

Moses-Columbia imperative constructions: A working paper  
Nancy Mattina  
University of Montana

## 0 Introduction

## 1 Simple imperatives

## 1.1 Singular imperatives

## 1.1.1 Intransitive

## 1.1.2 Transitive

## 1.2. Plural imperatives

## 1.2.1 Plural intransitive

## 1.2.2 Plural transitive

## 1.3 Prohibitives

## 1.3.1 Intransitive prohibitive

## 1.3.2 Transitive prohibitive

## 2 Complex imperatives

## 2.1 Pronoun-based imperatives

2.2 *t'ʔ*-based imperatives

## 2.3 Imperatives in series

## 3 Unmarked commands

## 4 Prohibitives in Interior Salish

**0 Introduction.** The imperative constructions of Moses-Columbia (Cm)<sup>1</sup> should interest teachers of the language (particularly those who use a Total Physical Response methodology) and Salishan linguists alike. My goal is to serve both groups with this preliminary description of the formal aspect of imperative constructions until a reference grammar of Cm becomes available. A. Mattina (1980) briefly described the imperative constructions of Cm using unpublished data made available to him by M. Dale Kinkade. Recent field work on this topic allows me to elaborate on Cm imperatives, particularly in the area of negative imperatives, designated here as prohibitives (Sec. 1.3). This paper concludes with a brief overview of prohibitives in Interior Salish (IS).

Cm imperative constructions are of two main types: simple and complex. Simple commands, both positive and negative, involve a single predicate that is inflected with the imperative suffix and person markers, if any. Complex imperatives, all positive, involve multiple predicates, the first of which carries the appropriate imperative suffix. The context of an utterance can impart imperative force to clauses that lack imperative marking (Sec. 3), but the simple and complex constructions comprise the core system.

<sup>1</sup>Moses-Columbia(n) is a Southern Interior Salish language spoken primarily on the Colville Reservation in Central Washington. Speakers refer to the language as *nxa'amxcín*. This paper was made possible by the Nxa'amxcín Language Program of the Colville Tribes and these speakers: Agatha Bart, Matilda Bearcub, Naomi Dick, and Norine Smith. In addition to my work with the Nxa'amxcín Language Program over the last year, I have consulted numerous articles by M. Dale Kinkade who has given us the first detailed descriptions of important subsystems of Moses-Columbia. All errors are my own.

**1 Simple imperatives.** The form of the simple imperative depends on three oppositions: 1) positive vs. negative mode, 2) singular vs. plural subject person, and 3) transitive vs. intransitive verb stem. These same oppositions obtain in the imperative systems of all of the other Southern Interior (SI) languages. Cm is unique in the SI group in that subject person marking co-occurs with the imperative suffix in some transitive imperatives.

**1.1 Singular imperatives.** The suffix *-taʔ* 'second singular imperative' is affixed to intransitive and transitive verb stems. In intransitives, the 2s subject marker found in declaratives is absent. In transitives, subject person is marked when object person marking is overt. *-taʔ* is never stressed, nor does it appear to have any effect on the stress of the stem.

**1.1.1 Intransitive.** Intransitive verb stems may be identified in two ways in Cm: 1) they inflect for person with intransitive subject clitics, and 2) they lack special transitive suffixes, first described in Kinkade 1982. In the declarative, the second person singular intransitive subject clitic is *kʷ*. Second person singular imperative *-taʔ* in effect replaces *kʷ* in imperative clauses. Compare the imperatives in (1-4a) with the declaratives in (1-4b).

- |    |    |                         |    |                           |
|----|----|-------------------------|----|---------------------------|
| 1. | a. | núxʷt-(t)aʔ<br>Go.      | b. | kʷnúxʷt<br>You went.      |
| 2. | a. | ʔftx-taʔ<br>Sleep.      | b. | kʷʔftx<br>You slept.      |
| 3. | a. | c'əlfx-taʔ<br>Stand up. | b. | c'əlfxkʷ<br>You stood up. |
| 4. | a. | ʔfm'x-taʔ<br>Move out.  | b. | kʷʔim'x<br>You moved out. |

The examples in (1-4) are imperatives formed on bare root stems, i.e. those stems that are not derivationally complex. Many intransitive stems are morphologically complex, as shown in (5). Stem-internal morphs are indicated by '+' or '=' (for lexical suffixes only).

