔəwpmíxaʔx	you are / will be going to shut up

In sum, verbs take ks- future, and nouns take kt- to-be. It so happens that the loss of ʔ before s in the nouns discussed in 1.1. makes those forms look like the verb forms listed here—verb forms that contain the sequence ks- ‘future; intent.’ But the ks- of these verb forms³ has to be kept separate from the kt- ‘likely-to-be’ morpheme, for reasons that match the separation of English {-Z} ‘plural of regular nouns’ from {-Z} ‘3rd sg. of verbs:’ they are in complementary distribution, but their functions and morpho-syntax are different.

3. OTHER OK s- (NOT NOMINAL) FORMS. One of the reasons I rule out a connection between ks- future and the {s-} which Salishanists refer to as nominalizer is that I don’t see the s- of ks- doing the things expected of nominalizers, at least in the future verb forms. Another is the presence in the language of a morpheme

³Where -m can be viewed as signaling an (indefinite) object.

{s-} which seems to mark future, or intention. Here first I review constructions with s- intent; 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.

3.1. s- intent. In lesson three of our Okanagan primer titled ta_nsfylxan, Sarah Peterson and I introduce students to s- intent as follows:

isʔʔacʔəm is a word that consists of four parts:

i- my; s- intent; ʔʔacʔ look at; -(ə)m verb ending

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

In a sentence like húmaʔ isʔʔacʔəm. the word húmaʔ, 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:

iskʔʔin-əm	I want to try it
iskʔʔilʔ-əm	I want to fix it.
istqá-m	I want to touch it.
isqəlʔwít-əm	I want to step on it.
iskʔʔa-m	I want to bite it.
isn + wís + lx + st-əm	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 person markers (kən, kʔ, 0, kʔu, p, 0 -lx),

ʔayxáxaʔ iʔ kʔu smʔayxtwíxʔs.

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

mʔayxítən ut kʔu kʔli wt ut one o'clock ut ixíʔ kʔu sʔaʔʔifəns.

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

ixíʔ spíxəmsəl 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:

t'i put iʔ sənp'ip'sk'aʔts, c'xilt axáʔ iʔ ʔable mat iʔ sənp'ip'sk'aʔts.
Not too big, big like this table. NB27-24 (lit. their bigness)

mat axáʔ iʔ stove pipe iʔ ʔir-ák''k''s.
Maybe curved (like ?) a stove pipe. NB 27-27 (lit. its curvedness)

t'i put iʔ spəptáʔts.
About this thick. (lit. its thickness—no plural reference)

I do not know, however, how these forms should be differentiated from other similar looking constructions, such as the following:

wayʔ lut skasts iʔ cawts iʔ ktcawts iʔ snəqsfx''s.
Things that are going to happen to his people are not good. (nb 25, p. 87)

'ant iʔ sq''m'iwts kən ʔaʔ cm'áyaʔm.
Look, it was a long time I told stories. (nb 25 p.83)

sx''iysc.
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, ks- sequences have been analyzed as underlying kt-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 ks- distinct from kt-, 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 kt-. 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 kt- AND ks-. Cr has (a) a form *tcəʔ* /*čət*/ cognate with Ok kt-. 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) *qʔ-*, and (*q*)s-. V calls (a) forms with *qʔ-* 'subjunctive nouns.' He also reports (b) an alternation *qs* ~ *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 *kt*) 'absolute 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 ʔs- which, K says, "may be translated (*in order*) to." (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 *kt*), 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.

Lilloet has (a) a postclitic *-(ə)ʔ* 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

Ok	s-	kt-	ks-
Cr	s-	čət	
Ka-FI-Sp		qʔ-	(q)s-
Sh	s-	k	
Th	s-	k	
Li	s-	kt	

4.2. COEUR D'ALENE. Reichard discusses a particle *tcəʔ* /*čət*/ '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 *tcəʔ*, which seems to be a free particle but which, because of *t*, 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 *tcəʔ*. e.g., with *hoi* in which case it means "now I have decided to", "now after consideration I intend ..." (p. 578).

In section 757 R says that *čət* "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 *čət* "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 *čət*, independently, or in conjunction with other forms. My discussion pays special attention to the form of *čət*: (a) whether it occurs by itself; (b) as *čes* (which R analyzed < *čət-s*); and (c) as *čət* ... -s (where *čət* and s- are at some distance from one another).

