

A Double Passive Construction in Klallam¹

Timothy Montler

1. Introduction

Thom Hess has never feared taking a contrary point of view on matters of Salishan grammar. He spoke and wrote confidently of nouns in Lushootseed long before most Salishanists would admit of them, and he has long held that there is no passive in Lushootseed (see, for example, Hess 1993) despite the fact that cognates for the Lushootseed *-b* suffix are called ‘passive’ by most Salishanists. Thom’s inspirational comfort with contrary positions will, I hope, allow him to appreciate the doubly contrary position I take in this paper: not only is there a passive construction in Klallam (cognate with the Lushootseed *-b*), but there are two passive constructions in Klallam, and, furthermore, they can both occur in the same clause.

It is open to debate whether either of the constructions to be discussed here should be considered passive at all. Whether they are or not certainly depends upon one’s assumptions and on a reasonable definition of what makes a passive construction. I assume here that it is useful to think of constructions as mappings of semantic roles onto syntactic relations. Thus, ‘Thom helped Tim’ and ‘Tim was helped by Thom’ are related in having the same participants in the same semantic roles mapped onto different syntactic relations in the two constructions. In the first sentence ‘Thom,’ the Agent is subject and ‘Tim’ the Patient is direct object.

¹ Klallam is a Central Salishan language of the Straits subgroup spoken on the north shore of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington. The research this work is based on has been supported by grants from the Jacobs Research Funds, National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, University of North Texas, and Elwha Klallam Tribe. The Klallam elders, especially Bea Charles, Adeline Smith, the late Ed Sampson, and the late Tom Charles helped me figure all this out. Thanks to Ivy Doak for a very helpful critical reading and to David Beck for his comments and for all the work he has put into this volume. With great admiration, I thank Thom Hess for getting me started on Saanich when my initial Klallam fieldwork stalled.

In the second sentence ‘Tim’ is still the Patient but is mapped to the subject syntactic relation while ‘Thom,’ still the Agent, appears as an oblique object. I also assume that the descriptive usefulness of the idea that a Patient is ‘promoted’ to subject in the passive has allowed it to enter what Dixon (1998) has called ‘Basic Linguistic Theory’ and outlive its particular theoretical origin.

I assume the following criteria for a construction to qualify as passive: 1) it is syntactically intransitive; 2) it is semantically transitive; 3) it is a morphologically or syntactically marked construction; 4) it has a corresponding unmarked, syntactically transitive, active construction; 5) it has a grammatical subject that is a non-Agent; 6) it may or may not specify an Agent, but if it does, the Agent is marked by an oblique case; 7) it functions to shift focus to a non-Agent. I am not claiming this as a universal definition of passive. For that see, for example, Postal 1986. I suggest only that most linguists finding a construction that meets these criteria will call it ‘passive.’ In this paper I take a construction meeting these criteria as a prototypical passive. There may be constructions that do not meet all these criteria that can usefully be thought of as passive though they deviate from this prototype (see, for example, Givón 2006).

I hope to show that there are two distinct, main clause constructions² in Klallam that meet these prototypical passive criteria. For want of better terminology I call one the η -passive and the other the s-passive, referring to their morphological marking. The η -passive morphology applies to any transitive stem while the s-passive applies only to ditransitive stems.

My intent here is to illustrate each construction, showing how it is a passive, then to show how the processes that form these two constructions combine to form a third, perhaps unique, construction—a double passive.

First it will be necessary to show the basic transitive and intransitive patterns. Klallam has a set of nominative enclitics and accusative suffixes that occur on the main predicate, which is usually the first word of the sentence. The forms in (1) show the

² Some of the Central Salishan languages have two passive morphemes: one occurring in main clauses and the other in subordinate clauses. See, for example, Gerds 1982 on Halkomelem and Watanabe 2003 on Comox. This distinction is not the subject of this paper. Klallam has no separate passive marking for subordinate clauses.

intransitive subjects and in (2) the transitive subjects (with a zero third person object).

