

PASSIVES AND THE MAPPING OF THEMATIC ROLES
IN UPPER CHEHALIS SENTENCES

M. Dale Kinkade
University of British Columbia

1. Because passive constructions in Salishan languages have a number of characteristics that make them different from passives in English and other western European languages, a number of scholars have avoided using this label in their descriptions of these languages.¹ Instead, such designations as "specific goal" (Hess 1967, Drachman 1969), "affected" (Efrat 1969, Thompson and Thompson 1971, Raffo 1972), "involvement" (Thompson and Thompson 1971), "obviative subject" (Gibson 1973), "indefinite dependent" (Vogt 1940), "indefinite object" (Watkins 1970), "indefinite recipient" (Mattina 1973), or simply "indefinite" (Thompson and Thompson ms.) have been used. Hess (1973) avoids *any* label, and specifically does not want to call them "passive". All other full-length descriptions of Salishan languages, as well as specific studies dealing with this and related parts of their syntax (e.g. Gerdts 1981, Hukari 1976 and 1980, Jelinek and Demers 1983) do call them passives.

This difference in terminology is hardly surprising if one takes into consideration the difficulty that typologists have in determining what characteristics are shared by constructions labelled "passive" in various languages of the world. In spite of important differences in such constructions, it is generally accepted that they do share traits that link them as related syntactic phenomena. Thus Sinha (1978:454) concludes

"that the two chief characteristics of the passive voice are: (a) an overt foregrounding of the affected NP (which differentiates it from an active sentence), and (b) a 'back-grounding' of an overt (or implied) NP which differentiates it from the *real* intransitives."

A somewhat different characterization is that of Perlmutter and Postal 1983:9:

- "Once this assumption is made, the two universals of passivization referred to stand out rather clearly:
(17) A direct object of an active clause is the (superficial) subject of the 'corresponding' passive.
(18) The subject of an active clause is neither the (superficial) subject nor the (superficial) direct object of the 'corresponding' passive."

Siewierska, in a recent comprehensive typological study of passives (Siewierska 1984:256), finds the following commonalities:

- "The passive may therefore be characterized as a construction:
a) which has a corresponding active the subject of which does not function as the passive subject
b) the event or action expressed in the passive is brought about by some person or thing which is not the passive subject, but the subject of the corresponding active
c) the person or thing if not overt is at least strongly implied."

She adds: "This characterization of the passive is not particularly illuminating" (1984:256); however, throughout the book she has argued that a number of quite disparate constructions may be considered passives, even though what they share is somewhat trivial.

¹ My major work on Upper Chehalis in 1960 and 1961 was made possible by grants from the American Philosophical Society Library and Indiana University. For comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper, I owe special thanks to Robert D. Levine, Eloise Jelinek, and Guy Carden.

Following Sinha, Siewierska, and many others, I find little problem in applying the label "passive" to Salish, recognizing that there will be differences from more familiar languages. It remains for those describing Salishan (and other) languages to point out these differences. I shall attempt to do that here for Upper Chehalis, one of the four languages of the Tsamosan branch of the Salishan family, with occasional references to passives in other languages of the family.

2. Upper Chehalis has four distinct morphemes to indicate passive voice: -m, -stš, -t, -tač̓i. To the best of my knowledge, this diversity of passive types is matched in Salish only in neighboring Cowlitz, which has cognates for each of the four. The first three are in complementary distribution as follows: -m is used in independent clauses in perfective and stative aspects; -stš is used in independent clauses in imperfective and unrealized aspects; -t is used in dependent clauses. The fourth morpheme, -tač̓i, is a "get"-passive.

Not all of these are passives of the same organization found in English, although all are commonly translated into English as passives. All four morphemes require the deletion of the agent or relegate it to an oblique phrase, but some do not make the patient the subject, leaving it rather as the object. It is this varying treatment of patients that might make the label 'passive' somewhat inappropriate for Upper Chehalis. I will try later to account for the different treatments of thematic roles among these passive types by means of the notion of "orientation". I will then expand this into a schema for mapping thematic roles onto the syntactic structure of Upper Chehalis sentences. This can be done most clearly by examining sentence adjuncts, which are coreferential with, and expand on, the basic argument structure ¹ of the (self-sufficient) predicate. Passives will be seen to be only a subset of all possible mappings, and to have very close relationship with other sentence types which are not passive. I use this schema because it allows the simple treatment of a large variety of sentences. (For more on argument and sentence structure in Upper Chehalis, see Kinkade 1983.)

Before taking up the use of the passives, a digression on person marking and the concordial system of Upper Chehalis is necessary. Several person markers have quite different shapes depending on the aspect used, and many other morphemes, both affixes and roots, may differ in some less radical way as well. The usual division is perfective and stative aspects on the one hand versus imperfective and unrealized aspects on the other. Aspects are marked in the first place by prefixes or proclitics, and secondarily by the resulting choice of subject and/or object markers. This choice of subject markers in turn determines the shape of all other inflectional, derivational, and lexical suffixes, and of roots themselves. The usual effect is that perfective and stative forms delete unstressed vowels (except from person markers), while imperfective and unrealized forms retain them. The reason for this variation seems to be that forms with a third person subject (the most common case) in perfective and stative aspects end in a non-syllabic consonant and hence a closed syllable, which triggers the vowel deletion. Third person subject in imperfective and unrealized aspects is -n, and this -n is often syllabic, resulting in a word-final open syllable, which allows vowels to remain. These rather strange rules are then extended analogically to other persons, even though all other persons in the imperfective aspect end in closed syllables. There are many exceptions to these rules, and the formulation given is not entirely satisfactory; however, they work fairly regularly, and are the best explanation I have been able to come up with to account for stem variations in Upper Chehalis.

