

Klallam demonstratives¹

Timothy Montler
University of North Texas

The Klallam language has a set of demonstrative determiners composed of small phonological units marking notions of specific, non-specific, definite, feminine, invisible, proximal, and distal. This note updates and expands upon the componential analysis provided by Thompson and Thompson 1971.

1 Introduction

The demonstratives in Klallam usually function as determiners. However, most of them can also stand alone as demonstrative pronouns. As determiners, they are a required specifier preceding any non-predicative noun. As demonstrative pronouns, they may occur in any position a noun can in a sentence—subject, direct object or prepositional object—but do not themselves occur with a determiner and, unlike nouns and focus pronouns (such as *ʔəc* ‘I’, *nə́kʷ* ‘you’), they are never predicative.

Thompson and Thompson (1971:265-266) provide a detailed componential analysis of the Klallam demonstrative system. They identify eleven basic elements (finals *-i*, *-ə*, *-anu*, *-ayə*, *-iʔə*, and initials *č-*, *c-*, *kʷ-*, *t-*, *ʔ-*, *s-*) that can combine to form 46 observed demonstratives in two categories: basic and emphatic. The tables in (1) are modified reproductions of the tables in Thompson and Thompson (1971:266).

(1a) Basic demonstrative determiners (adapted from Thompson and Thompson 1971)

				ʔə		sə	ʔəs, ʔəsə
č	či	čə		kʷʔə	kʷsi	kʷsə	kʷssə
kʷ	kʷi	kʷə	kʷʔi	kʷʔə		kʷəsə	kʷʔəsə
						kʷəs	kʷʔəs
t	ti	tə	ci	c(ə)	tsi	tsə	csə
						ʔəsə	cəsə
						ʔəs	cəs

¹ This paper has benefited greatly from the help of Klallam elders Adeline Smith and Bea Charles and their (great-)great-grand-niece, Wendy Sampson, who, when asked by an archeologist if Klallam was like Eskimo with a hundred words for ‘snow’ said, “No, but it’s got a hundred words for ‘the!’” Ivy Doak’s suggestions and comments have made this better than it would have been.

(1b) Emphatic demonstratives (adapted from Thompson and Thompson 1971)

sánu	sáyə	
ʔəsánu		
(kʷsánu)	kʷsáyə	<i>kʷsíə</i>
kʷəsánu	kʷəsáyə	
		tiʔə (tiə)
(tsánu)	tsáyə	<i>tsiə</i>
təsánu	təsáyə	
(canu)	cáyə	ciʔə
csánu	csáyə	

In the charts (1) I have put in boldface the demonstratives that I have observed. I have also observed the three items in italics, which do not appear in the Thompsons' list. The item *tiə*, in parentheses, is my observation corresponding to the item next to it recorded by the Thompsons. Native speakers will accept a glottal stop between the two vowels, but never produce it. Also, I have observed that stress is variable and fairly even on the vowels of the demonstratives shown in (1b). None of these items carry phrase or sentence level stress, therefore, I do not mark stress on them.

Several factors may contribute to the differences in observations. The Thompsons were working with speakers in the 1960's that were 15 to 20 years older than the speakers I have worked with 20 to 30 years later. They certainly spoke an older and richer variety of Klallam. Furthermore, the speakers they worked with were also speakers of the easternmost Klallam dialects, while the speakers I have worked with speak the westernmost Klallam dialects. Certainly another possible reason for the discrepancy is simply limitations of the corpus. I have tried eliciting all of the items in the Thompsons' list, but the semantic/pragmatic vagueness of the distinctions (see below) make clear judgments difficult.

One set of differences is due to an important phonological difference between the eastern and western dialects. The western dialects tend to delete all unstressed schwas. Among the younger native speakers this deletion is obligatory even in citation forms. For the older speakers the deletion occurs in all but the most careful speech. For the speakers I have worked with, the bare consonant forms (*t*, *kʷ*, etc.) are variants of the forms with schwa (*tə*, *kʷə*, etc.).

The twenty-five demonstratives that I have observed encode combinations of seven features of meaning: specific, feminine, invisible, non-specific, far, near, and definite. While any of the demonstratives (except the non-specific) may function as either determiner or demonstrative pronoun, the definite ones are much more likely to occur alone in a pronominal function. The table in (2) lists all of the Klallam demonstratives that I have observed and shows their component meanings. In the following sections I present a more detailed discussion and exemplification of each of the semantic parameters.