(1) Intransitive subjects: ‘go’³

	Singular	Plural
1 st	hiyá?_cn	hiyá?_st
2 nd	hiyá?_cx ^w	hiyá?_cx ^w hay
3 rd		hiyá?_Ø

(2) Transitive subjects: ‘help him/her/it/them’

	Singular	Plural
1 st	k ^w náŋt-Ø_cn	k ^w náŋt-Ø_st
2 nd	k ^w náŋt-Ø_cx ^w	k ^w náŋt-Ø_cx ^w hay
3 rd		k ^w náŋt-Ø-s

The only difference between the two paradigms is that while the third person intransitive subject, like the third person object, is zero, the third person transitive subject is marked by the ergative *-s* suffix.⁴

³ In the data the hyphen indicates a relevant morpheme boundary preceding a suffix or following a prefix. The underline precedes an enclitic. In this and following examples I use the symbol Ø to indicate the third person zero morph in the position where the first and second, non-zero, morphs would appear. The abbreviations used are as follows: AGT = ‘Agent role’, BEN = ‘Beneficiary role’, DAT = ‘dative applicative’, DET = ‘demonstrative determiner’, ERG = ‘ergative suffix’ (always 3rd person), FUT = ‘future tense marker’, OBJ = ‘object (accusative) suffix’, OBL = ‘oblique preposition’, PAT = ‘Patient role’, PSV = ‘ η -passive’, RECIP = ‘recipient/beneficiary role’, REQ = ‘request enclitic’, SUBJ = ‘main clause (nominative) subject’, SSBJ = ‘subordinate clause subject’, TRVZR = ‘basic transitivizer’.

⁴ Most Central Salishan languages display a similar ergative split with the third person transitive marked with an *-s* suffix while first and second persons are enclitics. See, for example, Gerdtz 1982. The first and second person subject markers are parts of a set of enclitics that always appears in second position, not necessarily on the main verb. The third person subject transitive subject marker is a suffix that is always attached to the main verb. See Demers 1980 and Montler 2003 for demonstrations of this pattern in Lummi and Klallam.

Virtually all verbs, whether or not they are semantically transitive, must take a transitivity suffix before direct object morphology can be applied. In Klallam there are eight transitivity suffixes. One of the eight is a basic transitivity marker and the others are various control, causative, and applicative transitivity markers.⁵ Throughout this paper, unless otherwise noted, the transitivity marker is the basic *-t* suffix, shown on the verb in (2).

2. Basic transitives and the η -passive

The η -passive construction is marked by a suffix *-əŋ* (or *-ŋ*) attached to a transitivized verb. This construction is common and has cognates (usually a suffix *-m*) across the Salishan family, though some of the cognates are best analyzed not as passive, *per se*. In some of the Interior languages the cognate marks an indefinite subject (Mattina 1987, Thompson and Thompson 1992) or non-topic ergative (Doak 1997). It also has peculiarities in most of the Coast Salishan languages. In some languages the cognate of *-ŋ* can be seen as an inverse marker indicating an Agent lower on a person hierarchy (Forrest 1994). In most of the Salishan languages—all of the Interior and most of the Coast languages—the presence of this morpheme requires that the Agent appear in an oblique case while the Patient remains marked by object rather than subject morphology as would be expected in a passive (see Gerds 1989 for a discussion of this).

In Klallam, however, and in the closely related Northern Straits⁶ language, this suffix marks a fairly ordinary, prototypical passive (though it does have some peculiarities that I will mention shortly). This η -passive is a marked construction contrasting with an active counterpart. In the active transitive the subject morphology marks an Agent and object morphology marks a Patient, Recipient, etc. When the *-əŋ* suffix is attached to the transitivized stem, the resulting form is intransitive and the subject morphology marks the Patient while an optional Agent is the object of a general oblique preposition *ʔaʔ*.

⁵ These transitivity markers are described in Montler 1996.

⁶ Northern Straits is the other language of the Straits subgroup. It is usually known by its dialect names: Sooke, Songish, Saanich, Samish, and Lummi (Montler 1986, 1999).

Example (3) shows an active form (the third person object is zero) while (4) illustrates the η -passive. In these two examples, all participants are third person and pronominal.

(3) k^wnáŋ-t-Ø-s
 help-TRVZR-3OBJ-3ERG
 PAT AGT
 ‘he/she/it helped him/her/it’⁷

(4) k^wnáŋ-t-əŋ_Ø
 help-TRVZR-PSV_3SUBJ
 PAT
 ‘he/she/it was helped’

Examples (5) and (6) show a pair with first person and specified third person participants.

