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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 the label "passive" in their descriptions of these languages. Instead, such designations as "specific goal" (Hess 1963, Drachman 1969), "affected" (Efrat 1969, Thompson and Thompson 1971, Rullo 1972), "involvement" (Thompson and Thompson 1971), "overtive subject" (Gibson 1973), "indefinite subject" (Vogt 1960), "indefinite object" (Watkins 1970), "indefinite recipient" (Marinova 1973), or simply "indefinite" (Thompson and Thompson ms.) have been used. Hess (1973) avoids any label, and specifically does not want to call them "passives." 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 Siewierska 1978:454) conclude 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 intrinsics.

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, c) the person or thing if not overt is at least strongly implied."

She adds: "This characterization of the passive is not particularly illuminating" (1984-276); 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.

Following Siewierska, 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 Tsouman 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, -tä, -t, -tä1. To the best of my knowledge, this diversity of passive types is matched in Salish only in neighboring Crowelts, which has cognates for each of the four. The first three are in complementary distribution as follows: -m is used in independent clauses in imperative and unrealized aspects; -tä is used in independent clauses in imperative and unrealized aspects; -t is used in dependent clauses. The fourth morpheme, -tä1, is a "get"-passive.

Not at all of these 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 in this varying treatment of patients that may 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 thematic structure of Upper Chehalis sentences. This can be done most clearly by examining sentence adjuncts, which are coreferential with, and expand up, the basic argument structure of the (self-sufficient) patients. 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 passive, 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 passive and active aspects on the one hand versus imperfective and stative aspects on the other. Aspects are marked in the first place by prefixes or proclitics, and secondarily by the resulting choice of subjects 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 passive and active forms delete unstemmed vowels (except from person markers), while imperfective and stative forms retain them. The reasons for this variation seems to be that forms with a third person subject (or most complements) in passive and active end in a non-syllabic consonant, 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; -m is used in dependent clauses. The fourth morpheme, -tä1, is a "get"-passive.

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 "adjectives" because they merely expand on the basic argument structure. Adjectives may reflect subjects, objects (both considered to be direct adjoncts), or a variety of other thematic roles.

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. Leizer, Eloise Jelinek, and Guy Carden.
Some of these suffixes 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 marking a transitive sentence (see 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, resulting in "+-c", "+-ci", and "+-ci" indistinguishable. The causative object set is no longer a non-causative; suffixes from this set occur on a number of non-causative roots and also follow causative suffixes. Other irregularities are ignored here.

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

1. **q'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

This can lead to the assumption that "-tači" is a preposition. A translation with "on" or "upon", however, requires that person be indicated as the object of this preposition, so the Upper Chehalis constructions use the subject form of the person mark; 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. 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. **q'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

3. **q'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

4. **q'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

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 be marked with a suffix which is not transitive, as in "-q'axo." Some information on Upper Chehalis morphological structure can be found in Boas 1933 and Kinkade 1963-64, although both are inadequate in many ways. The Cowichan cognate for this suffix is "-k'u". This is one of several Chehalis suffixes ending in "-č" that derive historically from "k'u".

This active also resembles in many respects what has been called an "advocacy" passive in Japanese (Cemité 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 Pettitmer 1978. For discussion of the role of control in other Salishan languages see Thompson 1983.

be obvious, and preceded by the preposition "t".

As examples 1 and 4 show, perfective/stative subject clitics immediately follow "-tači." Imperfective/neutralized affixes have an intrusive "n" (examples 3 and 5) or "t" (example 7) between "-tači" and the subject suffix.

(5) **sasat'lačináš.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*
   - *intransitive*
   - *causative*

(6) **t'il'lačin làtq'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

(7) **t'il'lačin làtq'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

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

(8) **q'axo.**
   - *transitive*
   - *causative*

'He became afraid it would burst on him.'
-tas-

(with two noca 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 texts collected by Boss, Meseuf, and myself and have found about 80 examples of it.

One characteristic of the dependent passive found in the northern languages (Halcomeme, Secul, 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 made 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 adverbial. Agents are again marked as oblique by the preposition t, which here is equivalent to English "by." Patients are unmarked, and are the only non-oblique adjunct possible here, presumably making them subjects, 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) dąnta t xågåpit t pa'yak. t tac yá-y'á-n.

There Bluejay was caught up by his sister.