(2) Meaning components of observed Klallam demonstratives

	speci- fic	non- speci- fic	femi- nine	in- visible	far	near	de- finite
tə	✓						
cə	✓						
ʔə	✓		✓				
tsə	✓		✓				
kʷə	✓			✓			
kʷsə	✓			✓			
kʷʔə	✓		✓	✓			
či		✓					
ti		✓					
kʷi		✓		✓			
kʷʔi		✓	✓	✓			
təsə	✓				✓		
ʔəsə	✓		✓		✓		
kʷəsə	✓			✓	✓		
kʷʔəsə	✓		✓	✓	✓		
tiə	✓					✓	
tsiə	✓		✓			✓	
kʷiə	✓			✓		✓	
kʷsiə	✓		✓	✓		✓	
cəwniʔ	✓						✓
tsəwniʔ	✓		✓				✓
kʷəwniʔ	✓			✓			✓
kʷsəwniʔ	✓		✓	✓			✓
təsəniʔ	✓				✓		✓
tiəwniʔ	✓					✓	✓

2 Specific and non-specific

By ‘specific’ and ‘non-specific’ I intend the difference between the two readings of English indefinites like (3):

(3) I’m looking for a deer.

In the specific reading there is a particular deer, say Bambi, that I am looking for. In the non-specific reading I will be happy to find any deer. Von Heusinger (2002) likes the test in English of inserting ‘certain’ after the ‘a’ to fix the specific reading. In either reading of (3) a deer is being introduced as a new discourse referent. This is opposed to ‘definite’ which requires a previous pragmatic instantiation as in ‘I’m looking for the deer.’ In English both the readings of (3) are indefinite. In Klallam, the specific demonstratives are neither definite nor indefinite.

The ‘specific’ set of Klallam demonstratives specify a particular, though not necessarily definite, referent. In (4), for example, the English translation with the indefinite ‘a’ shows that the referent is not definite. Although the speaker is referring to a specific deer, it is not necessarily a definite deer—not one that has been previously referred to or known from context. The fact that either translation is good shows that definiteness is not part of the semantics of this demonstrative.

- (4) *nəsqáča? cə húʔpt.*
 my catch SP² deer
 ‘I caught a deer.’ or ‘I caught the deer.’
- (5) *nít suʔkʷənəxʷs cə siʔámʷ swóyqaʔ.*
 then they see SP rich man
 ‘Then they saw a rich man.’

Example (5) also shows that *cə* is specific but not definite. This sentence is from a story about two girls, who look up from collecting feathers to see a strange man who is obviously rich. The man is a new, specific character, previously unknown and unexpected in the discourse. The English translation of (5) in its original context must use the specific indefinite ‘a’. When (5) was presented to native speakers out of context, the first translation they give is with the definite article, ‘then he saw the rich man.’ When asked about it, they confirm that either the definite or indefinite translation is good.

The ‘non-specific’ forms all end in /i/. Consistent with their ‘non-specific’ semantics, these forms never stand alone as pronominals; they must be followed by a noun or complement clause. They indicate an explicitly non-specific referent. Compare (6) and (7).

- (6) *nəsʔé? cə tála.*
 I want SP money
 ‘I want the/that money.’
- (7) *nəsʔé? čí tála.*
 I want NS money
 ‘I want money.’

In (6) the *cə* precedes a noun with a specific referent, while in (7) the noun following *čí* is not specific.

Examples (8) and (9) are from stories whose contexts show the non-specific use of *čí*.

² The following abbreviations are used in examples: SP = specific, NS = non-specific, FE = feminine, IN = invisible, FA = far, NE = near, DE = definite, OBL = oblique object, POS = possessive, APP = apparently, NOM = nominalizer, NEG = negative, CONJ = conjunction, INFORM = informative, SIM = similar, DEM = demonstrative.

- (8) *ʔiʔáʔəŋ ʔaʔ č̣i p̥əwi ʔiʔ ʔáwənə.*
 seeking OBL NS flounder CONJ nothing
 ‘He was looking for a flounder, but there were none.’
- (9) *ʔiʔáŋ cə st̥xʷaʔč̣ ʔaʔ č̣i swáyqaʔ.*
 seek SP octopus OBL NS man
 ‘Octopus looked for a husband.’

In (8) Mink’s sister had sent him out to get a flounder so she could make a meal. The *č̣i* is used here before a noun with a clearly non-specific referent. Example (9), from a different story, shows two nouns. Octopus, the main character of the story, is specific and marked with the *cə* ‘specific’ demonstrative. The second noun, *swáyqaʔ*, has no specific referent in the context of the story. This is, in fact, the first sentence of the story, which continues describing Octopus’s walking and searching for someone willing to be her husband. As the story develops, Octopus finds Mink, ties him up, then:

- (10) *ʔiʔáŋ ʔaʔ č̣i sʔf̥ən-s ʔəʔənístxʷ cə xəwʔəs swáyqaʔ-s.*
 seek OBL NS food-3POS feed SP new man-3POS
 ‘She looked for food to feed her new husband.’