- |    |                  |                      |                      |
|----|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 5. | paʔpaʔxánəm-taʔ  | (paʔ + √paʔ-xan + m) | Step.                |
|    | c'áw'səm-taʔ     | (√c'aw'=s + m)       | Wash your face.      |
|    | pəlk'mncút-taʔ   | (√plk' + mn + cut)   | Turn around.         |
|    | tr'qəncút-(t)aʔ  | (√tr'q + p + ncut)   | Take off running.    |
|    | ʔəsmncút-(t)aʔ   | (√ʔs + mn + cut)     | Get ready (dressed). |
|    | ʔət'p'ncút-(t)aʔ | (√ʔt'p' + ncut)      | Jump.                |
|    | xák'naʔ-taʔ      | (√xak'=naʔ)          | Listen.              |
|    | k'əwcn-taʔ       | (√k'w=cn)            | Be quiet.            |
|    | náwəlx-taʔ       | (√naw + lx)          | Run.                 |
|    | ʔáqəlx-taʔ       | (√ʔaq + lx)          | Sit down.            |

## 5. (cont.)

wəwáwɪx-taʔ	(w+√waw+lx)	Speak.
caɬçápəm-taʔ	(caɬ/çap+m)	Scream.
cəqqcɪn-taʔ	(√cəq+q=cin)	Land (a boat on the shore).
həycnmfnc-taʔ	(/hy=cn+min+ct)	Blabber.

Most if not all of the stem-internal morphs in (5) have been identified in the literature with morphemes, e.g. *-m* 'middle', *-(l)lx* 'autonomous', *-cút* 'reflexive'. The analysis of each in terms of Cm word formation and morphosyntax remains controversial. However, the relative morphological complexity of the stem does not appear to be relevant to the statement of Cm imperative formation. Each of the stems in (5) has a declarative intransitive counterpart and lacks stem-final transitive morphology. Bare root stems and 'extended' stems behave identically if speakers recognize them as intransitive.

1.1.2 **Transitive.** Singular transitive imperatives consist of a transitive stem with the imperative suffix *-taʔ*. There are several transitive suffixes, five of which are discussed here in terms of imperative constructions: *-nt*, *-ʔt*, *-tút*, *-x(t)ɪ*, and *-st(ú)*.<sup>2</sup> Subject, object, and the imperative suffixes follow the transitive suffix in this order: object-subject-imperative. In general, when the object is third person, no object or subject markers intervene between the transitive suffix and the imperative suffix. The *t* of the imperative suffix coalesces with stem-final *ɪ*.

6. q'iy'-t-t(ɪ)aʔ  
write-Trans-2sImp  
Write it for him/them.

When the object is non-third, both the subject and object suffixes occur.

7. q'iy'-t-sá-x"-taʔ  
write-Trans-1sOb-2sSu-2sImp  
Write it for me.
8. q'iy'-t-ál-t(ɪ)aʔ  
write-Trans-1pOb-2sSu-2sImp  
Write it for us.

The shape of the subject and object markers depends on 1) the inherent stress of the stem, and 2) the choice of transitive suffix. Citing a division between non-causative and causative transitive suffix types, Kinkade 1982 analyzes the relevant subject-object combinations as shown in (9).

<sup>2</sup> *-nt* may be further analyzable as *-n-t* where *-t* is the transitive suffix and *-n* indicates the degree of control of the agent (Kinkade 1982). Because *-t* 'transitive' rarely occurs without *-n*, I provisionally do not segment the two. The lone example I have of *-t* 'transitive' without *-n* 'control' is *ʔám-t(ɪ)aʔ* 'Feed him'. For discussion of the segments within the Cm transitive suffixes, see Kinkade 1982.