Aspect markers, object suffixes, and subject markers are given below:

stative aspect	ʔac-
perfective aspect	ʔit
imperfective aspect	s- (often omitted in texts)
unrealized aspect	ʔ-

¹ The designation "argument" is generally reserved in this paper for pronominal markers attached to a predicate, as that predicate may constitute a complete utterance with these pronouns. Non-pronominal constructions following a predicate are considered to be in apposition to these obligatory pronouns, and are themselves optional elements; these are termed "adjuncts" because they merely expand on the basic argument structure. Adjuncts may reflect subjects, objects (both considered to be direct adjuncts), or a variety of oblique roles.

	objects				subjects	
	non-causative		causative		perfective	imperfective
	perfective	imperfective	perfective	imperfective		
1st sg	-c	-cal-	-mš	-mal-	čn	-anš
2nd sg	-ci	-ci-	-mi	-mi-	č	-š
3rd	-n	-t-	-x ^o	-y-	ø	-n
1st pl	-tulʔ	-tul-	-mulʔ	-mul-	čʔ	-stawt
2nd pl	-tulʔ	-tul-	-mulʔ	-mul-	čalp	-alp
3rd pl	yamš		yamš		yamš	-iʔt
obv	-twali	-twal-	-wali	-wal-		
refl	-cš	-cšt-	-mcš	-mcšt-		
recip	-tuš	-twal-	-wš	-wal-		

Some of these affixes are segmentable historically, but only partially so synchronically. The -t- of the non-causative object set was originally a transitive marker, and serves a dual function synchronically, that of a mark of transitivity (see 9 below) and third person object; the latter function is not always present, the former is. It has been reinterpreted in Upper Chehalis in several forms, rendering -c, -ci, -cal-, and -cš indivisible. The causative object set is no longer only causative; suffixes from this set occur on a number of non-causative roots and also follow causative suffixes. Other irregularities are ignored here. '

3. The least common of the four passive suffixes is -tači, the "get"-passive; ' it can occur in both independent and dependent clauses, and may apply to both transitive and intransitive stems. Translations of this suffix can be somewhat misleading, since they often include the prepositions "on" or "upon", as in sentence 1.

- (1) c'ép'tači čʔ.
'Water came in on us.'

This can lead to the assumption that -tači is a postposition. A translation with "on" or "upon", however, requires that person be indicated as the object of this preposition, yet the Upper Chehalis constructions use the subject form of the person marker. Translation as a "get"-passive resolves this problem, allowing the pronoun to be left as subject. Although the choice of this passive ending seems to be about the same as the choice of a "get"-passive in English, it is possible to be more precise in stating when -tači can be used. All examples of its use known to me have agents which are not in control of the action, as in sentences 2, 3, and 4:

- (2) wínn 'actáqtači ʔ t xíwicš.
'Then it got shut (on it) strongly.'
(3) wi 'ack^ošstači.
'Night came upon them.'
(4) síw q'aʔ mácq^otači čn 'aʔ tit sq'áx^o.
'It might burst too much for me on this ice.'

A better label for -tači might therefore be "non-control passive", although since passivization is a means of removing the agent from direct consideration and eliminating any possible controlling subject, this can only be understood as referring to the agent of the equivalent active sentence. ' An agent, if present, must

' More information on Upper Chehalis morphological structure can be found in Boas 1933 and Kinkade 1963-64, although both are inadequate in many ways.

' The Cowlitz cognate for this suffix is -k^ou. This is one of several Chehalis suffixes ending in či that derive historically from k^ou.

' This passive also resembles in many respects what has been called an "adversity" passive in Japanese (Oehrle and Nishio 1981). Although the notion "non-control" also frequently applies to this construction and to English "get"-passives, it does not always do so. For a different approach to the problems of passives of intransitives see Perlmutter 1978. For discussion of the role of control in other Salishan languages see Thompson 1985.

be oblique, and preceded by the preposition ʔ.

As examples 1 and 4 show, perfective/stative subject clitics immediately follow -tači. Imperfective/unrealized affixes have an intrusive n (examples 5 and 6) or t (example 7) between -tači and the subject suffix.

- (5) sʔasíl'tačinanš.
'I am getting rained on.'
(6) t'íctačinn ʔ t sq'axáy' ča t c'axé's.
'Mud and sand splashed on him.'
(7) 'itu pícqtačitn š'aʔ t ʔuk^oálʔn'ʔs.
'Then it dripped on his upper lip.'

Forms with -tači also occur with possessive affixes when they occur in dependent constructions, as in 8.

- (8) q^oán'unn q'aʔ smácq^otačis.
'He became afraid it would burst on him.'

As can be seen from these sentences, -tači can passivize intransitive and what are sometimes called "unaccusative" stems as well as transitive stems. In fact, this is the only way of doing so in Upper Chehalis.