(11) mítta xå spûlttì t mís t xågåyátí.

"The eyes shall not be eaten by the children."

(12) t' sła wus st pa'yak t xit káh-káh.

The stick was taken off by Bluejay.

(13) mítta xå spûlttì t t xå-tisst xågåytù.

"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) an u t xåq'isit awus t t snáyay...

"If they are found by a woman..."

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

(15) xit ta sítåsmustít t spåqås'safluktåd... "When the Moon was run away with... (patient only)

(16) mísstunt t xådçutì t tac yá-y'á-n.

"Four times he was taken back by his sister." (agent only)

(17) mítta xå spûlttì. "He could not be killed." (no adverbial)

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

"transitive" and -m, since the latter also occurs following the other transitive and transitivizing suffixes, I.e. -tn, -sn, -stn, -atn, -tn, -tsm (corresponding to the seven suffixes listed in 9). The remaining -st is mostly homophonous with, or identical to, the suffix marking middle voice; identity is probably 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) 'tit tåq'ilìtn t t qo'cs'.

"I was shut up by Witch."

(19) 'tit tsúmítn t bál t mís st'ss'k'acì.

"I was sent to get you."

(20) čan 'it flóptì ywëwë t t pòså.

"I guess they were killed by a monster."

(21) t' t xóyc'ì t. "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 t. Third person patient-subject adverbs are direct, as in the dependent passive, and require no special marking, as in 22 to 24.

(22) čan 'it tåq'ilìtn 'tst nta máss'x'tn.

"I guess my older brother was killed."

(23) t' t xóyc'ì t xòa'd' t nta n'ts'ì.

"They say my older brother was run off with." (24) sásav xóyìsmì t xitì. "First his canoe was worked on."

6. Constructions with the imperfective/unrealized passive ending -st differ in important ways from their perfective/stative counterparts. This ending may not be preceded by -t- "transitive" (and differ from their 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) sásav c'wá-místà t pa'yakà.

"First Bluejay is thanked."

(26) c'smìstà t sw'ánd's'z'ani. "They are being sneaked after by X."

(27) 'ux'anáyátì t x'sasz'oni. "X is sought."

(28) fitqamìstà t s'xán'qáčč. "He was jumped after by Owl."

(29) t'só tó-x'sástà t cíic mán. "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) ståwalsmäst à t pòså.

"I am being pursued by a monster."

(31) s'x'w's'x'k'al'cw'arì. "I'm catching cold."
subject

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 -st in are ordinarily translated into English as passives, and because they are the paradigmatic equivalents in the imperfective and unrealized aspects of the - 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) wáŋštá it gqée t tásá̱ná. Witch spread her blanket.

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 tense will be objects, since first or second person patients are marked by object suffixes, and there is 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 a transitive or an intransitive sentence, it would at first appear that only subjects are foregrounded, as in 35 and 36.

(35) tít stiqiwi wí it 'qá̱lip tát smqá̱̱na. The house are the grass.

(36) tónca wi wí t ká̱̱kamčí 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) tít stiqiwiwí tí wí stúwegčustís. The horses are being parasized.

(38) cóni wi smánśóstís. He is being buried.

Sentence 38 shows that a pronoun (actually a pronoun predicate) concomitant 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 it is or is not an object or oblique. Foregrounding seems to be systematically marked; relatively few examples occur in texts, whereas they are quite frequent in my elicited sentences.

As Elaine 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 - st passive, while imperfective/unrealized object suffixes are used with the - st passive. None of these pronominal markers, except the third plural clitic, have been found with the dependent - t passive. The object suffix occurs immediately following a transitive suffix and before -st (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 occurrence of subject or object adjunct is infrequent, and can be avoided in several ways; I have adduced evidence for a natural underlying order, although I would expect the subject to precede the object. The basic order of subject and object of passives, however, seems to be oblique agent, then patient-subject. This order is sometimes realized in texts, but not as frequently as the other two orders. This, plus the fact that forms are extremely rare; in fact, these are the only three examples in the entire corpus of Upper Chehalis.

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 *st-b* 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.