9.	Non-causative	Causative
2s:1s	-s(á)-x" <sup>3</sup>	-m-x"
2s:1p	-(á)l-t	-(á)l-t

The non-causative transitive suffixes are *-nt*, *-ʔt*, and *-tút*. The causative transitive suffixes are *-st(ú)* and *-x(t)ɪ*.<sup>4</sup> Weak stems, which lose their stress to certain suffixes, take the stressed variant of the object markers with the non-causative transitive suffixes *-nt* and *-ʔt*. Non-causative *-tút* is always stressed.

10.	Object unstressed	Object stressed
a.	ʔác'x-ənt-(t)aʔ look_at-Trans-2sImp Look at it/them.	c'ák-ənt-(t)aʔ hit-Trans-2sImp Hit it/them.
b.	ʔác'x-ənt-s-x"-taʔ look_at-Trans-1sOb-2sSu-2sImp Look at me.	cák-ənt-sá-x"-taʔ hit-Trans-1sOb-2sSu-2sImp Hit me.
c.	ʔác'x-ənt-l-t(ɪ)aʔ look_at-Trans-1pOb-2sSu-2sImp Look at us.	cák-ənt-ál-t(ɪ)aʔ hit-Trans-1pOb-2sSu-2sImp Hit us.

Additional examples of non-causative transitives appear in (11). Stem-final *n* coalesces with the *n* of the *-nt* suffix.

11.	ʔaw'táp-ənt-(t)aʔ ʔaw'táp-ənt-s-x"-taʔ xak'naʔm(n)-ənt-l-t(ɪ)aʔ má <sup>o</sup> '-t-t(ɪ)aʔ má <sup>o</sup> '-t-s-x"-taʔ číxə-t-t(ɪ)aʔ ʔəm-t-sá-x"-taʔ k" <sup>o</sup> tn-tút-t(ɪ)aʔ k" <sup>o</sup> tn-tút-t-s-x"-taʔ tumistm-tút-t-s-x"-taʔ	Follow him. Follow me. Listen to us. Break it. Break it for me. Warm it for him. Feed it for me. Loan it to him. Loan something to me. Sell it to me.
-----	---	--

<sup>3</sup>This subject-object complex follows the *t* of the transitive suffix and *-t-s-x"* is heard as *-ct<sup>o</sup>* (object unstressed) or *-cat<sup>o</sup>* (object stressed).

<sup>4</sup>The functional differences among the transitive suffixes are subtle. Kinkade 1980a describes the semantics of Cm transitive suffixes. His labels 'non-causative' and 'causative' used here are based on formal and historical considerations rather than semantic ones.

The causative transitive suffixes *-st(i)* and *-x(i)t* are stressed when added to weak stems. First singular object *-m* is *u* (optionally) following a consonant and preceding second singular subject (Kinkade 1982).

	Object unstressed	Object stressed
12. a.	xátm-st-(t)a? lift-Trans-2sImp Lift it.	b. tǎx <sup>w</sup> p-stú-x <sup>w</sup> -ta? stop-Trans-2sSu-2sImp Stop him.
13. a.	xátm-st-u-x <sup>w</sup> -ta? lift-Trans-1sOb-2sSu-2sImp Lift me up.	b. tǎx <sup>w</sup> p-stú-m-x <sup>w</sup> -ta? stop-Trans-1sOb-2sSu-2sImp Stop me.
14. a.	xátm-st-l-t-(t)a? Trans-1pOb-2sSu-2sImp Lift each of us up.	b. tǎx <sup>w</sup> p-st-ál-t-(t)a? stop-Trans-1pOb-2sSu-2sImp Stop us.

Unlike all of the other transitive suffixes, *-st(i)* requires second subject marking with null third object when stressed (12b). This irregularity in the overall pattern of person marking in transitive imperatives might be understood as an irregularity in the shape of the transitive suffix in this one environment. That is, perhaps *-stú* is *-stú<sup>w</sup>* in 2s:3 transitive imperatives.<sup>5</sup> In (15) I give additional examples of causative imperatives.