4. The "control passive" suffix that occurs in dependent clauses is -t. I was unaware of the existence of this suffix until this past summer when, thanks to a paper read at the Haas Festival Conference in Santa Cruz by Paul Kroeber, I began to wonder how Upper Chehalis marked passives in dependent clauses--if, indeed, there were any examples in data available to me, or if they even occurred there. As Kroeber's paper reminded me, Comox and Halkomelem, at the northern end of the string of Central Salish languages, both mark dependent passives with a suffixed -(i)t. Beaumont (1985:99-100) reports the same morpheme as a passive marker in negative sentences in Sechelt, a language between Comox and Halkomelem. Finding a dependent passive in -t in Upper Chehalis was therefore quite surprising, since nothing like this has been reported for the five languages separating Halkomelem and Upper Chehalis. Examination of available texts in other languages reveals that it does occur elsewhere, however. There are two clear examples in the very few texts that Boas recorded in Pendatch; there is one possible example in Squamish (Kuipers 1967). There is also at least one likely example in Lushootseed (Hilbert and Hess 1977), and Hess has confirmed to me that he has recently become aware of its presence in that language. On the other hand, I can find no examples in the few Northern Straits texts I have seen, and I have no access to texts in Nooksack, Clallam, or Twana, nor do descriptions of the grammars of these four languages mention any such -t suffix. Within the Tsamosan branch, it also occurs in Cowlitz, although not in the one extant Lower Chehalis text, nor have I found it in Quinault texts.

This -t suffix for a dependent clause passive is thus obviously old in Salish, since it is widespread in two branches of the family. Furthermore, it has reflexes in Interior Salish, where a restructuring of object-suffix combinations has gotten it into active paradigms. It may also have been reinterpreted in Bella Coola, although this is by no means certain.

This suffix in Upper Chehalis occurs either as -t or -tt, and either variant may, but need not, be preceded by one of the transitivizing suffixes. In fact, the -tt variant may originally have been a sequence of -t 'transitive' and -t 'dependent passive'; this is clearly not necessarily the synchronic situation, because -tt can follow other transitivizing suffixes. There at least seven of these transitivizing suffixes:

- (9)
- | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| -t- | 'transitive' |
| -y- | 'transitive' |
| -mis- | 'relational' |
| -stw- | 'causative' |
| -tw- | 'causative' |
| -ø- | (with two roots in final 1 only) |

-tas- (with two roots only)

I am unable to detect any pattern to predict whether the -t or -tt variant of the dependent passive suffix will occur. Nor is this suffix uncommon, even though I was unaware of it for so long; I have read through all the Upper Chehalis texts⁴ collected by Boas, Metcalf, and myself and have found about 80 examples of it.

One characteristic of the dependent passive found in the northern languages (Halkomelem, Sechelt, Comox), but not in Upper Chehalis, is the use of object suffixes to express the passive patient-subject. There is no way to be certain that such constructions are not allowed in Upper Chehalis, although certainly no instances were found; where there is a first or second person patient in dependent clauses, a possessive construction is used instead of a passive. This is also possible with third person patients, but here both possessive and passive constructions occur.

The passive nature of dependent -t is shown clearly by sentences such as 10 through 13 which have both agent and patient adjuncts. Agents are again marked as oblique by the preposition ʔ, which here is equivalent to English 'by'; patients are unmarked, and are the only non-oblique adjuncts possible here, presumably making them subjects,⁷ and the constructions formally intransitive. Sentence 13 has two dependent clauses; the first, after the negative, is a possessive construction, as indicated by the third person possessive -s, and the second clause with -tt follows a modal particle.

- (10) šánx t syácapit t p'ayák' ʔ tac yá·yn's.
'There Bluejay was caught up to by his sister.'
- (11) míʔta ʔa s'upáltt ta mús ʔ t sq'ayáyʔ.
'The eyes shall not be eaten by the children.'
- (12) t'a s'íwstut ʔ p'ayák' ʔit ʔ'ésʔ'š.
'The stick was taken off by Bluejay.'
- (13) míʔta ta sqínmts q'aʔ spútitt ʔ t wá· titxtí syáyʔuʔ.
'He didn't want this report to be known by anyone.'

Sentence 14 shows the use of a third person plural clitic as subject-patient; only its perfective/stative variant can occur with this passive.

- (14) ʔam u ʔ t'úq'it awmš ʔ t síánay'...
'If they are found by a woman...'

Most commonly, however, only one (or no) adjunct occurs with a dependent passive; it can freely be either the agent or the patient. Examples are given in 15 through 17.

- (15) ʔaʔ ta síx'xmstut tit spàtq'x'aʔʔuk'áʔ...
'When the Moon was run away with...' (patient only)
- (16) músaišn t syác'tut ʔ tac yá·yn's.
'Four times he was taken back by his sister.' (agent only)
- (17) míʔta q'aʔ syucáytt.
'He could not be killed.' (no adjuncts)

5. Main clause passives are marked either by -m (perfective/stative aspects) or -stš (imperfective/unrealized aspects); both variants are very common, and numerous occurrences can be found in virtually any text or in elicited sentences. The first of these is found in all Salishan languages, and often reported as -tm. However, at least in Upper Chehalis, this -tm sequence must be divided into -t-

'Nearly all examples of passives in this paper are taken from these texts. The Boas texts (collected in 1927) are located in the American Philosophical Society Library in Philadelphia. The Leon Metcalf texts are on tape recordings (collected in 1952) located in the Thomas Burke Memorial Washington State Museum of the University of Washington, Seattle.

⁷ Unless these passives are subjectless, like the imperfective passives discussed below; if this is the case, these adjoined patients are objects.

'transitive' and -m, since the latter also occurs following the other transitive and transitivizing suffixes, i.e. -tm, -ym, -mism, -stm, -tm, -m, -tasm (corresponding to the seven suffixes listed in 9). The remaining -m is then homophonous with, or identical to, the suffix marking middle voice; identity is probable because of the similarity in meaning between middle and passive, with the passive usage being distinguished by occurrence after a transitive suffix.