I consider first the forms where *čət* (and not *čes*) 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. *čət-hi-c'-ftn* my food to be

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

2. a-čēt-i-sin-ʿac-ʿac-fnaʔ made to be thy ear ornaments
 3. naʔ gʷiyʷ-e-s-čēt-ʷuseʔ 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 *čēt* - person marker. Synchronically 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:

- čēt* - possessive person marker
 absolutive person marker - *čēt*

and this might be a clue to the distribution of the allomorphs of the possessive prefixes (see Ok in- ~ i-; an- ~ a-).⁵ Note also that in 3. *s-* 'nom.' (R's analysis) precedes *čēt*, and that *čēt* is deeply embedded in the compound.

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

4. *čēt-al-is-nikʷ-ēlemxʷ* they are to belong to thy tribe

Reichard analyzes: "(in-s → is-; *al-*, belong; in-, thy; s-, nom.; *nikʷ*, be made one; -*iləmxʷ*, person)." The fifth example has two instances of *čēt* in it:

5. *čēt-č-s-čēt-qel-ŋc'aʔ* in order for us to get what is to be fresh meat

Reichard analyzes: "(*čēt*, fut.inten.; č-, we; s- inten. with *čēt*; *čēt*, fut. referring to meat; *qel*, fresh; -*ŋc'eʔ*, 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 "*čēt* functions as a verbal element as well as a nominal one" (p. 667). I give the other example that shows the "double function" of *čēt* here, pointing out that, in fact, there are three occurrences of *čēt* in the example's two words:

- 5b. *lute-čes-s-lút-s čes-čey-əns-s*, she must go, not the her would refusing to the future her going [sic]

lute-čes-s-lút-s is parallel to Ok *lut ksluts*, an idiomatic expression that I have had translated 'there's no nos about it; 'no ifs ands or buts.' *čes-čey-əns-s*, not analyzed by R beyond the hyphens, has *čēt-*, *s-*, *čēt-* (we learn from note (93) that "*čēt-s-* vowel stem initial before accented syllable *čey-*" (p.699);⁶ see also ex. 23 below), *s-* etc.

⁵As Dale Kinkade has suggested out to me, the order of morphemes, different in the various languages, may help explain the allomorphy of Ok i(n)-, a(n)-. The nasalless allomorphs occur before *s* and (some) *t*'s, and before *ks-* future, and *kt-* to be. If, at some earlier stage of OK the possessive prefixes occurred following *kt-* and before the stem, the allomorphs of the possessive prefixes would be nasalless when preceding *s-* nominalizer. The possessives would then have remained nasalless after their position had shifted to precede *kt-* (and *ks-*).

⁶Reichard explains that "s before a vowel becomes y" (p.546.124), and Kinkade points out that "this looks more as if s becomes y before ʔ, and then this yʔ becomes y' (p.c.)"

The final example of the section, cases of "nouns or pronouns which are spoken of as existing in the future," is:

6. *čēt-kʷ-ʔəl-éngʷat* they are to belong to thee

And this is probably the 'pronoun' (*éngʷat* 'you sg.') R refers to in the description just quoted. Here too we have an absolutive pronoun that follows *čēt*.

I will divide the remaining examples into two groups: cases with *čēt-*, and cases with *čes-* < *čēt-s-*. Reichard does not discuss the behavior of *čēt* before *s*,⁷ but in note (9) to the "Analyzed Text, Muskrat Trespasses" that concludes her grammar, Reichard spells out her interpretation of the allomorphy of *čāt-* / *čū-* before *s*. There, referencing the form *utčāsŋŋgʷc* 'again she went to dig roots' she says:

čāt-s > *čās-*; *ut-* again; *čāt*, fut; *s-* inten.; *ŋŋgʷc*, "potatoes" which grow in the water. A noun with this construction may mean "go to get...." (p. 694).

One may want to infer that the *t* of *čāt* is regularly lost before *s*,⁸ but that cannot be the case, because in "Muskrat Trespasses" we find *četségʷet* 'who would it be?' In the footnote to the form, Reichard sends readers to notes 9, 181. Note 9 is the one just given; note 181 links *segʷet* with the gloss 'who is it?' In short, *čs-* < *čāt-s* cannot be a correct analysis.