15. caḥchápem-st-(t)a?	Make him scream.
lǎk <sup>m</sup> -stú-x <sup>w</sup> -ta? kasnúx <sup>w</sup> tǎx <sup>w</sup>	Force him to go.
wǎnm-stú-x <sup>w</sup> -ta?	Lower it.
wǎnmst-ál-t-(t)a?	Lower us.
ʔúqqa <sup>?</sup> -st-u-x <sup>w</sup> -ta?	Take me outside.
ʔúqqa <sup>?</sup> -st-l-t-(t)a?	Take us outside.
ǫx <sup>w</sup> -xft-(t)a?	Sew it for him/her.
ǫx <sup>w</sup> -xft-u-x <sup>w</sup> -ta?	Sew it for me.
ǫx <sup>w</sup> -xft-l-t-(t)a?	Sew it for us
ʔaní-xt-(t)a?	Take it to him.
má <sup>o</sup> -xt-(t)a?	Break it for him/her.
tk <sup>o</sup> f <sup>w</sup> -xt-u-x <sup>w</sup> -ta?	Pray for me. (A. Mattina 1980)

**1.2 Plural imperatives.** Second person plural imperatives are formed by suffixation of *-wǎnta?* to intransitive and transitive stems. The first vowel of the plural imperative suffix attracts secondary stress, although I do not mark it here.

<sup>5</sup>Plural *-st(i)* transitive imperatives regularly contain the 2p subject suffix, regardless of the stress pattern in the inflected stem, but this does not explain why object unstressed 2s:3 forms lack the 2s subject marker *-x<sup>w</sup>*. I have not yet researched the possibility that *-stú<sup>w</sup>* in 2s:3 forms might be a historical relic.

**1.2.1 Plural intransitive.** Subject person marking does not co-occur with the plural imperative suffix *-wǎnta?* on intransitive stems. As with singular intransitive imperatives, the morphological complexity of the intransitive stem has no bearing on the imperative construction. Examples of plural intransitive imperatives appear in (16).

16. ǫwám-wǎnta?	All go. <sup>6</sup>
tǎx <sup>w</sup> p-wǎnta?	All stop.
c <sup>o</sup> áw <sup>o</sup> sǎm-wǎnta?	All wash your faces.
ǫsǎmncút-wǎnta?	All get ready/dressed.
xák <sup>o</sup> na <sup>o</sup> -wǎnta?	All of you listen.
k <sup>o</sup> áwǎcǎn-wǎnta?	All be quiet.
kayǎrix-wǎnta?	All get in the car.
ʔím <sup>o</sup> x-wǎnta?	All move out.
ʔftx-wǎnta?	All sleep.
pa <sup>o</sup> pa <sup>o</sup> xánǎm-wǎnta?	All step.

**1.2.2 Plural transitive.** The plural imperative suffix *-wǎnta?* follows the object-subject markers on the transitive stem in the plural transitive imperatives. In the declarative, the relevant person markers are given by Kinkade (1982) as follows:

17.	Non-causative	Causative
2p:3	-ǫ-p	-ǫ-p
2p:1s	-s(ǎ)l-p	-(ú)(m)-p
2p:1p	-(ǎ)l-p	-(ǎ)l-p

The 2p subject suffix *-p* occurs in all plural transitive imperatives regardless of the object person. Examples of 2p:3 forms appear in (18-20).

18. háw <sup>o</sup> i-nt-p-wǎnta?	
fix-Trans-2pSu-2pImp	
All fix/prepare it.	
19. cíx-ít-p-wǎnta?	
warm-Trans-2pSu-2pImp	
All warm it up for him.	
20. ʔúqqa <sup>?</sup> -st-p-wǎnta?	
go_out-Trans-2pSu-2pImp	
All take him outside.	

<sup>6</sup>ǫwám is the suppletive plural stem of *núx<sup>w</sup>t* 'sg. go'.

Although the speakers I interviewed often found it difficult to construct plural transitive commands with 1st plural object, it appears that all of the person-marking patterns of the relevant declarative constructions are used in the imperative.

21. ʔác'x-nt-sl-p-wənta?  
look\_at-Trans-1sOb-2pSu-2pImp  
All look at me.
22. xák'naʔmn-(n)t-l-p-wənta?  
listen-Trans-1pOb-2pSu-2pImp  
All of you listen to me.
23. tumistm-túft-l-p-wənta?  
sell-Trans-1pOb-2pSu-2pImp  
Sell something to us.