Both independent clause passives differ from dependent passives in allowing a first or second person patient. With -m, the usual perfective/stative subject clitics are used, as in 18 to 21.

- (18) ʔit tšqšitm čn ʔ q'cx'é.
'I was shut up by Witch.'
- (19) ʔit túnitm čn šaʔ t n'á s'ík'aci.
'I was sent to get you.'
- (20) čən ʔit ʔšptm yawmš ʔ t pása'.
'I guess they were killed by a monster.'
- (21) ʔ t yucáyym č.
'You shall be killed.'

Pronominal agents do not seem to be allowed in any kind of passive, however; clauses with pronominal agents must remain in the active voice. Otherwise agents (when present) are marked as oblique by the preposition ʔ. Third person patient-subject adjuncts are direct, as in the dependent passive, and require no special marking, as in 22 to 24.

- (22) čən ʔit ʔšptm ʔit nta nšx'áʔtn.
'I guess my older brothers were killed.'
- (23) tit ʔx'x'stm ači nta x'áʔ.
'They say my older brother was run off with.'
- (24) xáwas yúsmism t wíʔs.
'First his canoe was worked on.'

6. Constructions with the imperfective/unrealized passive ending -stš⁸ differ in important ways from their perfective/stative counterparts. This ending may not be preceded by -t- 'transitive' (and differ from perfective -m in this respect), but may be preceded by any of the other transitivizing suffixes; compare 25 and 26 (with no transitive suffix) with 27 to 29 (with various transitivizers).

- (25) xáwas c'é·wistš t p'ayák' ʔ.
'First Bluejay is thanked.'
- (26) c'úmístš awmš ʔ t x'əníx'əni.
'They are being sneaked after by X.'
- (27) ʔux'ánaystš t x'əníx'əni.
'X. is taught'
- (28) ʔiqqamístš ʔ sk'ənúʔčič.
'He was jumped after by Owl.'
- (29) ʔitu tó·l'stustš ʔ cic méns.
'Then she is heard by her daughter.'

The most notable difference from perfectives, however, is that the patient is not expressed by a subject clitic (or suffix, as would be expected in this aspect), as in perfective/stative forms, but by the imperfective object suffix, as in 30 to 32, where -mal- and -cal- are first person singular objects.

- (30) stášsmalstš ʔ t pása'.
'I am being pursued by a monster.'
- (31) sx'ó·ʔx'ó·u'icalstš.
'I'm catching cold.'

⁸ The Cowlitz cognate for this suffix is -ctx. The origin of this morpheme is obscure; I know of no cognates elsewhere in Salish.

- (32) sqak°ólyaniscalstš.
'My teeth are chattering.'

Such forms are extremely rare; in fact, these are the only three examples in the entire corpus of Upper Chehalis material, and only the first is from a text.⁷

The use of an object suffix to mark the patient raises a question as to whether these should really be considered passive, since promotion of the patient to subject is one of the usual features of passives in many languages. Certainly 31 and 32 are not even translated as passives, and it is difficult to see how they could be. An alternative analysis might be to treat them as impersonal constructions; however, impersonal constructions would not be expected to allow the expression of an agent, even obliquely, and this is most certainly allowed in Upper Chehalis, as seen in 26, 28, and 29 above. This, plus the fact that forms with -stš are ordinarily translated into English as passives, and because they are the paradigmatic equivalent in the imperfective and unrealized aspects of the -m of the perfective and stative aspects supports treating them as passives. They also occur with both patient and oblique agent adjuncts, just like other passives, as in 33 and 34.

- (33) wáıqstš ı t q°cx°é t ıáııns.
'Witch spread her blanket.'
(34) č'úsus ıupáıstš tat q'šyx ı tat čawaıúmš.
'The gus are always being eaten by the women.'

The presence of a patient adjunct is not helpful in determining the passive nature of these sentences, because the patient-object adjunct of an active sentence would occur in exactly the same form and position (and an agent-subject would not ordinarily occur in the same sentence). Both subject and object adjuncts are unmarked, and may occur in identical form as direct adjuncts in a sentence. Indeed, patient adjuncts in the imperfective passive must still be objects, since first or second person patients are marked by object suffixes, and there is thus no subject in the sentence.

Foregrounding provides an alternative word order, and might be seen as evidence that a patient is the subject of an imperfective passive. This is not a necessary conclusion, however. When an adjunct is foregrounded, it is placed at the beginning of the sentence and constitutes a clause by itself; it is linked to the main sentence by the copula wi. Only the first possible adjunct may be foregrounded; since this must be the subject in either an intransitive or a transitive sentence, it would at first appear that only subjects are foregrounded, as in 35 and 36.

- (35) tit stıqıw wi ıit ıúpı tat smáq°mumš.
'The horse ate the grass.'
(36) ıónca wi ıit k°áx°mn čn.
'I came to him.'

But in imperfective passive sentences, the patient, being the only possible direct adjunct (and oblique adjuncts will never qualify), can be foregrounded, as in 37 and 38.

- (37) tit stıqıw'q°ııš wi st'ayác'tustš.
'The horses are being paraded.'
(38) cání wi snémšıstš.
'He is being buried.'