In (10) the food Octopus seeks is non-specific, but now she has found herself a husband, so the specific *cə* is used in reference to him.

Note also that in this context that *st̥xʷaʔč̣* ‘octopus’ is a proper name, referring to a definite, specific individual, well known in traditional Klallam stories. In Klallam, proper names, just as all other nouns, must be preceded by a determiner when they are subject or direct object. In (11), *ʔəʔʔúʔ*, a legendary Klallam heroine, is the subject and marked with the specific, feminine, invisible determiner.

- (11) *níʔ č̣ suʔxənəŋs kʷʔə ʔəʔʔúʔ, "ʔáytxʷ!"*
 it is APP is told IN.SP.FE do it again
 ‘So then *ʔəʔʔúʔ* told them, “Do it again!”’

Following the oblique object marker, the preposition *ʔaʔ*, a proper name is sometimes preceded by a determiner and sometimes not. There are two examples in (12) that show a proper name preceded by a determiner following the preposition. (13) shows three examples where there is no determiner before the proper name.

- (12) a. *kʷánəŋət txʷʔúxʷ ʔaʔ cə slapúʔ.*
 run go toward OBL SP
 ‘He ran toward *Slapúʔ* (the witch).’
- b. *ʔánt cə ŋəŋənaʔs ʔaʔ cə nówə.*
 comply SP his children OBL SP Noah
 ‘His children obeyed Noah.’

- (13) a. ččásəŋ ʔaʔ slapúʔ.
is chased OBL
'He was chased by *Slapúʔ*.'
- b. ʁənátəŋ ʔaʔ nəwə.
is told OBL Noah
'They were told by Noah.'
- c. tán yaʔ ʔaʔ Rosalie
mother PAST OBL
'It was the mother of Rosalie.'

The determiner is absent when the proper name is a passive agent as in (13a) and (13b) and when it is a possessor as in (13c).

Example (10) also shows that it is the semantics, not the presence of the possessive morphology, that determines whether *či* or *cə* is used. In (10) both nouns have the –s third person possessive suffix. The presence of a possessive form with *či* renders the sentence ungrammatical only when a non-specific reading is impossible. Compare (14a) and (14b).

- (14) a. ʔiyáʔt cn kʷsə nə-swəýqaʔ.
seeking him I IN.SP 1POS-man
'I'm looking for my husband.'
- b. *ʔiyáʔt cn či nəswəýqaʔ.

Example (14a) is good since it has *kʷsə*, the 'invisible, specific' determiner and the noun is specific. (14b) fails because it has the non-specific *či* with a noun meaning 'my husband', which can only have a specific interpretation. Examples (15a, b) are the same as (14a, b) without the possessive prefix.

- (15) a. ʔiyáʔt cn kʷsə swəýqaʔ.
seeking him I IN.SP man
'I'm looking for a/the/that man.'
- b. ʔiyáʔt cn či swəýqaʔ.
seeking him I NS man
'I'm looking for a man.'

Both (15a) and (15b) are acceptable and both can be translated 'I'm looking for a man.' The difference is that in (15a) there is a specific man being looked for, while in (15b) the man is non-specific. (15b) implies as in (9) that the speaker is looking for a husband, while no such implication is present in (15a).

In some sentences where a noun would seem to have a required specific reference, the non-specific determiner is used. In such cases the use of the non-specific determiner indicates that the speaker is being indirect or evasive. In (16), for example, *swəýqaʔ* must have a specific referent

because of the subject and the semantics of the main predicate. If ‘I see him,’ he must be specific.

- (16) $k^w\acute{o}n\acute{o}x^w$ cn $\acute{c}i$ $sw\acute{o}y'qa?$
 see him I NS man
 ‘I saw a/the man.’

The native speaker’s comment about this sentence was “it’s not said outright like.” The use of the non-specific determiner here indicates that the speaker is being slightly evasive. Example (17) is similar.

- (17) $k^w\acute{o}n\acute{o}x^w$ cn k^wi $sw\acute{o}y'qa?$ $ya?$
 see him I IN.NS man PAST
 ‘I saw a/the (late) man.’