Person-marking with the causative suffixes is illustrated in (24-25).

24. xátm-st-m-p-wənta?  
lift-Trans-1sOb-2pSu-2pImp  
All lift me up.
25. ʔəx'-xft-l-p-wənta?  
sew-Trans-1pOb-2pSu-2pImp  
Sew it for us.

**1.3 Prohibitives.** Prohibitives lack overt imperative marking and are formally identical to non-imperative clauses with future or 'unrealized' meaning. Their imperative force is usually discernible from context.

**1.3.1 Intransitive prohibitive.** Intransitive prohibitives consist of the negative particle *lut*, followed by a verb stem with these prefixes: *kas-* 'unrealized' and the nominalizer *s-*. In singular subject prohibitives, the person marker is the prefix *in-* from the possessive person marking paradigm. In singular intransitive prohibitives, the combination of *kas-*, *in-*, and *s-* yields *kis-*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup>The morphophonemics of this combination is not clear to me. Tentatively, I assume that *kas-* is *k-* before *in-* '2nd singular possessive'. The nasal of the possessive prefix is regularly absent before *s-* 'nominalizer'. *kas-* may be *k-* before at least one other vowel-initial prefix. The prefix *al-* prefixed to a verb means 'again', or 'back' as in *kn\_nuʔt* 'I went' > *kn\_al\_nuʔt* 'I went back' and *háw'inx'* 'You fixed it' > *al-háw'inx'* 'You fix it again (repaired it)'. The 'unrealized' prefix *kas-* regularly occurs in non-perfective constructions as illustrated in (i).

(i) *kn\_kas-núx't-əx'* I'm going to go.

26. *lut kis-ʔayx'tmncút*  
(*lut kas-in-s-ʔayx'tmncút*)  
neg Unr-2sPo-Nom-tire\_oneself  
Don't tire yourself.

Additional examples of singular intransitive prohibitives appear in (27).

27. *lut kis-xáct* Don't dig (roots).  
*lut kis-ʔúqqaʔ* Don't go outside.  
*lut kis-c'əlíx* Don't stand up.  
*lut kis-nk'ʔal'uscút* Don't get angry.  
*lut kis-núx't* Don't go/walk.

In plural intransitive prohibitives, the plural subject person marker is *-p*. *kas-* followed by *s-* is *kas-*.

28. *lut kas-ʔwám-p*  
(*lut kas-s-ʔwam-p*)  
neg Unr-Nom-go(pl.)-2pPo  
Don't all go/walk.

Pairs of singular and plural intransitive prohibitives appear in (29-30).

30. *lut kis-c'áw'səm* Don't wash your face.  
*lut kas-c'áw'səm-p* Don't all wash your faces.
31. *lut kis-təx'p* Don't stop.  
*lut kas-təx'p-əp* Don't all of you stop.
32. *lut kis-əyɛncmínc* Don't chatter/blabber.  
*lut kas-əyɛncmínc-p* Don't all chatter/blabber.

**1.3.2 Transitive prohibitive.** Transitive prohibitives consist of *lut* followed by *kas-* prefixed to a fully inflected transitive stem. Subject and object person markers are from the transitive (ergative) paradigm. The division between non-causative and causative person-marking patterns holds in prohibitives as it does in

When the verb stem begins with *al-*, *kas-* is *k-*.

- (ii) *kn\_k-al+núx't-əx'* I'm about to go back.  
(iii) *k-al+c'ú'iy* It's going to get dark again.

Additional work is needed to determine that *kas-* and *k-* are not allomorphs of separate morphemes.

positive imperatives. Examples of non-causatives are given in (33), causatives in (34).