Sentence 38 shows that a pronoun (actually a pronominal predicate) coreferential with the object suffix (although zero here) may be foregrounded. This suggests that what is relevant is the fact that this is the first possible adjunct available, not whether or not it is subject or object. Foregrounding seems to be stylistically marked; relatively few examples occur in texts, whereas they are quite frequent in my elicited sentences

⁷ As Eloise Jelinek has pointed out to me, these forms have a striking resemblance to ergative constructions. If they are to be interpreted as ergative, they are the only ergative constructions in Upper Chehalis known to me, although several other Salishan languages regularly use ergative constructions.

(which is the source of 35 to 38). Their frequency in elicited material most likely has to do with elicitation procedures, asking for sentences with both subject and object adjuncts, a combination usually avoided in Upper Chehalis. Many of these examples were also probably direct translations of English word order, with subject before the predicate; this, of course, is the reverse of the usual order in Upper Chehalis.

7. A last matter to be considered before attempting to account for the variety in Upper Chehalis passive constructions is that of ordering of adjuncts. Pronominal arguments of passives are infrequent in texts, and, as noted earlier, pronominal agents seem to be excluded entirely. Patients are expressed in non-control passives by regular subject clitics in perfective/stative forms and by regular subject suffixes in imperfective/unrealized forms. These same perfective/stative subject clitics are used in independent clauses after the -m passive, while imperfective/unrealized object suffixes are used with the -stš passive. None of these pronominal markers, except the third plural clitic, have been found with the dependent -t passive. The object suffixes occur immediately following a transitive suffix and before -stš (as before a subject suffix in active forms), and subject suffixes and clitics are word-final.

Any non-pronominal adjuncts in a clause occur after pronominal markers. The order of these adjuncts, however, is not as fixed as are pronominal arguments. In an active sentence, the co-occurrence of subject and object adjuncts is infrequent, and can be avoided in several ways; I have no strong evidence for a natural underlying order, although I would expect the subject to precede the object. The basic order of adjuncts in passive sentences, however, seems to be oblique agent then patient-subject. This order is contradicted by only 10 sentences out of 50 found in texts with both agent and patient present. There is at least one additional problem, however. It is probable that there is an animacy hierarchy in Upper Chehalis that would place any animate adjunct before an inanimate one (as reported for Halkomelem by Donna Gerds), and there are only four sentences of the 50 in which an inanimate adjunct comes first. Two of these exceptions have been given above (sentences 11 and 34); the other two are 39 and 40.

- (39) mııta ı'a spúıtı nq'aı k°anán tit qéq ı ıit nta snáwaı.
'My taking the camas will not be known by my parents.'
(40) c'áıqstš ta xáıts t c'ıııčstwayaı ı tit ıuk°áı ča t néıscıs.
'The house of Toad is broken up by Moon and his younger brother.'

Presumably these are stylistic variants of a more usual order; they violate both the probable animacy hierarchy and the more common order of adjuncts. The compound agent in sentence 40 might be an instance of a heavy element shifted to the right, except that the patient-subject is a possessive construction, and also heavy.

The strongest evidence for a basic order would be the presence of two inanimate or two animate adjuncts in a single sentence. The first possibility, unsurprisingly, does not exist, and the second remains somewhat inconclusive. Nineteen such sentences occur, and all but five place the oblique agent before the patient-subject. This is not a very large number of instances, and insufficient for a safe generalization. Furthermore, context must also play a role, since two sentences occur in one text with the same adjuncts in opposite orders:

- (41) k°anástš tanın ı q°cx°é t sq'°ás.
'Crane is now taken by Witch.'
(42) k°anástš t sq'°ás ı q°cx°é.

Sentence 41 occurs in a context where Witch is the main topic of discussion. Sentence 42 occurs just a little later immediately after telling what Crane has been doing. Thus at least in these instances, the character in focus is apt to be first when there is a choice between two animate adjuncts, and it is normally the main character of the story, or one of two main characters, which comes first, regardless of whether he is the agent or the patient. As it happens, he is usually the agent, hence the large number of oblique agents preceding patient-subjects. As noted earlier, two adjuncts are relatively uncommon in a passive sentence, so the question of order does not often arise.

8. It seems clear that the four types of constructions discussed so far are, in some sense, passives. It still remains to be shown why the formation of the imperfective passive (with -stš) should be so different from the other passives. This construction is subjectless, and retains patients as objects, whereas the other passives change patients into subjects. Nevertheless, the two types of construction are very similar.

The imperfective passive is rather reminiscent of impersonal constructions in German, French, or Spanish, which retain active syntax while replacing the agent with a dummy subject, as in 43 to 45.

- (43) (German) Hier spricht *man* englisch.
- (44) (French) On parle anglais ici.
- (45) (Spanish) Se habla inglés aquí.

Note that the best English translation for these sentences is not with an impersonal subject, as in 46,

- (46) One speaks English here.

but as a passive, as in 47.

- (47) English is spoken here.

This suggests a close relationship between impersonal and passive constructions; this relationship is in the common removal of the agent of the sentence from its usual subject role. However, the two sentence types differ in two ways: in the syntactic role assigned to the patient, and in the extent to which an oblique agent is tolerated. An agent is tolerated in a passive sentence, but not in an impersonal one. Thus 48 is not allowed.

- (48) *One speaks English here by the waiters.

It is in the tolerance of an agent that Upper Chehalis imperfective passives differ from impersonal constructions.