Example (17) has the ‘invisible’ non-specific determiner and the noun is marked past tense. Again, $sw\acute{o}y'qa?$ must have a specific referent. The comment from the native speaker about this sentence was “it’s like you can’t mention his name; it’s like he’s dead.” Here the non-specific determiner is used in response to the traditional taboo against directly mentioning or specifying a recently deceased individual.

The most common use of the non-specific determiners, especially $\acute{c}i$ and k^wi , is to introduce a sentential complement clause. In this function the determiner is followed by a nominalized verb with a subjective genitive. This is shown in (18a).

- (18) a. $n\acute{a}s\lambda\acute{e}?$ $\acute{c}i$ $n\acute{a}$ -s-hiyá?
 I want NS 1POS-NOM-go
 ‘I want to go.’

- b. $*n\acute{a}s\lambda\acute{e}?$ $c\acute{a}$ $n\acute{a}$ -s-hiyá?

When a specific reading is impossible, as with $n\acute{a}shiyá?$ in (18), which cannot refer to a specific instance of ‘going’, the sentence is unacceptable with the specific determiner $c\acute{a}$ in place of the non-specific $\acute{c}i$ as in (18b).

Example (19a) shows the typical non-specific reading with a noun, $s?i\acute{f}\acute{a}n$ ‘food’, preceded by the $\acute{c}i$ non-specific determiner. In (19b) the noun has the first person possessive prefix making the noun specific and is preceded, as in (14), by a specific determiner. In (19c) the $\acute{c}i$ determiner forces a non-specific, sentential complement interpretation of $n\acute{a}s?i\acute{f}\acute{a}n$. (19b) is comparable to (18b). Example (19b) is acceptable because $n\acute{a}s?i\acute{f}\acute{a}n$ has a possible specific interpretation; (18b) fails because $n\acute{a}shiyá?$ cannot have a specific interpretation in the context.

- (19) a. $n\acute{a}s\lambda\acute{e}?$ $\acute{c}i$ $s-i\acute{f}\acute{a}n$.
 I want NS NOM-eat
 ‘I want food.’

b. *nəsʔéʔ cə nə-s-ʔíʔən.*
 I want SP 1POS-NOM-eat
 'I want my food.'

c. *nəsʔéʔ či nə-s-ʔíʔən.*
 I want NS 1POS-NOM-eat
 'I want to eat.'

Incidentally, (18) and (19) illustrate a need to recognize two different kinds of *s*-nominalization. The *s*-nominalization of *ʔíʔən* 'eat' as in (19b) has independent lexical status, while the *s*-nominalization of *hiyáʔ* 'go' as in (18) does not.

Example (20) shows one more pair where *cə* is used for a specific interpretation and *či* is used for non-specific. In (20a), with *cə*, the speaker is weary of a specific thing that the addressee is saying. In (20b), with *či*, it is the addressee's talking, in general, that the speaker is fed up with.

(20) a. *nəsčínuʔ cə ʔənʔ-s-qʷáqʷi.*
 I'm weary SP 2POS-NOM-talking
 'I'm tired of what you are saying.'

b. *nəsčínuʔ či ʔənʔ-s-qʷáqʷi.*
 I'm weary NS 2POS-NOM-talking
 'I'm tired of your talking.'

Among the 'specific' set of demonstratives *tə* and *cə* are by far the most frequently occurring. As (2) shows, these are the least semantically and phonologically marked of the demonstratives and, in fact, are not semantically distinguishable. Although alternation of /c/ and /t/ is not found elsewhere in the language, it must be concluded that *tə* and *cə* are free phonological variants of the same determiner. Native speakers accept either in the same context and seem not to notice the difference.

The two non-specific terms *tí* and *čí* may be variants of the same determiner. As for the *tə* and *cə* specific variants, I have not been able to find any difference in usage between them, and native speakers accept either in the same context. I suspect that there may be some subtle difference because /t/ and /č/ alternate nowhere else in the language. However, working with the remaining speakers, I have been unable to confirm the subtle semantic/pragmatic distinction between the two found by the Thompsons (1971:265).

This specific/non-specific distinction in determiners does not appear in Saanich. It corresponds generally to the distinction in Squamish described as definite/indefinite by Kuipers (1967). It seems to correspond less closely to the distinction in Lushootseed and Musqueam called 'hypothetical, remote' in Hess and Hilbert (1980) and Suttles (2004), respectively.

3 Feminine

The feminine determiners are most commonly used to specify the natural gender of the referent of gender-neutral kin terms. Examples are shown in (21) and (22) where the (a) and (b) examples differ only in that (a) has the feminine determiner and (b) does not.