Here are the nine examples that show *čās*, which R analyzes as < *čāt-s*:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 7. <i>u-čes-in-mélʷps</i> | it was just about to boil |
| 8. <i>čes-s-kʷétʷp-əms</i> | he was going to pull it off (his shirt) |
| 9. <i>čes-gʷišt-əms</i> | (he was looking at it) to see it |
| 10. <i>lut ciʔʔ čes-fékʷ-əncut</i> | not there to lie down |
| 11. <i>kʷmʷ lut xəst čes-gʷišt-celp</i> | then not well you should see me |
| 12. <i>hoy xʷe čes-č-šéf-ntxʷ</i> | stop watching her in the future |
| 13. <i>hoy lustus xʷe čes-č-šéf-nts</i> | now she refused to take care of her |
| 14. <i>xʷe čes-qéyʷ-ntxʷ</i> | (thou hast learned) how thou shouldst write it |
| 15. <i>xʷe čes-čs-táxʷxʷ</i> | (I) who should be the one to die |
| 16. <i>u-čas-tár-nts</i> | just as he untied it preparatory to ... |

These peculiarities should be noted: Reichard segments *č-s* in 8 (and twice in 5b), and leaves *čs* unsegmented the rest of the time; and she has *u* (*čas*) in 16, the lowered variant of *e* before uvulars, pharyngeals and *r*. It should also be noted that 8. and 9. are similar transitive constructions with different roots; 11 is transitive and has the same root as 9; 12 and 13 are parallel transitive constructions with different person referents; also transitive are 13 and 16. 10 is reflexive; and the remaining examples, 7 and 15, are intransitive. We see that R analyzes the *s-* of these examples as 'intentional,' and not *s-* 'nom.,' the two occupy different slots in the word (see example 3).

I refer again to note 9, where Reichard identifies *s-* as 'inten,' and follow that lead to sections 346-355 of her grammar, where she explicates the "several forms of expression" she calls *intentional*.

⁷She does say that "Final *t* of an element assimilates to following *s*, *č*, *y*' [*s* > *s-*. (p. 550, section 145).

⁸See Post's attempt, discussed in 3.2, to sort out what *s*'s cause the loss of *t*.

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-čitus-čém'-t-tmet let's go fetch it from him
18. s-cún-čt-m-it-tām it was to be shown for him
19. k'-s-tuy'-ác'č'-t-tām 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 complete 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'is-....-am, I intend to thee
- 1-3 his-....-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 complete,' consisting of "čāt- fut. – pronominal subject – *s-* inten. – stem." The six examples she lists are:

20. čāt-či-s-ččš-am, I am to go along (for čāt-čín-s-)
21. čāt-k'-s-g'w'ič, thou art to see
22. čā-s-nič'-amš, he is to cut (for čāt-s-nič'-amš)⁹
23. čāt-č-y'-f'n, we are to eat (for čāt-č-s-f'n)
24. čāt-k'p-y'-ac'-acqe?, you are to go out (for čāt-k'p-s-ác'-acqe?, *c* before stem initial vowel > *c*)
25. če-s-t'ap-sčént-ilš (čas-t'a-t'ap-sčént), they are to shoot something indefinite

In sum, R's data suggest that there is a morpheme *čet* (R calls it a 'particle, but she writes it as a prefix).¹⁰ There is also *s-* 'intentional.' The data further show that 'intentional' and 'future' often co-

⁹The suffix *-amš* corresponds to the *-mix-* of Ok *-mlix-aʔx*. 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 *-an* in the preceding case take *-amš*... (p. 587).

Note 93 of the Muskrat Trespasses text refers to the form *čey'úck'mš* 'about to bathe' (a form which, incidentally, contains the *čet-* prefix):

(93) *čet-s-* vowel stem initial before accented syllable > *čey'-*; see note 9; *uck'* bathe; *-amš* inten. with indef. obj.

¹⁰Speaking 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 contiguously, thus causing some reinterpretation on the part of speakers, and eventually, problems of analysis for linguists. Both the "double function" (nominal and verbal) of *čet* and the presence of two *čet*-like morphs in a single form, suggest two prefixes, *čes-* and *čet-*, one a *future* (with verbs); the other a *to-be* (with nouns). Historically it will probably be possible to connect Cr *čes* 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, *kt-*, *ks-*. Instead of the expected *č*, each of these has *q*. This signals either an irregular development, or borrowing from Ok. First I discuss *qt-*. In his discussion of *Nouns* Vogt explains that "The nouns have a subjunctive, formed by the prefix *qt-*, or *q-* before initial *s-*" (p. 27). He gives examples based on the two stems *cixw* 'house' and *ilamixum* 'chief' as follows:

cixw house *qt cixw* Lat. domus sit

čiqtilamixum I am going to be chief
k'qt ilamixum Thou art going to be chief

iqtilamixum he is going to be my chief
aqtilamixum he is going to be thy chief

Two observations. First, these examples do not show the equivalent of Ok *k'u ktilmšms* 'I am his chief-to-be.' Second, *čiqtilamixum* 'I am going to be chief' is the exact equivalent of Ok *kān ktilmšm* 'I am going to be chief' (see section 1.2.).