(5) k^wnáŋ-t-Ø_cn cə swáyqə?
 help-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ DET man
 PAT AGT PAT
 ‘I helped that man’

(6) k^wnáŋ-t-əŋ_cn ?a? cə swáyqə?
 help-TRVZR-PSV_1SUBJ OBL DET man
 PAT AGT
 ‘I was helped by that man’

The intransitive subject has a semantic role corresponding to the direct object of the active counterpart while the Agent subject of the active counterpart appears in this passive as oblique. Thus (6) appears to be a passive. However, this construction does have

⁷ Third person forms are neutral with respect to number and gender; (3) shows my standard glosses for third person. Also predicates are neutral with respect to tense. Past and future tense can be marked by enclitics but need not be if context makes it clear. In (3) and subsequent examples I use past tense in the English gloss unless otherwise indicated in the Klallam.

two limitations: 1) first and second persons may not occur as oblique Agents in this construction. So, for example, there is no passive of (5), no monoclausal way of saying ‘that man was helped by me’.⁸ And 2) when the Agent is third person and the Patient is first or second person, the passive is obligatory.

A full subject/object transitive paradigm for the basic *-t* transitivizer is shown in (7).

(7) Subjects/Objects: ‘help’

	1	1pl	2	3
1			k ^w nánɛ-c_cn ⁹	k ^w nánɛ-Ø_cn
1pl			k ^w nánɛ-c_st	k ^w nánɛ-Ø_st
2	k ^w nánɛ-c_cx ^w	k ^w nánɛ-úŋɫ_cx ^w		k ^w nánɛ-Ø_cx ^w
3	(k ^w nánɛ-əŋ_cn)	(k ^w nánɛ-əŋ_st)	(k ^w nánɛ-əŋ_cx ^w)	k ^w nánɛ-Ø-s

The forms in (7) in the slots for the 3rd person subject with 1st and 2nd person objects are passives. They are parenthesized to indicate that these are not properly part of this paradigm, but they are included because there is no other way to indicate these pairs of relations. There is no monoclausal way, for example, of saying ‘he helped me/you’ except for the passive. Moreover, in five of the seven other transitive paradigms the passive is required **whenever** there is a third person Agent (Montler 1996). In these other five paradigms the *-s* 3rd person ergative is not allowed so the 3/3 form must also be passive.

⁸ There are focused, cleft forms such as:

ʔəc k^waʔ k^wnánɛ-t-əŋ ʔaʔ cə swáyqəʔ.
 it is I SUB help-TRVZR-PSV OBL DET man
 ‘It was me that was helped by the man.’

but no simple single clause can have first or second persons as objects of the oblique preposition in passives. This is also true of passives in other Salishan languages. See, for example, Gerdts 1982:199.

⁹ The suffix *-c* marks both the 1st and 2nd person objects. It is the morphophonemic realization of the *-t* transitivizer followed by the *-s* 1st or 2nd person object marker. In subsequent glosses this fusion is indicated as TRVZR:1OBJ and TRVZR:2OBJ. This alveolar affricate is phonetically distinct from the final *-t-s* of the 3/3 form.

Though this is a deviation from the passive prototype characterized in section 1, it seems that the fact that these passives are obligatory—that there is no active counterpart—is grammatically inconsequential. Whether and which of these forms is obligatory varies from dialect to dialect with no other apparent consequences in the grammar. In Klallam 3/1, 3/2, and 3/3 Agent/Patient combinations require the passive in some paradigms while only the 3/1 and 3/2 combinations require the passive in other paradigms. In the Saanich dialect of Northern Straits the passive is obligatory only with a 3/2 Agent/Patient combination in all paradigms (Montler 1986). In the Lummi dialect of Northern Straits 3/2 or 3/1 combinations in all paradigms must be passive but not 3/3 (Jelinek and Demers 1994). Generally there does not seem to be much to be gained cross-linguistically in denying that this construction is passive.

3. Ditransitives and the η -passive

Ditransitive stems may be either inherent or derived. Inherent ditransitive stems have semantics that require three participants. In (8), (9), and (10) the semantically ditransitive root *ʔəŋaʔ* ‘give someone (something)’ is illustrated. Inherent ditransitives take the basic transitivizer, and the role marked by the object suffix is ‘Recipient’ or ‘Beneficiary’. The ‘Patient’ or ‘thing given’ in this case is oblique.