- (21) a. ʔáwə cn c kʷənəxʷ kʷłə nəčáʔməqʷ yaʔ.
not I NEG see IN.SP.FE my great-grandparent PAST
'I never saw my late great-grandmother.'
- b. ʔáwə cn c kʷənəxʷ kʷsə nəčáʔməqʷ yaʔ.
not I NEG see IN.SP my great-grandparent PAST
'I never saw my late great-grandfather.'
- (22) a. níʔ kʷłə ɳənaʔ-s
it is IN.SP.FE offspring-3POS
'It was his daughter.'
- b. níʔ kʷsə ɳənaʔ-s
it is IN.SP offspring-3POS
'It was his son.'

As in other Coast Salishan languages (Musqueam (Suttles 2004:340), for example), Klallam has very few lexical items that distinguish natural gender. Only the words for man, woman, boy, girl, father, and mother have distinct roots that indicate gender. All other words, including kin terms such as *cáčc* 'aunt/uncle' and animal terms such as *húʔpt* 'deer' are neutral as to gender. The difference between the female and male counterparts is indicated with the feminine determiners as shown in (21), (22), and (23).

- (23) a. kʷənəxʷ cn kʷłə húʔpt.
see it I IN.SP.FE deer
'I saw a/the doe.'
- b. kʷənəxʷ cn kʷsə húʔpt.
see it I IN.SP deer
'I saw a/the deer.'

Note that the translation for (23b) is not 'I saw the buck.' The *kʷsə* form, though not feminine, does not mean non-feminine or masculine. All of the determiners that are not explicitly feminine are neutral as to gender, although with kin terms, as in (21) and (22), the usual interpretation of the non-feminine forms is as masculine. To specify a male animal the word *swəyʔqaʔ* 'man, male' must modify the animal term as in (24).

- (24) kʷənəxʷ cn kʷsə swəyʔqaʔ húʔpt.
'I saw the buck.'

Though not required, the feminine demonstratives are usually used when referring to singular females. They are never used, however, when the noun is in the collective plural. This is shown in (25) where the collective plural in (25a) has the neutral determiner while the singular in (25b) has the feminine.

- (25) a. x^wítəŋ cə q̣óyaʔŋi.
 jump SP girls.
 'The girls jumped.'
- b. ʔáwəno sɣčít tsə q̣áʔŋi.
 not exist her knowing it SP.FE girl
 'The girl didn't know it.'

Unlike other Coast Salishan languages such as Lushootseed (Hess and Hilbert 1980:18) the Klallam feminine determiners apply only to feminine referents and do not apply to a masculine referent even if it is the smaller or less significant of two items.

The feminine forms *tə* and *tsə* are both marked the same in (2). There may be a difference, but only three examples of *tə* appear in the corpus where there are hundreds of examples of *tsə*. Direct elicitation has been unsuccessful in determining a difference between the two. The forms recorded by the Thompsons beginning with /cs/ in (1) seem to be variants of the forms beginning /ts/.

4 Invisible

Demonstratives beginning with *k^w*- indicate that the referent is not visible at the time of utterance, perhaps in another room, behind a tree, or not yet found. For example, a specific nominal object of the verb *ʔiyát* 'seek' always takes an invisible determiner. Example (14) above illustrates this. Another example is given in (26).

- (26) ʔiyát caʔn k^wsə nəmúsmus.
 seek it I will IN.SP my cow
 'I'm going to look for my cow.'

The invisible demonstratives are always used when referring to people who have died in the past. Example (27) is particularly illustrative of this.

- (27) ʔáwəno q̣ nəsxčít čí n... k^wi nəščičiʔúʔis yaʔ.
 not exist EMPH my knowing it NS IN.NS my ancestors PAST
 'I really don't know who my ancestors were.'

In this sentence, the speaker started using the *č*i determiner, hesitated, then corrected to the invisible, non-specific *k^wi* because the noun following refers to non-specific people who died in the past. Example (28) shows that it is

not just the presence of the past tense marker on the noun that determines the use of the invisible determiner.

- (28) suʔtákwss cə ɣə́nəʔs yaʔ.
 so he bought SP his offspring PAST
 ‘So he bought the one that had been his daughter.’

In the story (28) is from, a girl is taken by a spirit and then is recovered by her father. The girl is visible, so the invisible determiner is not used. Note, also, incidentally, that the feminine form of the determiner is not used here since there is only one offspring in the context.