There are in this section no examples of *q(t)-* before *s-*. One such can be found in section 47, where Vogt refers to another, related, alternation, that between *qe?* and *qa*. After he explains that "final glottalization" is "lost in the personal prefix *qe?* before the particles *qt-* (*q*) and *s-*" (p. 22) he gives:

qe? cixw our house *qaqt cixw* this is going to be our house
qe? esamén x'w we are smoking *qaqsamén x'w* 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 *qt-* and leaves the presence of *s-* unexplained;¹¹ the other that posits two prefixes, *qt-* and *qs-* 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 *qs-* <

verb-complex together; still others are independent" (p. 664).

¹¹More 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.

**qt-s*. Some of the *s*- forms and *qs*- forms are interchangeable: *qesamén'x'i* and *qaqsamén'x'i* 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 *qs*-. Vogt interprets all *qs*- as *qt*- "always combined with *s*-. The section in its entirety reads as follows (line numbers inserted for reference purposes):

Subjunctive Forms

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

Continuative

The prefixes *qs*- and *qe*- are both used, apparently without appreciable difference of meaning. The continuative prefix *es*- is dropped after *qs*-. Before the preverb *et*-, only *qe*- is used. We get thus, from *činesalmi* I am getting mad: *čiqsalmi* I am going to be mad or *čiqe'esalmi*, *čiqe'etalmi* or *čiqe'etesalmi* I am going to be mad again; *čineskúpi* I am pushing > *čiqskúpi*, *čiqe'eskúpi*; *yeskúpam* I am pushing him > *iqe'eskúpam*. The *qs*- forms are frequent, the *qe*- forms are recorded: II. 4, III. 1. 4, V. 4. 18, VIII. 5, IX 43, XI. 21. *qe'etas*- X. 23.
The *čiqs*- forms of class II and III are inflected as the independent nouns: *čiqsalmi*, *k'qsalmi*, *qsalmi*, pl. *qasqasalmi*, *qasalmi*, *qsu'pmiti*. The *iqs*- forms of class IV as the dependent nouns: *iqskúpam*, *aqskúpam*, *qskúpams*, pl. *qaqskúpam*, *qskúpamp*, *qskú'pams*.

Completive

110. The prefixes are *qs*-, and *qe*- before *et*:- *činaim* I get mad > *čiqsalmi*, *čiqe'etalmi*; *činkúpam* I push > *čiqskúpam*, *čiqe'etkúpam*; *kúpam* I push him > *qskúpam* (*qe'etkúpam*?).
There are some instances of *qes*- in prohibitive sentences (X. 20. XVII. 2).¹²
The form V questions in line 18 is the only transitive form of the lot—a possible "conjecture" of V's. We see that *s* (of *qe's*) is lost before *et*- 'again,' as it is in Okanagan. And we see that there are more

¹²In Flathead Egedal has implicitly assumed the former composition (by regularly interpreting Fl *qs* as *qt-s* 'irrealis - nominalizer'); similarly Thomason. [Check Carlson].

occurrences of *qs*- than there are of *qe's*-. In fact, V says there are eight such recorded (lines 11-12). These are:

- II4 *qe'eti'áp tulšéy'u qe'eso-l'ús*¹³
We went back to where the fire-place was going to be
III1 *tá k'qe'esxúí*
You shall not go
III4 *š'al' ta qstám esiyá' u qe'esqitqətti*
because everyone has to be awake
V4 *š'al' né qe'esp'u-péwłši*
so he could breathe
V18 *pən' iqe'esəmfim inqe'šə'ip*
I want to know for sure
VIII5 *xúšš k'iqe'esac'əšəm*
Go, I'll be watching you.
IX43 *qe'esq'əyquít sqélix'*
There will be many people (?)
XI21 *éx' tá k'qsənč'al'épəm*
éx' tá k'qe'esənč'al'épəm
don't behave like a fool (lit. like a coyote)

The forms with *qe'es* may be the reflexes of constructions with a particle *qe*(?) and the aspect prefix *es*-. XI21 shows how *qe'es* came to vary with *qs*-, the particle merging with the 'intent' prefix (my analysis); the lone case of *qe'et*- 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 GUIZLTEM, 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.