This suggests a close relationship between impersonal and passive constructions; this relationship is in the common removal of the 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 argument 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 "suffixed -n", 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 impersonal 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. 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 entirely unlike the structures in Welsh, Maasai, and Seri that have been called "imperfectives", and which have been the basis of extensive discussion recently, that attention should be called here to the issues involved. Serzisko's schema is as follows in 49 (with his terminology translated; 1984:53).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St-b</td>
<td>St-b</td>
<td>St-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-b</td>
<td>Distanced</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-b</td>
<td>Reused</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-inefficient impersonal, and to account for other types of constructions, which can also come to occupy subject or object positions.

An agent-inefficiency distinction is necessary to show the difference between Upper Chehalis imperfective passives and French, German, or Spanish 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 subject). Thus sentences like 25-34 are subjectless. Otherwise, Upper Chehalis predicates generally require a subject, it may be more specific to some passive forms, but paradigms show that this zero must be taken to set the parameters of the arguments of the sentence. In imperfective or unrealized forms, third person is always marked by a suffixed -tw or -tsw, like the passive. That there are no subject is clear from these forms with first or second person patients, which are expressed by the usual object suffixes, but which lack the usual -n subject marker. In 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. 11 Since an agent, if expressed, must be oblique, the construction is subjectless. 11

11 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 intentional clause is a drop to low pitch and a pause; this can precede a subject adjunct, which then follows with its own sentence contour. An object adjunct must be within the intentional contour of the main predicate. Only eightiers 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 imperative 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 entirely unlike the structures in Welsh, Maasai, and Seri that have been called "imperfectives", and which have been the basis of extensive discussion recently, that attention should be called here to the issues involved. Serzisko's schema is as follows in 49 (with his terminology translated; 1984:53).

*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 at final 1. In some cases, such dummy nominals appear in the surface sentence, in many other cases...they do not.* (Perlmutter andPostal 1983b:101)

And again: "For the possibility exists that (impersonal) PASSives can be subsumed under the characterization in (4) if they involve the advancement of a dummy 1 to 1. In some cases this can be done; in others it cannot. The Chehalis imperfective passive..." (Postal 1986:10)

Perlmutter and Postal also argue against Comrie's suggestion of unidirectional demotion in accounting for the Welsh impersonal passives. I find it difficult to accept the notions of a dummy for Upper Chehalis, simply because no predicate can occur without a subject, either zero or -n, except in one imperative passive construction. The language simply does not allow for imperatives: As far as I can see, this leaves us, in Relational Grammar terms, with spontaneous demotion of subjects. Such spontaneous demotion also occurs in the depassivizing constructions discussed below in 9.1. See Chehalis for a convincing treatment within the Relational Grammar framework of Halkomelem passives more or less comparable to the Upper Chehalis imperfective passive. Kemen suggests 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, denoted S. Any 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 construction will be a marked process..." (Kemen 1972:346-347).

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, β-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 orientations) as a means of identifying and connecting the various 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 intolerant 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 the 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.

![Sentence table](https://example.com/sentence_table)

(50)

1. Agent subject oblique object object oblique object oblique object
2. Patient subject oblique subject oblique subject object oblique
3. Peripheral oblique object oblique subject object oblique
4. Patient subject oblique object oblique object oblique oblique
5. Peripheral oblique object oblique oblique oblique subject 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. There are only two types allowed in English: 1, 6, and 8, 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-/-m-, which leaves an object only implied or allowed as an oblique adjunct, as in 52-54.

(52) c'Uq'ma'nal t ltu'a'll.

Moon put it in.

(53) k'andátí'mal t ò'c'ù tu 'ril tit 'il tít ò'c'ù tu 'ril tit títìl.

One of the bees took one of the rings.

(54) k'wá nóg'g'mal t t k'ákk'á t sáklá.

'Behold, Deer was whistling little pieces of wood.'

All these predicates contain transitive stems. This suffix is sometimes translated 'something', and these constructions are thus intransitive. 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

![Distanced passive case](https://example.com/distanted_passive_case)

'Comit' passive involves passive morphology and assumption of a secondary GF [NPS] by the direct object; presumably, a language will have passive morphology only if this case exists. (Chomsky 1981:125)

This would say that the Upper Chehalis imperfective passive is not a passive at all.

11This 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.
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Although this suffix can follow a causative suffix (see below), no other transitive or transforaming suffix can co-occur with it, meaning these constructions are unequivocally intransitive, and any accompanying adjuncts can only be a subject (and the agent). Further co-occurrences with -mal-/-m- are taken up below.