5 Far and near

The far and near demonstratives are built on two endings: -əsə ‘far’ and -iə ‘near’. These endings each occur with beginnings marking particular feminine and neutral and particular, invisible feminine and neutral for a total of four demonstratives each. The neutral, particular, far determiner is illustrated in (29) and the invisible, feminine, far determiner is shown in (30).

- (29) cúŋtx^w tə sčúł čʔíyaʔ təsə cácu.
 bring up SP firewood from there FA beach
 ‘Bring up the firewood from the beach.’
- (30) ɣiʔəsít cn k^włəsə nəcáčc.
 write someone I IN.FE.FA my aunt/uncle
 ‘I wrote to my aunt.’

The far and near demonstratives, unlike the other Klallam demonstratives, specifically indicate location. When the referent is a location, as in (29), these are the most likely demonstratives to be used. When the referent is not a location, as in (30), the determiner usually indicates that the referent is at a far or near location relative to the propositional event, not necessarily the speech act. That is, the ‘far’ and ‘near’ of these demonstratives are not necessarily related to distance from the speaker or addressee. In (31), for example, from a historical narrative, the use of the far determiner indicates a position relative to the participants in the event, not relative to the participants in the speech act.

- (31) níł suʔənʔás čéʔiŋ təsə šəmánt.
 it is so they come go up FA our enemy
 ‘So then our enemies came up.’

When the participants in the event are the speaker and addressee, then the far and near demonstratives indicate distance from the speaker, not necessarily the addressee. The example in (32) comes from a taped letter recorded by Leon Metcalf in 1951. The speaker is in Jamestown and is

recording a message for a niece who was living with her Klallam mother at Lummi—a much farther distance in 1951 than today.

- (32) yəcúst kʷaʔčə kʷtəsə ʔəntán
 tell therefore IN.FE.FA your mother
- ʔaʔ čí nəsuʔmánʔ ʔuʔ xʷáʔxʷəxʷəm.
 OBL NS I'm very CON lonely
 'So tell your mother that I am very lonely.'

In (32) the referent of the far marked noun, *ʔəntán*, is far from the speaker but not the addressee.

Forms ending in *-əsə* shown in (2) are also listed in Thompson and Thompson (1971:266), but not identified as encoding the meaning 'far'. The native speakers I have worked with consistently provide translations for sentences with these forms that indicate the referent is explicitly far away.

Of the near demonstratives, *tiə* is, by far, the most common. An example of each of the near demonstratives is shown in (33) – (36).

- (33) ʔixt caʔn tiə saplín ʔaʔ tiə pótə.
 spread I will NE bread OBL NE butter
 'I'm going to spread this bread with this butter.'
- (34) ʔúxʷəns cn kʷiə nəswóʔqaʔ.
 go toward I IN.NE my husband
 'I'm going to get my husband.' [he is home, but not in the room]
- (35) ʔáʔaʔ ʔaʔ kʷsiə ʔənaʔs.
 here OBL IN.FE.NE his offspring
 'He's here at his daughter's place.' [the house next door]
- (36) yəcústəŋ cn ʔaʔ tsia nəʔənaʔ.
 is told I OBL FE.NE my offspring
 'I was told by my daughter.' [daughter is present]

6 Definite

The definite demonstratives all end in *niʔ*, which by itself is the third person focus deictic predicate. It is likely that these are historically composed of *niʔ* prefixed with one of the other demonstratives. Synchronically, however, native speakers do not connect them. While *niʔ* is a predicate, the definite demonstratives are never predicative, just as are all the other demonstratives. Each definite demonstrative can precede a noun as a determiner and each can stand as a pronominal alone in a sentence.

One example each of the six observed definite demonstratives listed in (2) is shown in (37)-(41). In each case the demonstrative indicates a specific, definite referent, previously mentioned or known from context.

The definite demonstratives can never be translated with the English specific, indefinite ‘a’.

- (37) náʔəŋ cn ʔaʔ cəwʔniʔ.
 is named I OBL DE
 ‘I was named by him.’
- (38) qəwəʔən ix^w yaʔ k^wəwʔniʔ sk^wtúʔ.
 Cowichan GUESS PAST IN.DE raven
 ‘I guess Raven was Cowichan.’
- (39) níʔ tsəwʔniʔ nəŋənaʔ.
 it is FE.DE my offspring
 ‘It’s my daughter.’
- (40) ʔiʔát cn k^wəwʔniʔ.
 seeking I IN.FE.DE
 ‘I’m looking for her.’
- (41) ʔuʔiyáʔ yaʔ cn k^waʔ ʔaʔ təsəniʔ sx^wʔayəməát.
 be there PAST I INFORM OBL FA.DE belonging to Klallam
 ‘I was there at that Klallam place.’
- (42) ʔuʔniʔ tiəwʔniʔ nəŋənaʔ ʔuʔnəšx^wʔáʔaʔ.
 it is NE.DE my offspring my reason for being here
 ‘It’s my son here that’s the reason I’m here.’