CHIKS 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:

SUBL.Pres. - CHIKS, I; kU KS, thou; KS, he; KAEKS, we; P KS, you; KO, they.

Pres.Cont. CHIKAES; KUKAES; KAES; KAKAES; PKAES; KAES

¹³Later in this sentence, V writes "*xu'it tu'qaqtsšš'úk'we?* (*qaqššš'úk'we?* ?)." This is interesting because it shows the sequence *qts* tentatively emended (in V's word a "conjecture") to eliminate the *š*, which, apparently he had recorded. The phrase means 'lots of firewood-to-be,' a noun phrase, *tu'qaqtsšš'úk'we?* 'our firewood-to-be.'

The characteristic of the subjunctive, KS, becomes KL before a definite verbified noun, e.g. Chiks ilimigui, I want to be a chief.

ChikI ilimigum, I want to be the chief.
(Dict I, p.234)

KS becomes KAES in the *continue*, e.g.

Chikaes ilimigu, I want always to be a chief." (p. 36).

The parenthesized reference is to the Giorda Dictionary. The translations with "want" accord with the "inten." reading I am suggesting is appropriate for *s-*.

On page 26 of his grammar Post lists the "possessive pronouns" both "absolute, and in "composition." The latter have two shapes, "Present & Past," and "Subj. and Fut." "Present & Past are the possessive *in-an-* etc. The "Subj. and Fut." are the possessive with "kJ," forms that he translates "is to be mine, or: I want, wish to have, to do ..." (p. 26).

It is here that he states "Final L of Subjunctive and Future is likewise dropped before S not radical" (p. 26).¹⁴ In summary, as we have seen, Post says that *qs-* becomes *qt-*, and that *qt-* 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. qt- 'subjunctive'

qt- 'subjunctive' occurs in both transitive and intransitive constructions. *t* of *qt-* is deleted before *s-* 'nominal', *es-* 'actual', *et-* 'back', and *ept-* 'have'. *n* of *čin*, *in-*, and *an-* deletes, and *qe?* 'first person plural' → *qu?* before *qt-*. (See 2.9.)

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. qt- 'wishing; obligation; future'

či q-s-šs-t-i	'I want to be good.'
či q-es-šs-t-i	'I want always to be good.'
q-s-k"ul"-n	'I want to do it.'
q-es-k"ul"-s-t-n	'I wanted always to do it.'
i-qt-nóx"-noš"	'I want her for my wife.' (D II p. 430)
či q-s-q"l-q"élt-i	'I have the wish to talk.'
či q-es-ilmix"	'I want always to be a chief.'
tu? x"l t i q-s-?im"š u es-c"q"áq"-i	

'On account of my wishing to start, he is crying.'

a-q-s-x"ic"-t-t-m	'Thou must give it to him.'
k"u a-q-s-x"ic"-t-t-m s-?itn	'You must give me some food.'
ta q-s-?it-n-t-x" tu? es-xiw	'Don't eat those not ripe.'
k"u a-q-s-k"ul"-t-t-m qt-qix"-mn	'Make me a whip.'

¹⁴See footnote 1.

k" q-s-tc'i-m	'You deserve to be flogged.'
k"ne u k" q-s-tc'i-m	'You should be flogged.'
k"u q-s-?aym-t	'One must have been angry.'
k"u q-s-?áym-t-i	'One must be angry.'
k"u cúw-i-s či q-s-k"ul"-i	'He told me to work.'
tu? i-q-s-k"ul"-m	'my having to make it'
tu? i-q-s-k"ul"	'what I have to make'
tu? i-q-s-c-k"ul"	'what I had to make'
qa? qt-n-šs-ét'e?	'Let us have clean vessels.' (D I p. 164)
tu? q-s-k"ul"-n-t-x" te? s-tem', k" q-s-č'aw-i	
'When you wish to do some work, you should pray.'	
k'en-t a-qt-ac-sqáxe"-tn	'Take your rope to tie your horse.'
ta a-q-et-k"ul"-n-č"s-tfn, ši tlcí? m č"s-t-ši-t-m-t	
'Sin no more, lest worse should befall thee.' (Bible p. 63)	
tu? ne k" q-s-n-mi-p-m-fst-i m k" č'aw-m	
'Before confessing you must pray.'	
tu? q-s-šl-m-i, šey č'aw-m	'Before dying, he prayed.'
k"u q-s-ilmix"-m	'One may be chief.'
i-qt-citx"	'The house is for me (my house-to-be).'
a-qt-sic"-m	'The blanket is for thee (thy future blanket).'
qt-q"ac-qi-s	'The hat is for him (his hat-to-be).'
a-qt-n-šs-tfn	'It is for thy good (thy future good).'
qt-šc-numt-s tu? i-s-q"sé?	'It is a coat for my boy (my boy's future coat).'
k'en-t ye s-c"ulix"-élx", an-l?ew qt-qe?-šf-s	
'Take this deer skin for a pair of shoes for your father.'	
k" swet tu? ne qa? q-et-cún-m tu? t šey u qe? c-k"ul-t-l-t	
'Who art thou that we may tell it to those who sent us hither.' (Bible p. 50)	
ne q-s-mós-qt-ilš	'when the fourth day will have come'
q-s-nk"u"-i	'one by one (things)'
q-s-č-nq-naqs-i	'one by one (persons)'
q-s-?esél-i	'two by two (things)'
q-s-č-esél-i	'two by two (persons)'