The relationship between these constructions can be made clearer when viewed through the notion of "orientation", as developed by linguists at the University of Cologne, and in particular following ideas developed by Fritz Serzisko in his monograph "Orientierung (Beitrag zur sprachlichen Dimension der Partizipation)" (Serzisko 1984). Serzisko recognizes four types of constructions depending on the syntactic role of agents and patients. A normal active transitive sentence has the agent as subject and the patient as object. An impersonal sentence is one in which the agent is "changed". Alternatively, the patient may be changed, in which case the construction is labelled "distanced". If both agent and patient are changed, the result may be a passive. The sole difference between passive and impersonal, in Serzisko's terms, is that in a passive sentence, the patient is changed (to subject), while in an impersonal sentence it is unchanged; both have a changed agent. Serzisko's schema is as follows in 49 (with his terminology translated; 1984:53). I am calling his "central participant" an agent and his "peripheral participant" a patient to simplify matters for present purposes; his use actually defines the central participant as the one closest to the "Partizipatum" ("event"; Serzisko 1984:3).

(49)		1	2	3	4
agent		same	same	changed	changed
patient		same	changed	changed	same
		--	Distanced	Reoriented	Impersonal

Upper Chehalis has all four of Serzisko's sentence types, and more. To account for these additional types, it is necessary to recognize a difference between agent-tolerant and agent-intolerant impersonals, and to pay attention to other types of thematic roles, which can also come to occupy subject or object positions.

An agent-tolerance distinction is necessary to show the difference between Upper Chehalis imperfective passives and French, German, or English impersonals. The latter require a subject, but exclude

an agent; the former allow an agent but have no subject (and in both cases the patient remains object). Thus sentences like 25-34 are subjectless. Otherwise, Upper Chehalis predicates always require a subject; it may be zero in perfective or stative forms, but paradigms show that this zero must be considered one of the arguments of the sentence. In imperfective or unrealized forms, third person is always marked by a suffixed -n, *except in the imperfective passive*. That these have no subject is clear from those forms with first or second person patients, which are expressed by the usual object suffixes, but which lack the usual -n subject marker. If the patient is third person, and expressed by an adjunct, this adjunct can only be the object, even though there is no formal marking to distinguish subject and object adjuncts.¹⁰ Since an agent, if expressed, must be oblique, the construction is subjectless. ¹¹

¹⁰ Upper Chehalis does have one way of distinguishing subject adjuncts from object adjuncts, but it is not required, and is only sometimes present. The sentence-final intonational contour is a drop to low pitch and a pause; this contour may precede a subject adjunct, which then follows with its own sentence contour. An object adjunct must be within the intonational contour of the main predicate. Only eighteen imperfective passive sentences with a direct adjunct occur in tape-recorded texts, and none of the eighteen has a sentence-final contour before the adjunct. This proves nothing, of course, since the final contour before a subject contour is optional. Only its presence in an imperfective passive sentence would be significant.

¹¹ Although it is not my purpose here to enter into a discussion of the adequacy or inadequacy of current theoretical approaches to an understanding of passive structures, the Upper Chehalis imperfective passive is enough like the structures in Welsh, Maasai, and Seri that have been called "impersonal passives", and which have been the basis of extensive discussion recently, that attention should be called here to the issues involved. Comrie (1977) has argued that Welsh impersonal passives have no subject, and that this construction violates certain laws proposed by Perlmutter and Postal within the Relational Grammar framework. Against this position, Perlmutter and Postal 1983a, 1983b, 1984, and, most recently, Postal 1986 maintain that all sentences must have subjects; the subject may be a dummy, even if the dummy does not appear on the surface:

"We claim that...sentences...that have been claimed to have 'no grammatical subject', do not violate the final 1 Law because they have a dummy nominal as final 1. In some cases, such dummy nominals appear in the surface sentence. In many other cases...they do not." (Perlmutter and Postal 1983b:101)

And again:

"For the possibility exists that I[mpersonal] P[assive]s can be subsumed under the characterization in [4] if they involve the advancement of a dummy 2 to 1, in some cases of an invisible dummy nominal. This is the general R[elational] G[rammar] position. Perlmutter and Postal (1984b) show that even for IPs without visible 1s there are good arguments for the existence of a dummy as both 2 and 1. Following RG work, I assume that this is uniformly the case, both for IPs in N[atural] L[anguage]s where no IP has a visible dummy, and for IPs in NLs where no clause of any type has a visible dummy. Perlmutter and Postal (1984b) motivate such a description for Welsh, which never has visible dummies in IPs. The assumption that all IPs involve superficial 1s is, of course, a sine qua non of any attempt to subsume IPs under the RG characterization of passive clause in terms of substructures like [4]." (Postal 1986:10)

Perlmutter and Postal also argue against Comrie's suggestion of unmotivated demotion in accounting for the Welsh impersonal passives. I find it difficult to accept the notion of a dummy for Upper Chehalis, simply because no predicate can occur without a subject, either zero or -n, except in this one imperfective passive construction. The language simply does not allow for impersonal sentences. As far as I can see, this leaves us, in Relational Grammar terms, with spontaneous demotion of subjects. Such spontaneous demotion also occurs with objects in the detransitivizing constructions discussed below in 9.1. See Gerds 1981 for a treatment within the Relational Grammar framework of Halkomelem passives more or less comparable to the Upper Chehalis imperfective passive. Keenan proposes what I find a more reasonable position:

"For each language L there is a specific extent to which L requires that the surface main clauses have independent NP subjects. This extent will be called the subject number of L. If L has a high subject number (and most do) then the gap created by the PASSIVE demotion of the Su will be filled by some NP. But if L has a relatively low subject number then passive Ss may lack surface subjects." (Keenan 1975:346-347)