- (8) ʔəŋaʔ-c_cn
 give-TRVZR:2OBJ_1SUBJ
 RECIP AGT
 ‘I gave (it) to you’
- (9) ʔəŋaʔ-c_cn ʔaʔ cə sʔiŋ.
 give-TRVZR:2OBJ_1SUBJ OBL DET food
 RECIP AGT PAT
 ‘I gave you that food’
- (10) ʔəŋaʔ-t-∅_cn
 give-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ
 RECIP AGT
 ‘I gave (it) to him/her/them’

A derived ditransitive uses the *-sit* dative applicative which indicates that the direct object has a non-Patient, Recipient or Beneficiary role. In (11) and (12) the root *kʷən-* ‘see’ has the basic *-t* transitivizer producing a simple transitive stem that takes a Patient object and means ‘look at’.

- (11) *kʷən-t-Ø_cn*
 see-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ
 PAT AGT
 ‘I looked at it’
- (12) *kʷən-t-Ø_cn* *cə* *snəxʷł*
 see-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ DET canoe
 PAT AGT PAT
 ‘I looked at that canoe’

In (13) and (14) the same root has the *-sit* dative applicative and produces a ditransitive stem that takes a Beneficiary direct object and means ‘look at (something) for someone’.

- (13) *kʷən-sít-Ø_cn*
 see-DAT-3OBJ_1SUBJ
 BEN AGT
 ‘I looked at (it) for him/her/them’
- (14) *kʷən-sít-Ø_cn* *?a?* *cə* *snəxʷł*
 see-DAT-3OBJ_1SUBJ OBL DET canoe
 BEN AGT PAT
 ‘I looked at that canoe for him/her/them’

Ditransitives have the same object marking as simple transitives as shown in (7), but the object suffix in ditransitives has the semantic role of Recipient (or Beneficiary, Source, etc. depending on the root) while a Patient is marked by the oblique preposition. (15) is the same as (10) with the addition of explicit Recipient and Patient.

- (15) ʔáŋaʔ-t-Ø_cn cə sláni ʔaʔ cə táɭə
 give-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ DET woman OBL DET money
 RECIP AGT RECIP PAT
 ‘I gave that money to that woman’

The η -passive of a ditransitive has the role/relation correspondence expected of a passive. When ditransitive stems are marked with the η -passive $-ə\eta$ suffix the resulting intransitive form has the expected Recipient subject and optional oblique Agent. Example (16) shows this.

- (16) ʔáŋaʔ-t-əŋ_cn ʔaʔ cə sláni
 give-TRVZR-PSV_1SUBJ OBL DET woman
 RECIP AGT
 ‘I was given (it) by that woman’

4. Ditransitives and the s-passive

The s-passive has not previously been described as such for any Salishan language and I am unaware of how widely distributed this construction is across the family.

The s-passive construction has no distinctive suffix as does the η -passive, but it is also an intransitive construction contrasting with an active counterpart. And as is typical of a passive it has a non-Agent in the nominative case and the Agent in an oblique case.

The s-passive construction differs from the η -passive construction in four ways: 1) While the η -passive applies to all transitive stems, the s-passive applies only to ditransitive stems (and to stems derived from those, as will be shown shortly). 2) Unlike the η -passive there is no special suffix for the s-passive. 3) In the η -passive of a basic ditransitive stem the Recipient is the subject, but in the s-passive it is the Patient, not the Recipient, that becomes the subject. 4) The Agent in the η -passive may be indicated as the object of the *ʔaʔ* oblique preposition, but the Agent in the s-passive appears marked by the genitive pronominal morphology. The s-passive is so called because the *s*- nominalizer prefix accompanies the attachment of the genitive morphology.¹⁰

¹⁰ The s-passive can be seen as a transitive verb that has been nominalized, then denominalized as an intransitive verb.

Example (17) shows the s-passive of (10).

- (17) n-s-ʔáŋaʔ-t-∅_∅
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-3OBJ_3SUBJ
 AGT RECIP PAT
 ‘It was given to him/her by me’

Since the third person is zero in both intransitive subject and object, one can only infer it. But (17) is structurally intransitive since in Klallam transitive subjects are overtly indicated in all persons and only intransitive subjects are zero.