4.1.4.2. qt- 'dative of advantage'

qt-swet u k" es-k"ul"-i	'For whom are you working?'
i-qt-k"uy"é	'For me.'
qt-cnítc	'For him.'
ha qt-k"uy"é	'Is it for me?'

a-qt-anwí? 'It is for thee.'
 ha qa? qt-qe?nplé? 'Is it for us?' (Speck 1980, pp. 51-53).

These examples show:

(1) noun forms with *qt-* 'to-be' (and my paraphrases):
 i-qt-nóx"-nox" my wife-to-be
 qa? qt-n-šs-été? our clean vessels-to-be
 a-qt-ac-sqáxe?-tn your horse tying rope-to-be
 i-qt-cítx" my house-to-be)
 a-qt-síc'-m thy blanket-to-be
 qt-q'ác-qi-s his hat-to-be
 a-qt-n-šs-tín thy future good
 qt-šc-numt-s his coat-to-be
 qt-q'e?-šf-s his shoes-to-be
 qt-qix"-mn a whip-to-be

(2) transitive forms with *q-s-*:
 q-s-k"ul"-n 'I want to do it'
 q-es-k"ul"-s-t-n 'I wanted always to do it'
 ta q-s-?it-n-t-x" 'don't eat it'
 q-s-k"ul"-n-t-x" 'you want to do it'

(3) intransitive forms with *q-s-* and absolutive person markers:
 či q-s-šs-t-i 'I want to be good.'
 či q-es-šs-t-i 'I want always to be good.'
 či q-s-q'l-q"élt-i 'I have the wish to talk.'
 či q-es-ilmix" 'I want always to be a chief.'
 k" q-s-té'i-m 'You deserve to be flogged.' (twice)
 či q-s-k"ul"-i 'I will work.'
 k" q-s-é'áw-i 'you should pray'
 k" q-s-n-mi-p-m-íst-i 'you will confess'
 q-s-šl-m-i 'he will die'
 ne q-s-mós-qt-ilš 'when the fourth day will have come'

(4) some intransitive forms all representing a construction that remains unclear to me:
 q-s-nk"ú?-i 'one by one (things)'
 q-s-š-nq-naqs-i 'one by one (persons)'
 q-s-?esél-i 'two by two (things)'
 q-s-é-esél-i 'two by two (persons)'

(5) intransitive forms with (single) possessive inflection:
 i-q-s-?im'š 'my wishing to start'
 tu? i-q-s-k"ul"-m 'my having to make it'
 tu? i-q-s-k"ul' 'what I have to make'
 tu? i-q-s-c-k"ul' 'what I had to make'

(6) ditransitive forms with double possessive inflection:
 a-q-s-x'ic'-t-t-m 'Thou must give it to him.' (thou will give his ... ?)
 k"u a-q-s-x'ic'-t-t-m 'You must give me some food.' (AND ? thou will give my ... ?)
 k"u a-q-s-k"ul"-t-t-m 'thou will make it for me.' (thou will make my ...)

(7) some forms with *k"u* that remain unclear to me:
 k"u q-s-?aym-t 'One must have been angry.'
 k"u q-s-?áy-m-t-i 'One must be angry.'
 k"u q-s-ilmix"-m 'One may be chief.'