Chomsky's position has even more serious consequences:

"...such processes as 'passive' are composed of more fundamental abstract features, such as the elements of Case theory, θ -theory, etc. It does remain true, however, that the 'core case' of

9. Given this treatment of thematic relations and their assignment to various syntactic roles (or orientation) as a means of identifying and connecting the variant passive formations of Upper Chehalis, it is worth looking at other possible arrangements of thematic relations to see how adjuncts can be manipulated to produce a rich variety of syntactic patterns. To illustrate this variety, it will be necessary to expand on the Serzisko model to include thematic roles other than agents and patients— that is, to allow a variety of peripheral roles. It will not be necessary to include a distinction between tolerated and non-tolerated arguments, because Upper Chehalis does not allow the possibility of non-tolerated arguments as exemplified by German or French impersonal sentences. The three thematic roles, agent, patient, and peripheral, must be allowed to occupy any of three syntactic positions, subject, object, and oblique. More than one oblique element is allowed, and obliques can be freely omitted from a sentence. These parameters can produce thirteen sentence types, given in 50.¹²

(50)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Agent	subject	subject	object	object	oblique	oblique	
Patient	object	oblique	subject	oblique	subject	object	
Periph.	oblique	object	oblique	subject	object	subject	
	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Agent	subject	oblique	object	oblique	oblique	oblique	oblique
Patient	oblique	subject	oblique	object	oblique	oblique	oblique
Periph.	oblique	oblique	oblique	oblique	subject	object	oblique

Type 1 is the active transitive sentence of English or Upper Chehalis, type 8 its passive counterpart in English and in Upper Chehalis perfective passives. English also allows type 6 when an indirect object becomes subject of a passive sentence, as in 51.

(51) My brother was given a new car by his boss.

English (or German or French) impersonal sentences are like type 10, except that an agent is not tolerated. These are the only types allowed in English: 1, 6, and 8, plus 10 with a major restriction attached.

Upper Chehalis, on the other hand, allows six types directly, and two more secondarily. Types 1 and 8 are active and perfective passive in Upper Chehalis, as noted. The imperfective passive is type 10, where there are two obliques but no subject.

9.1. Type 7 is achieved by means of a detransitivizing suffix -mal-/-mł, which leaves an object only implied or allowed as an oblique adjunct, as in 52-54.

- (52)
- c'úq'°maln t łuk'°áł.
- 'Moon put it in.'
- (53)
- k'°anámaln t 'ó-c's tu 'ał tit 'icičs ł t 'ó-c's tu 'ał tit lál'.
- 'One of the bees took one of the rings.'
- (54)
- k'°a s'°áq'°maln ł t 'é-š'š t s'°aláš.
- 'Behold, Deer was whittling little pieces of wood.'

All these predicates contain transitive stems. This suffix is sometimes translated 'something', and these constructions are thus indefinite. This is Serzisko's "distanced" sentence type, and differs from the Upper Chehalis imperfective passive (type 10) only in that it is the patient, rather than the agent, that is made

¹²(cont'd) passive involves passive morphology and assumption of a secondary GF [NP,S] by the direct object; presumably, a language will have passive morphology only if this case exists." (Chomsky 1981:126)

This would say that the Upper Chehalis imperfective passive is not a passive at all.
¹³This schema applies to basically transitive sentences; a similar schema can be used to show relationships among intransitive sentence types (by allowing for empty or non-present roles), such as simple intransitives, middles, patient-oriented sentences, causatives, middle causatives, reflexives, and reciprocals.

oblique.¹³

Although this suffix can follow a causative suffix (see below), no other transitive or transitivizing suffix can co-occur with it, meaning these constructions are unequivocally intransitive, and any accompanying adjunct can only be a subject (and the agent). Further co-occurrences with -mal-/-mł are taken up below.

9.2. Type 2 sentences are created in Upper Chehalis by means of one of the four indirective suffixes -ši-/-š-, -tux°-/-tux°t, tmi-, or -ni-/-n-. These suffixes allow the shift of a peripheral role into the object position with simultaneous demotion of the patient to an oblique position. How the four suffixes differ in function is not clear, but to some extent different kinds of peripheral roles are affected by the different suffixes. Examples of the first two are given in 55-59.

- (55)
- sá'šicinanš ł t wináw ča t timsač'a.
- 'I will make you wedges and a maul.'
- (56)
- tít sá'šn tít méns ł t q'°ayó-q'°s.
- 'She made a cradle for her child.'
- (57)
- čən q'ał c'úq'°šn čn ł t 'ššš'š tít s'°əq'°x'°əq'°əluwstn.
- 'Maybe I can place the stick on the place the world comes together.'
- (58)
- x'ók'°tx'°tn p'é-°tłm t mūs ča t mátns.
- 'He wiped his eyes and his head all over for him.'
- (59)
- 'am u q'ał tít čáłtux°t čn tít nqé-q, wi q'ał ta c'šcs tan.
- 'If I give him my camas, it will be all gone.'

The English translation often expresses the new object by means of a prepositional phrase, since English does not have a comparable construction. The original patient can still be expressed, preceded by the oblique marker ł, as in 55-57.

These constructions bear a resemblance to passives, except that the role switching centers on the object rather than the subject. In a passive sentence, the agent becomes oblique and the patient becomes subject; in an indirective sentence, the patient becomes oblique and a peripheral role becomes object. This might be termed a "patient-passive" to point up this similarity.