If the definite demonstratives are composed of *niʔ* and a prefixed demonstrative, for example *cə-wʔ-niʔ*, there remains the *wʔ* piece to account for. This may be historically related to the discourse *ʔuʔ-* prefix. There are some variant pronunciations of the definite demonstratives following the usual Klallam phonological processes. The schwa can delete resulting in the vocalization of the /wʔ/ to /uʔ/. Also, since a /wʔ/ regularly causes a preceding schwa to lower, the first vowel can appear as /a/. So, for example, *cəwʔniʔ* has these alternants: *cuʔniʔ*, *cawʔniʔ*.

In Halkomelem the demonstratives corresponding to the Klallam definites have *-niʔ* forms in the island dialect (Gerdtz and Hukari 2004) and *-ʔa* forms in the Musqueam dialect (Suttles 2004). In that language they have a special case marking function. In Halkomelem, although these forms can appear in intransitive subjects, prepositional objects, and direct objects, when they occur with two overt arguments, they mark the subject.

Although the semantics of the Klallam definite demonstratives appears to match the corresponding Halkomelem forms, I have found no solid evidence of a comparable use as *de facto* case markers. It cannot be determined if Klallam is like Halkomelem or not in this respect because, in Klallam, transitive sentences with two full third person arguments are extremely rare. The passive is, by far, the preferred construction when the predicate calls for two participants. Around 55% of occurrences of the definite demonstratives are in intransitive subjects (including passive

subjects). Around 16% of occurrences are in prepositional objects (including passive agents). 22% of occurrences are found in direct objects—almost all of those with first or second person subjects. Their use in transitive subjects amounts to only 5% of occurrences. Of that 5%, I have found only two sentences in all of my text corpus that have a definite demonstrative in one of two full arguments. These two are shown in (43) and (44).

- (43) mǎyaʔts cǎwniʔ cǎ stiqéw.
kick 3/3 DE SP horse
'He kicked the horse.'

- (44) tčáts cǎwniʔ mǎšču cǎ stíkʷəns
stab 3/3 DE mink SP his nephew
'Mink stabbed his nephew.'

It is true that in both of these sentences the definite demonstrative is the transitive subject, but in the few other transitive sentences with two full third person arguments, the definite demonstratives are not used at all. One example is shown in (45).

- (45) ʔǎyǎqʷts cǎ swǎyqaʔ cǎ snǎxʷʔ sʔíʔaʔs.
smash 3/3 SP man SP canoe he bought
'The man smashed up the canoe he bought.'

Typically in 3/3 transitive sentences only one full argument appears. This argument is usually interpreted as the direct object. It can, however, if the context makes it clear, be interpreted as subject as in (45). The definite determiner is not required and not usual in such sentences. One example is shown in (46).

- (46) ččáts kʷǎ nǎcát.
build 3/3 IN.SP my father
'My father built it.'

The definite demonstratives are the only ones that have a collective plural form. The form of the plural is unique to these demonstratives. Ordinarily the collective plural is formed by infixation of /y/ or reduplication. In the definite demonstratives, the plural is formed by the infixation of /ǎʔ/ after the /n/. The infix takes stress. Examples are shown in (47)–(49).

- (47) nǎsxʷiščǎníkʷən cǎwnǎʔiʔ.
my pity DE.PL
'I pity them.'

- (48) ʔuʔxʷǎŋ č yaʔ cǎ sxʷítəŋs kʷǎwnǎʔiʔ xʷiyanítəm.
fast APP PAST SP their jump IN.DE.PL white people
'Those white people apparently jumped quickly.'

- (49) ʔk^wnán ʔaʔ cawⁿáʔiʔ q^húmăčən.
are taken OBL DE.PL killer whale
‘They were taken by those killer whales.’

Example (47) shows that the plural form, just as the non-plural, can be pronominal. In (48) the determiner is followed by the collective plural form of *x^wanítəm*. In (49) the noun following the plural determiner is in the singular. It is also possible to have a plural noun with a non-plural definite determiner as in (50).

- (50) q^wíŋi cəwⁿniʔ q^həy^húmăčən čəsaʔ.
get out DE killer whales two
‘Those two killer whales got out.’