Example (18) shows a specified third person Patient patterning as a typical intransitive subject. Compare this to (15) where the Patient, ‘money’, is oblique.

- (18) n-s-ʔáŋaʔ-t-∅_∅ cə tálə
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-3OBJ_3SUBJ DET money
 AGT RECIP PAT PAT
 ‘The money was given to him/her by me’

Example (19) shows a second person Recipient marked by object morphology. Note that though this has the second person object, it has the zero third person intransitive subject.

- (19) n-s-ʔáŋaʔ-c_∅
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR:2OBJ_3SUBJ
 AGT RECIP PAT
 ‘It was given to you by me’

In (20) it is the Patient that is second person.

- (20) n-s-ʔáŋaʔ-t-∅_caʔ_cx^w
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-3OBJ_FUT_2SUBJ
 AGT RECIP PAT
 ‘You will be given to him/her by me’
 (‘I’ll give you to him/her’)

These examples show that this construction with the genitive Agent meets the structural criteria for a passive construction as

does the η -passive. It is a marked construction with the Agent in an oblique case—genitive—and a non-Agent subject. The only divergence from a passive prototype is the fact that in this s-passive it is the oblique, Patient, object that is promoted to subject and not the direct object as in the η -passive.

5. The s-passive in questions and relative clauses

Since the s-passive has never before been described as such for a Salishan language, a firmer descriptive basis for it should be established by describing some of its functions in more detail. In this section I describe briefly the use of the s-passive in questions and relative clauses.

In addition to focusing the Patient, the s-passive has other functions similar to passive constructions found in other languages. In Klallam as in other languages there are restrictions on what grammatical relation can be questioned or relativized. Generally in Klallam only subjects and direct objects are accessible to questioning and relativization, that is, only subjects and direct objects can be coreferential with a question word or with the head of a relative clause. In order to question or relativize an oblique it must be moved into an accessible syntactic relation: subject or direct object. One of the functions of a passive found in languages that have similar restrictions is to make a particular role accessible.¹¹

It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe in detail how questions and relative clauses are formed in Klallam,¹² but a few examples with brief explanations will suffice to show how the s-passive is used to bring a Patient into an accessible relation.

¹¹ The term ‘accessible’ here is used in the sense of Keenan and Comrie 1977. Keenan 1972 shows how passive voice is used in Malagasy to promote an inaccessible relation into the accessible subject position. The Malagasy ‘circumstantial’ voice is also used in this way (Keenan 1972). The Malagasy circumstantial voice is somewhat similar to the Klallam s-passive in that it promotes an oblique into subject position. They differ in that while in Malagasy apparently any non-Patient oblique relation is promoted in the circumstantial, in Klallam it is only the Patient that is promoted to subject in the s-passive. I have seen no mention of the Malagasy passive and circumstantial voices appearing in the same clause.

¹² Generally, relative clauses in Klallam are structurally the same as those in Saanich, which are described in Montler 1993.

In Klallam questions the question word is the main predicate coreferential with a subject or direct object argument in a following subordinate clause.¹³ In (21), (22), and (23) the basic situation is illustrated.

(21) stáŋ ʔuč čí kʷən-t-Ø-xʷ
 is.what REQ DET look at-TRVZR-3OBJ-2SSBJ
 PAT PAT AGT
 ‘What is it that you looked at?’

(22) cán ʔuč čí ʔəŋaʔ-t-Ø-xʷ
 is.who REQ DET give-TRVZR-3OBJ-2SSBJ
 RECIPIENT PAT AGT
 ‘Who is it that you gave it to?’

(23) cán ʔuč čí ʔəŋaʔ-c
 is.who REQ DET give-TRVZR:2OBJ
 AGT RECIPIENT
 ‘Who is it that gave it to you?’

In (21) and (22) the subject of the subordinate clause is indicated with one of the special set of subordinate clause subject markers; it is the direct object of the subordinate clause that is questioned. In (21) the direct object is the Patient or thing looked at. In (22) the direct object is the Recipient.

In (23) it is the Agent that is questioned and there is a gap in the subject position of the subordinate clause which would ordinarily be marked by the *-s* third person subject marker.¹⁴ The direct object is marked with the regular object morphology.