9.2. Type 2 sentences are created in Upper Chehalis by means of one of the four indirective suffixes -ál-/-án-, -tuw/-tuwá, tnl-, 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'sícínánál t t wínd wí la t címsa't.

'I will make you weep and a mad.'

(56) tíín ák'én t títìl t q'áq'a-q'áq's.

'She made a cradle for her child.'

(57) c'nl q'áq's c'ág's c'nl t t'ká'á's t q'áq'a-q'áq's tólswísnt.

'Perhaps I can place the stick on the throne in the world comes together.'

(58) xí'k'tíím t sáll t mána t t'máns.

'He took his wife and his hired all over for him.'

(59) t'én u q'áq tí tál'í's tít qót cís tís tís q, wí q'áq ta cís cís tás tan.

'If I give him my name, 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 t, 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) sá'm q'áq's t q'áq's tís.

'I was shot up by Witch.'

(61) t'só'sitlís t cíc sisíll t t'q'q'í'l.

'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 the same Type 7 produced from demisanitization 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 this variety. Five known occurrences are given in 62-66.

12 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 Jacobs (1985) and Dayley (1985: In particular, the Tzurujil "absolutive antipassive"). Ergative languages, in forming the antipassive, must change an ergative subject to an absolutive subject (of transitive) to an absolutive subject (of the resulting intransitive); since Upper Chehalis is a strictly nominative/accusative language, no change of subject marker is necessary. The Upper Chehalis detransitive differs further from the Tzurujil absolutive 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 Tzurujil also has a "completive passive" which resembles the Upper Chehalis non-control passive (Dayley 1985:206-207).
(62) *niší, / *nišálín.
(63) *niší, / *nišálín.
(64) *nússí,
(65) *nússí,
(66) *nússí,
(67) *nússí,

appear on intransitive or middle roots. Causatives of intransitives produce two-argument structures in which the object is a peripheral role, as in 67.

Most causatives in Upper Chehalis are either the sole transitivization of a root or a missive or middle root. Causatives of intransitives produce two-argument structures in which the object is the original agent, as in 67.

(68) *nú, *nú.
(69) *nú, *nú.
(70) *nú, *nú.

There is another root meaning 'sell'; its causative is intransitive. Causativized middles may produce the desired sentences with three thematic and syncretic roles; compare 68 and 69, the former with two roles, the latter with three.

(71) *nú.
(72) *nú.

There are several such examples in the texts, another in Boas' notes. Both are given in 78 and 79.

(73) *nú, / *nú.
(74) *nú, / *nú.

Note that German can occasionally create such constructions with the prefix *ver-, as in *mieter/vermieter; kaufen/verkaufen, or pachten/verpachten.

9.6. Causatives may also be made passive (producing another Type 8) or detransitive (producing another Type 11). Passive and causativized forms are shown in 74 and 75.

(75) *nú, *nú.
(76) *nú.
(77) *nú.
(78) *nú.
(79) *nú.

'You might bump the child.'

9.9. Two additional construction types should be possible, at least in theory. Since both passivization and detransitivization are automatic processes, both should be applicable to a Type 4 sentence, the indirectivized causative. Because of the rarity of the latter sentence type, I have no examples of these two possibilities. A passivized Type 4 would produce a third Type 7, and a detransitivized Type 4 would produce a third Type 11.

10. Of the thirteen sentence types allowed in 50, only five cannot occur in Upper Chehalis. Three of these, 9, 12, and 13, are disallowed because they have no subject, a situation allowed only in imperfective passives. Type 5 would be a rather bizarre shifting around of arguments. Type 3 would simply inver the agent and patient roles of their usual subject-object to object-subject, and this inversion would seem an unlikely eventuality. It can be done, however, by lexical change, as in 80 and 82 in English.

(80) The man frightened the dog.
(81) The man frightened the man.

Such lexical inversions do not seem to be common, however, and the only other example I can think of is lead/follow. There are, of course, other differences in the meanings of these pairs. Upper Chehalis may or may not have anything comparable. There, the frighten/fear pair is accomplished derivationally, and the roots equivalent to both lead and follow have enough additional meanings as to make it difficult to claim lexical invention.

But regardless of the status of these marginal sentence types, Upper Chehalis is rich in possible arrangements of thematic roles, much richer than English. Taking this approach to Upper Chehalis syntax helps to account for many things, among them the seeming disparity among passive types.
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