(8) some forms with *q-* before (*et-* 'back, again':
 ta a-q-et-k"ul"-n-šs-tín 'don't sin more / again'
 ne qa? q-et-cún-m 'we will say it back'

The forms P labels 'dative of interest' are unfamiliar to me. They are reminiscent of the Ok constructions of the type

ilmix"əm ta? ktktmīx" 'the chief's wife'
 where I have identified *kt-* 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-* a '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?*: tá?was k-?sktékst *don't let go!*, tá?was k-snx"ntéx *don't believe him!*, tá?was k-sləxncécmx *don't tell on me!*, tá?was f'yi? k-?šxīlm *don't do it!*, tá?was f'yi? k-šxīltx *don't do it that way!*" Not only do they show *k*, they also show *s* (and in two

cases ?s)¹⁵. K says that the s of (?s) is the nominalizer that accompanies all negatives with "ta? it is not the case ... with the article k" (p. 81). But Sh also has a prefix ?s-, a prefix that K labels *in order to* (p. 72). Here's what K says about it: "It is possible that this prefix is bimorphemic and contains the nominalizer, as the 1sg. possessive prefix is inserted between ? and s" (p. 43). The examples he gives in that section are given below; more interesting are those listed in the syntax, section 34, which I reproduce in its entirety following the first paradigm with ?s-:

cúct-kn ?n-s-?f?n	I want to eat
cút ?s-?f?n-s	he wants to eat
... t-?s-?f?n ¹⁶	id. thee
... ?s-?f?n-kt	id. us (incl.)
... ?s-?f?n-mp	id. you (pl.)
... ?s-?f?n-s k'əx'	id. us (excl.)

34 USE OF THE ?S-FORM. The ?s-form always refers to a fact, often with a shade of goal-directedness. Examples: cúct-kn ?ns?i?n *I want to eat*, cúct-n-k t-?s?f?n *do you want to eat?*, x'úús-k t-sq'acéc *you're eager to go*, tá? k-sqnmfns ?skícxš *she didn't want to go there* (VIII:135), x'yx'yém-n-k t-?s?f?n *do you want to eat?*, me? k'ék'nlx-kn ?nsyépplx me mstncúctwn ?nspłqíq'lx *I'll try to go up there and do my best to return*, me? k'éns-ək'e ?scəxntés *he's going to try and fix it*, xətxét ?f? ?s?élksts *he's always willing to work*, qíx't-nke ?scə?á?útx's *they seem to be reluctant to come in*, nǎét-n-k t-?st'əq'pxén *are you afraid of having a flat tire?*, ?ex k'əx' ?-yéxəs ?sx'úps *we're packing to go*, q'acéc/sx'úp k'əx' ?swéwlms *we set out to go fishing*, clǎmstéx t-?s'acmé *you know how to knit (nets)*, m-xənwéln-k t-?s'éx'm *you are able to swim*. With impersonal main verbs: xkəcxús t-?sq'acéc *it's time for you to go*, cúk' ?sknúx'nx *you must help him*, x'ətyé? ?st'éks *he'll come soon*, kék'me?l ?sx'éyts *they almost perished*. With different subject in main and subordinate verb: m-cúncn t-?sq'acéc *I told you to go*, m-xcwncécms ?nspípǎm *he suggested / hinted for me to go hunting*, me? kəxcxín t-?s?e'lkst *I'll give you work to do* (VII:69), k'úk'lm-kn ?swl'fms *I make him laugh* (p. 86-87).

¹⁵Aert Kuipers writes to me that in these two cases "we have 2nd pers. possessive ?s- (sect. 11.4), and the following -s- is simply the nominalizer... In Sh there is no prefix s- 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 itr. verbs only" (Kuipers 1974:43). In other words, K identifies the s- 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-s- here represents the telescoping of the second person possessive ?- with the ?s-. The t- of the second form is an article, a form which, incidentally, alternates with k.

One of these examples shows the prefix with k: tá? k-sqnmfns ?skícxš *she didn't want to go there*; I would suggest a reading 'negative-inten,' "she wouldn't go, didn't intend to go."¹⁷ And instead of the reading "a fact, with a shade of goal-directedness" for what the ?s- forms refer to, I would suggest that "future intention" fits as well, borrowing Reichard's label 'intentional' of the cognate form.