¹³ Note that the question words *cán* and *stáŋ* are not just pronouns. They are basically focus predicates meaning ‘it is someone’ and ‘it is something’, respectively, filling non-specific slots in the paradigm of predicative focus person deictics translated as ‘it is I’, ‘it is you’, and so on. When used with a following question enclitic they are interpreted as question words ‘to be who’ and ‘to be what’. The constructions in (21)-(23) are focus cleft constructions parallel to those mentioned in footnote 7.

¹⁴ In subordinate clauses the *-s* suffix marks subjects whether transitive or intransitive.

In (25) the head of the relative construction is coreferential with the direct object of the restricting clause while in (26) the head is coreferential with the subject.¹⁵ In each the restricting clause is a regular transitive. The Agent in (25) is the subject marked with *-x^w*, the second person subordinate clause subject marker.

In (27) the restricting clause is a derived ditransitive based on the root *tk^w* ‘buy’ modified by the dative applicative suffix *-si* suffixed before the basic transitivizer *-t* producing a stem *tk^wsi^t* ‘buy (something) for someone’ with a Recipient direct object.

- (27) *k^wən-t-Ø_cn*
 look at-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ
 [cə snəx^wl n-s-tk^w-sí-c]
 DET canoe 1GEN-S-buy-DAT-TRVZR:2OBJ
 PAT AGT RECIP
 ‘I looked at the canoe I bought you.’

In the restricting clause of (27) the Agent is marked by the genitive, the Recipient is the direct object, and the Patient is the subject. The s-passive is required in the restricting clause of (27) so that the Patient head of the relative construction can be coreferential with an accessible relation, i.e. subject or direct object.¹⁶

The s-passive thus has both the structural and functional characteristics of a passive construction. We can now show how it combines with the η-passive to form the double passive construction.

¹⁵ The requirement that 3/2 and 3/1 Agent/Patient combinations take the passive holds only in main clauses. Main clauses differ from subordinate clauses also in that, while main clauses exhibit a split ergative pattern with third person only marked in an ergative/absolutive pattern, subordinate clauses are consistently nominative/accusative.

¹⁶ The η-passive occurs readily in elicitation since it is required in basic paradigms. The s-passive appeared only rarely and sporadically in direct elicitation. I first noticed it as a distinct construction when I found it occurring in tape recorded narratives that I was transcribing. Without the natural discourse I would never have recognized this construction. After finding out that it was there, it was fairly easy to elicit more and various examples.

6. The double passive construction

When three distinct participants occur with three distinct roles in a proposition at least one of the participants must be third person. The fact that both third person subjects and objects are zero in Klallam obscures the nature of the s-passive construction and probably accounts for why it has not previously been described.

In (19) and (20) we have first, second, and third person participants. (19) has a third person Patient; (20) has a third person Recipient. What happens when we have all three persons with a third person Agent?

In (7) and in the discussion following that paradigm it is shown that when a third person Agent occurs with a first or second person Patient or Recipient the η -passive is required. Accordingly, when it is the Agent that is third person in a ditransitive and the other participants are first and second person, the η -passive applies just as in the basic transitive paradigms shown in (7). Then the s-passive applies to this to produce the double passive construction. (28) shows this result.

(28) n-s-ʔəŋaʔ-t-əŋ_cx^w ʔaʔ cə nɪcát
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-PSV_2SUBJ OBL DET your father
 RECIP PAT AGT
 ‘You were given to me by your father’

In (28) we have all three persons with a third person Agent. In (28) both passives have applied.

The charts in (29) - (31) schematize the mappings involved in the passives. (29) represents the η -passive applied to an inherent, underived ditransitive stem.

(29)	AGT	PAT	RECIP
Active	Subj.	Obl.	D.O.
η -Passive	Obl.	Obl.	Subj.

The relationship between a basic active ditransitive and the s-passive is shown in (30).

(30)	AGT	PAT	RECIP
Active	Subj.	Obl.	D.O.
s-Passive	Gen.	Subj.	D.O.

The chart in (31) shows the outcome of the application of the s-passive applied to the η -passive stem.

(31)	AGT	PAT	RECIP
Active	Subj.	Obl.	D.O.
η -Passive	Obl.	Obl.	Subj.
s-Passive	Obl.	Subj.	Gen.