### 33. Non-causative transitive prohibitives

lut kas-má <sup>o</sup> -nt-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't break it.
lut kas- <sup>o</sup> ác'x-nt-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't look at it.
lut kas-náltmən-(n)t-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't forget it.
lut kas-náltmən-(n)t-s-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't forget me.
lut kas-náltm- <sup>o</sup> ft-l-t	Don't forget our _____.
lut kas-q'iy'- <sup>o</sup> ft-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't write it for him/her.
lut swat kas-k' <sup>o</sup> tənk'háp- <sup>o</sup> ft-p	Don't you all open the door for anyone
lut kas-má <sup>o</sup> - <sup>o</sup> ft-p	Don't all break it for him.

### 34. Causative transitive prohibitives

lut kas- <sup>o</sup> fx <sup>w</sup> -xft-u-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't sew it for me.
lut kas- <sup>o</sup> fx <sup>w</sup> -xft-lt	Don't sew it for us.
lut kas-caḥḥapəm-stu-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't make him scream.
lut kas-xátm-stu-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't lift it.
lut kas- <sup>o</sup> úcqa?-st-x <sup>w</sup>	Don't take it outside.
lut kas- <sup>o</sup> úcqa?-st-m-p	Don't all take me outside.

**2 Complex imperatives.** Complex imperatives consist of two predicates, the first of which bears the imperative suffix. There are three types of complex imperatives in the corpus; there may be other kinds of initial predicates used in complex imperatives.

**2.1 Pronoun based-imperatives.** The first type of complex imperative is comprised of an independent pronoun, widely considered to be a predicate, which has the imperative suffix. This first predicate is followed by a transitive or intransitive predicate. The intransitive predicate is uninflected for subject person (37).

35. <sup>o</sup>inw<sup>o</sup>-ta? <sup>o</sup>ác'xənt-x<sup>w</sup>  
2sPro-2sImp look\_at-Trans-2sSu  
You, look at it.
36. ləplápst-wənta? <sup>o</sup>ác'xənt-p  
2pPro-2pImp look\_at-Trans-2pSu  
You all look at it.
37. <sup>o</sup>inw<sup>o</sup>-ta? <sup>o</sup>itx  
2sPro-2sImp sleep  
You, sleep.

The corpus includes one example of the imperative suffix following *ya?ya?ni* 'all'.

38. ya?ya?tú-wənta? q'iy'-nt-p  
all-2pImp write-Trans-2pSu  
Everyone write it.

**2.2 t'fl'-based imperatives.** A second type of complex imperative consists of the predicate *t'fl'* (meaning uncertain) that has the imperative suffix, followed by a second predicate. Subject person-marking on the second predicate appears to be optional with intransitive predicates.

38. t'fl'-ta? <sup>o</sup>itx Now, go to sleep.  
t'fl'-wənta? <sup>o</sup>itx Now (all) go to sleep.  
t'fl'-wənta? k<sup>o</sup>p <sup>o</sup>itx All go to sleep.  
t'fl'-wənta? <sup>o</sup>ac'xnt-p Now (all) look at it.

Speakers report these imperatives have the pragmatic force of permissives.

**2.3 Imperatives in series.** Imperative predicates in series have the imperative suffix on the first predicate, followed by one or more transitive or intransitive predicates. Second predicates if transitive are fully inflected for subject and object person (39-40). Second intransitive predicates are optionally inflected for subject person (41-42).

39. húy-ta? namúlcən-(n)t-s-x<sup>w</sup> ṭ nax<sup>o</sup>iy ṭ saw<sup>o</sup>tk<sup>w</sup>  
go-2sImp dip-Trans-1sOb-2sSu cl. cold cl. water  
Go on, dip me some cold water.
40. x<sup>o</sup>úsas-ta? cɬ'a?k'án'-(n)t-l-t-(t)a? 1 i-stəq<sup>o</sup>fl'  
hurry-2sImp fetch-Trans-1pOb-2sSu-2sImp prep 2sPo-raft  
Hurry, come get us on your raft.
41. c'əlx-ta? k<sup>o</sup>a? (k<sup>o</sup>) nu<sup>o</sup>x<sup>o</sup>t k'əl kəɪnk'máp  
stand(sg.)-2sImp conj. 2sSu walk prep door  
Stand up and walk to the door.
42. kəswitmfnct-(t)a? ṭərqəm  
do\_best-2sImp jump\_up\_and\_down  
Do your best, jump up and down.
- Imperatives in series are also used in first plural hortatives, as in (43).
43. x<sup>o</sup>ús-ta? kṭ sq'əy'mix  
hurry-2sImp 1pSu write (non-perfective)  
Come on, let's write.