4.5. THOMPSON. Th has a particle that Thompson and Thompson label 'unrealized.' Here is their description of the form: "In frequent opposition to /tə/ is /kə/ UNREALIZED, which marks adjuncts referring to matters that are unknown, unreal, or contrary-to-fact—occasionally simply indefinite—to be established in the future, if at all" (p. 150). The following examples has two ks:

?e /t-úta?q' us k e?-s/núk'e? Xu'e k s/záx-n-x'
... UNR friend ... UNR NOM/clothe ...
'if your friend is naked, clothe him'

the first k accompanies 'your friend,' presumably 'hypothetical friend,' where 'friend' is a nominal construction. The second k, however, immediately precedes a transitive verb that begins with s-. Similarly

k'f'k'e?t k s-n/'tóg'-s
near ... UNR NOM-boil ...
'it is close to boiling'

shows k preceding a 3rd person form that begins with s-.

In their grammar of Th, the Thompsons do not, as far as I can see, discuss a prefix s- that can be identified as the cognate of Cr s- inten. There are several places, however, where forms can be seen as containing the equivalent of an s- 'inten.' prefix. Where they discuss the "introductory predicative" /?é 'there is..., it is (that)..., that is..., the authors also refer to an "incantation formula with the reflexive: /?é ws ... k e?-s....-cút," and though their interlinearizations gloss s- as NOM, an interpretation 'future' is not implausible:

/?é ws met k e?-s/q'ay--n-cú·t
'shoot yourselves!' (lit. 'may you come to be shot')
/?é ws met k e?-s/ya'-e-cút
'drag yourselves!'

Perhaps more suggestive are the first two forms the Thompsons list in section 35.2 INTERROGATIVE-INDEFINITES:

/ké?e k e?-s-x'uy' /nés?

¹⁷K 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 Engl. '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/ké?e k s-x'uy'-ep /q'cíyx
 'are you people about to leave?'
 as are two of the examples listed in 35.32:
s/tém e s/tè? k s-k'u-/k'w-ét-n-e
 'I will not step on it'
s/tém e s/tè? k s/tél[ə]-ix-s
 'he couldn't stand up'
 and most of all, all the examples listed in 35.33 PROHIBITIVES:
/tém us tè?e k e?-s-(e)s/kə́t=xón
 'don't go barefoot!'
/cúk' us k s/k'ít-ix-m-cm-x'
 'don't come near me!'
/cúk' us k e?-s-yu?-/yu?s=xón
 'don't trip!'
/cúk' us k s/k'én-x' xè?e k e?-s/náq'
 'stop taking this that you'd be stealing!'
/cúk' us /qəs-t-éx'
 'don't scratch (that particular place you're scratching)! (cf. */cúk' us k e?-s/qəs-cút* '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. Lilloet has a postclitic *k(a)t* 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 *x'w'aoz* we use *x'w'áozas*, so we get *x'w'áozas k'w' snúk'w'anax'w'* "don't you help him!", *x'w'áozas k'w' sx'w'itensál'ap* "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.

References

- Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A grammar of Spokane: A Salish language of eastern Washington. University of Hawaii PhD dissertation. Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 4.4.
 Coeur d'Alene Tribe 1975. Sñchitsu'umshtsn: The Coeur d'Alene language. Southwest Research Associates, Albuquerque.
 Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. The Shuswap Language. Grammar, Texts, Dictionary. Mouton.
 Mattina, Anthony. 1993 "Okanagan Aspect: A Working Paper." XXVIII International Conference on Salishan Languages, University of Washington, August 19-21.
 Mattina, Anthony and Nancy Mattina. 1995 "Okanagan *ks-* and *kt-*." 30th ICSL, Victoria, B.C.
 Nicodemus, Lawrence. 1975. Sñchitsu'umshtsn: The Coeur d'Alene Language. Vol I: The Grammar. Coeur d'Alene-English Dictionary. Vol II: English-Coeur d'Alene Dictionary. University Press, Spokane, Washington.
 Post, Rev. John, S. J. 1904. Kalispel Grammar. MS, Archives of the Oregon Province of the Society of Jesus.
 Reichard, Gladys A. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. Handbook of American Indian Languages, ed. by Franz Boas, 3.517-707. J. J. Augustin, Gluckstadt-Hamgurg-New York.
 Speck, Brenda J. 1980. An Edition of Father Post's Kalispel Grammar. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, No. 1. University of Montana.
 Thompson, L. C. and M. T. Thompson 1992. The Thompson language. UMOPL No. 8., Missoula.
 van Eijk, Jan P. 1985. The Lillooet Language. Phonology, Morphology, Syntax. PhD dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
 Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel language. Det Norske Videnskaps-Academi i Oslo.