As with the s-passive, the double passive construction first came to my attention in transcribing natural discourse. It is very difficult to elicit this construction directly using a bilingual approach to data gathering. Usually the direct English translation of these is strange and at least strained. This can be seen especially when the double passive occurs with derived ditransitives.

In (32) we have the same derived ditransitive stem that appears in the restricting clause in (27).

(32)	tk ^w -sít-Ø_cn	cə	ntán
	buy-DAT-3OBJ_1SUBJ	DET	my mother
	RECIP AGT	RECIP	
	‘I bought (something) for my mother.’		

In (33) direct, literal translation of the η -passive, where the subject is the Recipient, is already strained.

(33)	tk ^w -sít-əŋ_cn	ʔaʔ	cə	ntán
	buy-DAT-PSV_1SUBJ	OBL	DET	my mother
	RECIP	AGT		
	‘I was bought (something) for by my mother.’			

In (34) the s-passive makes the thing bought the subject and more closely matches the kind of passive found in English.

(34)	n-s-tk ^w -sít-Ø_Ø	cə	ntán
	1GEN-S-buy-DAT-3OBJ_3SUBJ	DET	my mother
	AGT	BEN PAT	RECIP
	‘It was bought for my mother by me.’		

In (35) the double passive construction—the s-passive of the η -passive in (33)—makes a structurally literal translation impossible. It is possible, of course, to provide an English gloss, but there is no comparable construction in English.

- (35) n-s-tk^w-sít-ə η _Ø ʔaʔ cə ntán
 1GEN-S-buy-DAT-PSV_3SUBJ OBL DET my mother
 BEN PAT AGT
 ('It was bought by my mother for me.')

The applicative derived ditransitive in (35) adds another layer of role/relation correspondence that can be charted as in (36).

(36)		AGT	PAT	RECIP
	Active	Subj.	D.O.	Obl.
	Applicative	Subj.	Obl.	D.O.
	η -Passive	Obl.	Obl.	Subj.
	s-Passive	Obl.	Subj.	Gen.

In the basic active form the Agent is subject, the Patient is direct object, and the Recipient is oblique. The dative applicative suffix makes the Recipient the direct object and the Patient oblique. Then the η -passive applies to that making the previous subject, the Agent, oblique, and the previous direct object, Recipient, becomes subject. The s-passive then applies to this outcome sending the previous, Recipient subject into the genitive relation while making the previously oblique Patient the subject.

7. Summary and conclusion

The double passive is a construction based on two distinct and independent passive constructions: the η -passive and the s-passive. The η -passive promotes the object (Patient in simple transitives and Recipient/Beneficiary in ditransitives) to subject and places the former subject in an oblique prepositional phrase. The η -passive applies to any transitive stem. The s-passive promotes an oblique Patient to subject and places the former subject in the genitive case. The s-passive applies only to ditransitive stems or to η -passives of ditransitive stems. The η -passive promotes a direct

object and makes an Agent oblique; the s-passive promotes a Patient and makes a subject oblique.

Examples (37), (38), (39), and (40) are a set that provides a simple summary of the constructions discussed in this paper.

In (37) we have the basic transitive in its simplest form. No passive has applied here. The object is a zero third person Recipient and the subject is a first person Agent. An unspecified third person Patient is oblique.

- (37) ʔəŋaʔ-t-∅_cn
 give-TRVZR-3OBJ_1SUBJ
 RECIP AGT
 ‘I gave (it) to him/her’

In (38) the η-passive in its simplest form is illustrated. The subject is the first person Recipient. The third person Agent is unspecified and oblique and the Patient, as in (37), is a third person oblique and unspecified.

- (38) ʔəŋaʔ-t-əŋ_cn
 give-TRVZR-PSV_1SUBJ
 RECIP
 ‘I was given (it)’

In (39) the s-passive has applied corresponding to the active in (37). The subject is the promoted zero third person Patient, the Recipient is still the object and the Agent is in the genitive.

- (39) n-s-ʔəŋaʔ-t-∅_∅
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-3OBJ_3SUBJ
 AGT RECIP PAT
 ‘It was given to him/her by me’

In (40a) and in (28), repeated here as (40b), we have the double passive. The η-passive has applied putting the Recipient into subject position and the Agent oblique. Then the s-passive has put that derived subject into the genitive and made the Patient—zero third person in (40a) and second person in (40b)—the subject.