3 Unmarked commands. Simple declarative sentences in most aspects can have imperative/hortative force, despite the absence of an imperative suffix. Most of the examples that follow include unrealized, future, or optative modals.

44.	k <sup>w</sup> kas-təx <sup>w</sup> pmíx	You are going to stop.
	na <sup>?</sup> su <sub>k</sub> <sup>w</sup> təx <sup>w</sup> p	You should stop.
	na <sup>?</sup> su <sub>k</sub> <sup>w</sup> p təx <sup>w</sup> p	You all should stop.
	xák'na <sup>?</sup> mən-(n)t-s-x <sup>w</sup>	Just listen to me.
	t'íl' kas- <sup>?</sup> ác'x-ənt-əm	Let's look at it.
	sa <sup>?</sup> k <sup>?</sup> ác'x-ənt-əm	We should look at it.
	sa <sub>k</sub> (ya <sup>?</sup> ya <sup>?</sup> tú) cík <sup>w</sup> mənst	Let's (all) stand up.

Among prohibitives, the nominalized constructions in 1.3 are the most common. Speakers report that negative non-nominalized expressions can have stronger prohibitive force, just as in English 'You will not smoke' can be more forceful than 'Don't smoke'. I have intransitive examples only (45), but negated, non-nominalized transitive predicates are probably also used with prohibitive force. The intransitive subject clitics in (45) are *k<sup>w</sup>* '2s' and *k<sup>w</sup>p* '2p'.

45.	lut k <sup>w</sup> kas-təx <sup>w</sup> p-míx	You will not stop anywhere.
	lut k <sup>w</sup> p kas-təx <sup>w</sup> p-míx	You all won't stop anywhere.
	lut k <sup>w</sup> p kas-təx <sup>w</sup> p	You all will not stop.
	lut kas-kayərix k <sup>w</sup> p	You all will not get in (a vehicle).
	lut k <sup>w</sup> mán'x <sup>w</sup> əm	You will not smoke.

4 Prohibitives in Interior Salish. A. Mattina 1980 compared the imperative constructions of Interior Salish, but descriptions of the prohibitives were few at that time. In Figure 1. I summarize the structure of prohibitive constructions for each of the Interior Salishan languages based on these sources: Coeur d'Alene (Cr), Doak 1996; Kalispel (Ka), Vogt 1940<sup>8</sup>; (Ok) Colville-Okanagan, A. Mattina 1980; Lillooet (Li), van Eijk 1985; Shuswap (Sh), Kuipers 1974; Thompson (Th), Thompson and Thompson 1992. I also considered the Cm data in A. Mattina 1980, along with my own field notes on Cm and Ok prohibitives.

Despite some differences of form, IS prohibitives are morphosyntactically similar. Each begins with a negative particle or predicate followed by an unrealized/hypothetical clitic or prefix. The next element is the stem, preceded by *s-* which is historically known as the nominalizer prefix.<sup>9</sup> In the Southern Interior, the stem may be inflected with any of the three sets of person markers: possessive (genitive), intransitive (absolutive), or transitive (ergative). Ka is unique among the SI languages in using intransitive person markers in the intransitive prohibitive.<sup>10</sup> In the Northern Interior (NI), the stem is inflected with either the

<sup>8</sup>No published data on prohibitives was available for Spokane or Montana Salish (Flathead).

<sup>9</sup>This *s-* may alternatively be the 'intent' marker, as discussed in A. Mattina 1996.

<sup>10</sup>This may be an artifact of the limited data available to me. I found 2 intransitive prohibitives in the texts provided in Vogt 1940. These may be strong negative instructions rather than the core prohibitives of

possessive or transitive person markers. The position of the subject and object person markers varies because of slight formal differences among the person-marking paradigms of these languages.