7 Other possible forms

I have been unable to confirm the person/entity distinction in the emphatic forms described by the Thompsons (1971:266). They give six forms ending in *-ayə* referring to non-person entities as distinct from the *-anu* forms, which refer to persons.

In my data only two *-ayə* forms appear: *cayə* and *tsayə*. These are not listed in (2) because there are too few examples to determine their semantics. In the few examples I have, the behavior of these forms is different from the other demonstratives. All of the other demonstratives occur either alone as a pronoun or before a noun or nominalized clause as a determiner. In each case of *-ayə* it occurs neither alone nor followed by a noun or a nominalized form. Examples are shown in (51) and (52).

- (51) ʔáwə c q^wáq^wi ʔaʔ či sšíʔtəŋs ʔaʔ tsayə
not NEG talking OBL NS their desire OBL DEM

ʔáy^h ti sk^wənts.
good NS their looking at it
‘They don’t talk about their desire for ones that are good looking.’
- (52) húytx^w či suʔáy^s či ʔəŋxčŋín ʔaʔ cayə
be only DEM good NS your thought OBL DEM

huy ʔuʔəsʔúʔʔəm^h ʔiʔ ʔuʔšaʔšúʔ.
only is right CONJ is happy
‘Have only good thoughts for those that are well and happy.’

All occurrences of the *-ayə* forms that I have are from two texts from two speakers recorded separately at Jamestown by Metcalf. It is, perhaps, interesting that, though the contexts of these occurrence are quite different—(51) at the end of a traditional tale and (52) within a sermon—they both, and in fact all occurrences of *-ayə* forms, occur in sentences giving advice. The

Elwha speakers I have worked with have no trouble interpreting these, but I have not been able to elicit any examples.

As for the *-anu* forms shown in (1b), I have recorded several of these, but in every case it can be better analyzed as one of the other demonstratives, *cə*, *tsə*, *kʷsə*, *tiə*, preceding a word beginning with the prefix *nuʔ-*. The considerable overlap between /a/ and /ə/ in Klallam accounts for the vowel perception. The prefix *nuʔ-*, which has a variant pronunciation *nu-*, was not identified by the Thompsons in the 1971 sketch. It has a general meaning ‘similar to, seems like, kind of, sort of, rather’, as shown in (53).

- (53) *kʷənnəxʷ cn kʷsə nuʔ-swəyʔqaʔ*.
 see it I IN.SP SIM-man
 ‘I saw (what looked like) a man.’

I had originally recorded sentences like (53) as the Thompsons did, for example, *kʷənnəxʷ cn kʷsanu swəyʔqaʔ*. The ‘kind of like’ element of the meaning of these forms emerged gradually in the course of field work. Suspicions that the analysis was inadequate first arose when it became clear that while all of the demonstratives but the non-specific ones can act as independent pronominals, forms such as **kʷənnəxʷ cn kʷsanu* are consistently rejected. Later sentences such as (54) appeared to confirm the need for reanalysis.

- (54) *nuʔ-swəyʔqaʔ cə stáni*.
 SIM-man SP woman
 ‘That woman is like a man.’

The *nuʔ-* prefix is also used in comparison constructions:

- (55) *nókʷ nuʔ-čəq ʔaʔ ʔəc*.
 you SIM-big OBL I
 ‘You’re bigger than me.’

8 Conclusion

Klallam has a demonstrative determiner/pronoun system composed of a small number of phonological elements. They distinguish invisible and feminine referents, as do the other Central Salish languages. Both of these are opposed to demonstratives that are neutral for these semantics. In addition, Klallam has demonstratives that explicitly distinguish specific and non-specific referents independent of definiteness. A separate set of demonstratives, built in part on the specific forms, indicate definiteness in referring to previously mentioned or known discourse participants. Two other demonstrative sets indicate near or distant location relative to participants in the proposition. None of the demonstratives have any case marking function.

The list of demonstratives in (2) are those that I have observed. There are obvious gaps. It is unknown whether the gaps are systematic or accidental.

References

- Gerds, Donna B. and Thomas E. Hukari. 2004. Determiners and transitivity in Halkomelem texts. In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honor of M. Dale Kinkade*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, No. 17. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Hess, Thom and Vi Hilbert. 1980. *Lushootseed I*. Seattle: Daybreak Star Press.
- Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. *The Squamish Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Suttles, Wayne. 2004. *Musqueum Reference Grammar*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: a preview. *Studies in American Indian languages*, ed. Jesse Sawyer. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 65.251-294.
- Von Heusinger, Klaus. 2002. Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19:245-274.