- (40)a. n-s-ʔóŋaʔ-t-əŋ_∅
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-PSV_3SUBJ
 RECIIP PAT
 ‘It was given to me (by him/her)’
- b. n-s-ʔóŋaʔ-t-əŋ_cx^w ʔaʔ cə nícót
 1GEN-S-give-TRVZR-PSV_2SUBJ OBL DET your father
 RECIIP PAT AGT
 ‘You were given to me by your father’

When both passives apply, the s-passive applies to a stem formed from the η-passive. The η-passive puts the Recipient into subject position, then the s-passive puts the Patient into subject position and the Recipient is oblique.

It may be that neither of what I call the η-passive and s-passive constructions is properly ‘passive’. They each deviate from the prototype. The η-passive has limitations; especially the fact that it is sometimes obligatory and has no active counterpart makes it look less like a functional passive.

The s-passive, unlike the η-passive, is structurally obligatory only in making a Patient role accessible to questioning and relativization and has no restrictions on what persons may appear in an oblique. It deviates from the prototype in that it seems to promote an oblique rather than the direct object to subject.

In any case, what has been demonstrated here is that both constructions have substantial structural and functional characteristics of passives. The two constructions may combine to form a third construction. This resulting double passive construction is highly unusual in showing two separate replacements in the subject position. As an indication of how unusual such a construction is see Postal 1986. He discusses such double passive constructions, assumes they are universally impossible, and considers the ungrammaticality of sentences such as (41) to be a consequence of a fundamental Relational/Arc Pair Grammar universal, the 1 Advancement Exclusiveness Law.

- (41) *It was been given by him by me.

Example (41) is bad because the subject has been replaced twice—once by the Recipient, then again by the Patient. Yet (41) is a

structurally literal translation of the perfectly good Klallam sentence in (40a).

My field data show that at least one other Salishan language has this construction: the closely related Northern Straits. I suspect that it can be found in other Salishan languages—at least among those languages of the coast. It would be remarkable, indeed, if a similar construction were not to be found elsewhere among the languages of the world.

References

- Demers, Richard A. 1980. The category AUX in Lummi. *ICSNL* 15.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1998. *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doak, Ivy. 1997. *Coeur d'Alene Grammatical Relations*. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Forrest, Linda B. 1994. The de-transitive clauses in Bella Coola: passive vs. inverse. In *Voice and Inversion*, T. Givón (ed.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 2006. Grammatical relations in passive clauses: a diachronic perspective. In *Passivization and Typology*, Abraham, Werner and Larisa Leisiö (eds.), 337–350.
- Gerds, Donna. 1982. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem*. UCSD PhD dissertation.
- Gerds, Donna. 1989. Object agreement in the Halkomelem Salish passive: a morphological explanation. In *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics: in Remembrance of Stanley Newman*, Mary Ritchie Key and Henry M. Hoenigswald (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hess, Thom. 1993. A Schema for the presentation of Lushootseed verb stems. In *American Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson*, ed. by A. Mattina and T. Montler. *UMOPL* No. 10. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers. 1994. Predicates and pronominal arguments in Straits Salish. *Language* 70.697-736.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1972. Relative clause formation in Malagasy. In *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause*

- Festival*, Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi, Gloria C. Phares (eds.). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1987. *Colville-Okanagan Dictionary*. UMOPL No. 5. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Montler, Timothy. 1986. *An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish*. UMOPL No. 4. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Montler, Timothy. 1993. Relative clauses and other attributive constructions in Saanich. In *American Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson*, A. Mattina and T. Montler (eds.). UMOPL, No. 10. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Montler, Timothy. 1996. Some Klallam paradigms. *ICSNL* 31.
- Montler, Timothy. 1999. Language and dialect variation in Straits Salishan. *AL* 41:462-502.
- Montler, Timothy. 2003. Auxiliaries and other categories in Straits Salishan. *IJAL* 69.2:103-134.
- Postal, Paul M. 1986. *Studies of Passive Clauses*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. *The Thompson Language*. UMOPL No. 8. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Watanabe, Honore. 2003. *A Morphological Description of Sliammon, Mainland Comox Salish*. *Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim Publications Series* A2-040.