In the NI languages, the negative element is more obviously a predicate than its SI counterpart. The negative element in NI prohibitives has conjunctive inflection and an article/complementizer that introduces the lower clause (Li *k<sup>w</sup>*, Sh *k*, Th *k*). In SI, the stem only is inflected for unrealized/future mood and no subordinating element occurs in front of the stem.

Figure 1. Prohibitives in Interior Salish.<sup>11</sup>

		Neg.	PM	Unr.	PM	Nom.	Stem
Cm	Intrans.	lut		k(as)-	i-	s-	stem <sub>P</sub> <sup>12</sup>
	Trans.	lut		kas-		s-	stem <sub>T</sub>
Cr	Intrans.	lut		čəł	i-	s-	stem <sub>P</sub>
	Trans.	lut		čəł		s-	stem <sub>T</sub>
Ka	Intrans.	tá	k <sup>w</sup>	q(e <sup>?</sup> e)		s-	stem <sub>I</sub>
	Trans.	tá		q(e <sup>?</sup> e)		s-	stem <sub>T</sub>
Ok	Intrans.	lut	a-	k-		s-	stem <sub>P</sub>
	Trans.	lut	a-	k-		s-	stem <sub>T</sub>
Li	Intrans.	x <sup>w</sup> áz-as			k <sup>w</sup> s-		stem <sub>P</sub>
	Trans.	x <sup>w</sup> áz-as			k <sup>w</sup> s-		stem <sub>T</sub>
Sh	Intrans.	táw-əs		k	ʔ-ʔ-s-		stem <sub>P</sub> <sup>13</sup>
	Trans.	táw-əs		k	s-		stem <sub>T</sub>
Th	Intrans.	té		k		s-	stem <sub>P</sub>
	Trans.	cúk <sup>w</sup> us <sup>14</sup>		k		s-	stem <sub>T</sub>

the language. That is, possessive person marking may occur on true prohibitives, but I have no evidence of this at this time.

<sup>11</sup>Abbreviations for this chart are as follows: Neg. = negative particle or predicate; PM=person marker; Unr.=unrealized or hypothetical element; Nom.=nominalizer. The subscript on the stem indicates the possessive (P), intransitive (I), or transitive (T) person-marking paradigm utilized in the construction.

<sup>12</sup>Kinkade 1980b analyzes *kas-* as *kaš-* followed by the nominalizer *s-* which reduces by general rule to *kas-*. The corpus at my disposal does not give me evidence for this analysis, but it may be correct on historical grounds (cf. the Cr and Ok forms).

<sup>13</sup>The second singular possessive person marker *-ʔ-* is an infix in *ʔs-* 'nominalizer' (Kuipers 1974).

<sup>14</sup>Th *cúk<sup>w</sup>* 'finish' is the most common of two negative predicates found in Th prohibitives (Thompson and Thompson 1992). The other is *tém* 'lack'. Both appear to fill the same slot in parallel constructions.

While a detailed comparative analysis of Interior prohibitives remains to be done, Figure 1. shows how Cm prohibitives more closely fit the SI pattern than the NI one. However, in the positive imperative construction, Cm is more like an NI language in retaining subject person-marking in some transitive imperatives.

## References

- Doak, I. 1996. Coeur d'Alene imperative constructions. Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, pp. 119-125. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Kinkade, M.D. 1980a. Columbian Salish *-xi*, *-ʔ*, *-tʰ*. International Journal of American Linguistics 46.33-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980b. Interior Salishan particles. Anthropological Linguistics 23.327-343.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. Transitive inflection in (Moses) Columbian Salish. Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics 7.49-62.
- Kuipers, A. 1974. The Shuswap language. The Hague: Mouton.
- Mattina, A. 1980. Imperative formations in Colville-Okanagan and in the other Interior Salishan languages. Glossa 14.212-232.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Interior Salish *to-be* and *intentional* forms: a working paper. Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, pp. 239-248. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Thompson, L.C. and M. T. Thompson. 1992. UMOPL No. 8, Missoula.
- van Eijk, Jan P. 1985. The Lillooet language: phonology, morphology, syntax. University of Amsterdam PhD dissertation.
- Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel language. Det Norske Videnskaps-Academi i Oslo.