9.3. Indirective sentences may be secondarily passivized, moving an original peripheral role into subject position, and producing two obliques, one from the original patient, the other from the original agent. This is type 11, as exemplified in 60 and 61.

- (60)
- 'it tšqšitm čn ł q'°c'x'°é.
- 'I was shut up by Witch.'
- (61)
- séyxšitm ł cíc łax'°áł ł t t'úp'i.
- 'It was replaced by the older sister with rotten wood.'

9.4. Indirective predicates may also be detransitivized, moving the advanced peripheral back to peripheral. This produces Type 7 again, and is like the Type 7 produced from detransitivization alone, but with an indirective suffix present and a different direct object implied. Detransitivized indirectives are not common, and I have not yet found any in the texts. Five known occurrences are given in 62-66.

¹⁴ The Upper Chehalis detransitive -mal- resembles, in its syntactic outcome, the antipassive of ergative languages, except that there is no change in subject/agent marker--that is, both remove the patient from a direct relationship with the predicate. For examples see Jacobsen (1985) and Dayley (1985; in particular, the Tzutujil "absolute antipassive"). Ergative languages, in forming the antipassive, must change an ergative subject (of transitives) to an absolutive subject (of the resulting intransitive); since Upper Chehalis is a strictly nominative/accusative language, no change of subject markers is necessary. The Upper Chehalis detransitive differs further from the Tzutujil absolute antipassive in that the latter does not allow the expression of a patient at all, whereas the former allows it as an oblique adjunct. Note that Tzutujil also has a "completive passive" which resembles the Upper Chehalis non-control passive (Dayley 1985:206-207).

REFERENCES

Beaumont, Ronald C. 1985. *she shashishalhem: The Sechelt Language*. Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books.

Boas, Franz. 1933. A Chehalis text. *IJAL* 8:103-110.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Comrie, Bernard. 1977. In defense of spontaneous demotion: the impersonal passive. Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock, eds., *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 8: Grammatical Relations*, pp. 47-58. New York: Academic Press.

Dayley, Jon P. 1985. Voice in Tzutujil. Johanna Nichols and Anthony C. Woodbury, eds., *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause: Some Approaches to Theory From the Field*, pp. 192-226. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drachman, Gaberell. 1969. *Twana Phonology*. Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics 5.

Efrat, Barbara S. 1969. *A Grammar of Non-particles in Sooke, a Dialect of Straits Coast Salish*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Language and Literature, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Gerds, Donna B. 1981. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California.

Gibson, James A. 1973. *Shuswap Grammatical Structure*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. (Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5.5, 1973.)

Hess, Thom. 1967. *Snohomish Grammatical Structure*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

-----, 1973. Agent in a Coast Salish language. *IJAL* 39:89-94.

Hilbert, Vi and Thom Hess. 1977. Lushootseed. Barry F. Carlson, ed., *Northwest Coast Texts*. NATS 2.3:4-32.

Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. Person in a Coast Salish language. *IJAL* 42:305-318.

-----, 1980. Subjects and objects in Cowichan. Paper presented at the 15th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, Victoria, B. C.

Jacobsen, William H., Jr. 1985. The analog of the passive transformation in ergative-type languages. Johanna Nichols and Anthony C. Woodbury, eds., *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause: Some Approaches to Theory From the Field*, pp. 176-191. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jelinek, Eloise and Richard A. Demers. 1983. The agent hierarchy and voice in some Coast Salish languages. *IJAL* 49:167-185.

Keenan, Edward. 1975. Some universals of passive in Relational Grammar. Robin E. Grossman, L. James San, and Timothy J. Vance, eds., *Papers from the Eleventh Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 340-352.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1963-64. Phonology and morphology of Upper chehalis. *IJAL* 29:181-195, 345-356, 30:32-61, 251-260.

-----, 1983. Salish evidence against the universality of 'noun' and 'verb'. *Lingua* 60:25-40.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. *The Squamish Language*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Mattina, Anthony. 1973. *Colville Grammatical Structure*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. (Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5.4, 1973.)

Oehrle, Richard T. and Hiroko Nishio. 1981. Adversity. *Coyote Papers. Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Arizona*, vol. 2:163-185.

Perlmutter, David M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. Jeri J. Jaeger, et al., eds., *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 4:157-189.

----- and Paul M. Postal. 1983a. Toward a universal characterization of passivization. David M. Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*, pp. 3-29. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

-----, 1983b. Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. David M. Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*, pp. 81-128. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

-----, 1984. Impersonal passives and some relational laws. David M. Perlmutter and Carol Rosen, eds., *Studies in Relational Grammar 2*, pp. 126-170. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Postal, Paul M. 1986. *Studies of Passive Clauses*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Raffo, Yolanda A. 1972. *A Phonology and Morphology of Songish, A Dialect of Straits Salish*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Serzisko, Fritz. 1984. *Orientierung (Beitrag zur sprachlichen Dimension der Partizipation)*. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts Nr. 57.

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*. Dover, N.H.: Croom Helm.

Sinha, Anjani Kumar. 1978. Another look at the universal characterization of the passive voice. *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society* 14:445-457.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1985. Control in Salish grammar. Frans Plank, ed., *Relational Typology*, pp. 391-428. Trends in Linguistics (Studies and Monographs 28). Berlin: Mouton.

----- and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: a preview. Jesse Sawyer, ed., *Studies in American Indian Languages*. UCPL 65:251-294.

-----, ms. The Thompson language.

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

Watkins, Donald. 1970. *A Description of the Phonemes and Position Classes in the Morphology of Head of the Lake Okanagan (Salish)*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.