

[Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages.
UBC 1996. pp. 257-263]
Some Klallam Paradigms

Timothy Montler
University of North Texas

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Subject
 - 2.1 Main clause nominative and ergative
 - 2.2 Subordinate clause nominative
- 3 Genitive
 - 3.1 Possessor genitive
 - 3.2 Main clause genitive inversion
 - 3.2.1 Psychological roots
 - 3.2.2 Inherent object roots
 - 3.3 Genitive passive of ditransitive stems
 - 3.4 Subordinate subjective genitive
- 4 Accusative
 - 4.1 Basic transitive
 - 4.2 Noncontrol transitive
 - 4.3 Applicatives
 - 4.3.1 Causative
 - 4.3.1.1 Subject of effect
 - 4.3.1.2 Object of effect/Imperative
 - 4.3.1.3 Locative causative
 - 4.3.2 Dative
 - 4.3.3 Aggressive
 - 4.3.4 Object of emotion
- 5 Predicative person deictics
- 6 Conclusion

1. Introduction. The purpose of this paper is to present the various transitive and intransitive paradigms of Klallam to make this data and grammatical information available preliminary to a thorough descriptive treatment. Thus this paper continues and expands upon Thompson and Thompson's 1971 'preview'.

2. Subject. In main clauses first and second persons are marked in a nominative/accusative pattern while third person is marked in an ergative/absolutive pattern. The third person absolutive is zero. Examples are found in §2.1. In subordinate clauses (§2.2) and in the genitive constructions (§3.2, 3.3, 3.4) the third person subject is marked in both transitives and intransitives.

2.1. Main clause nominative and ergative. The first and second person main clause subjects belong to a class of enclitics that also includes markers of tense and various speech act indicators such as the yes/no question and the evidential markers. The following shows the intransitive paradigm. The root is *hiyáʔ* ‘go’ :

(1)		Singular		Plural
	1st	<i>hiyáʔ cn</i>		<i>hiyáʔ st</i>
	2nd		<i>hiyáʔ cx^w</i>	
	3rd	<i>hiyáʔ</i>		

The second and third person are either singular or plural. The plural of any second person (subject, genitive, object, independent predicate) can be explicitly specified through the use of the additional enclitic *háʔ* as in *hiyáʔ cx^w háʔ* ‘y’all go’. The third person plural subject can be made explicit by taking plural morphology, usually an infix *əy ~ aʔy ~ i ~ iʔ*.

The transitive paradigms are listed in the various subsections of §4. I will give one example here to illustrate the subject. In this paradigm the basic -t transitivizer is used (§4.1) giving the predicate the meaning ‘look at her/him/it/them’:

(2)		Singular		Plural
	1st	<i>k^{wm}nt cn</i>		<i>k^{wm}nt st</i>
	2nd		<i>k^{wm}nt cx^w</i>	
	3rd	<i>k^{wm}nts</i>		

Note that this differs from the intransitive only in that the third person subject is here marked not with zero but with the suffix -s. Thompson and Thompson 1971 did not report this ergative suffix and it does not occur often. Usually when there are two third person participants the passive form is used: *k^wnⁿtəŋ*. Note also that the form *k^{wm}nts* ‘he looks at him’ is phonetically distinct from the form *k^{wm}nc* ‘look at me’. Unlike the -s ‘1st/2nd person object’ suffix (see (18) in §4.1 for example), the ergative -s does not combine with the -t transitivizer to form an affricate.

2.2. Subordinate clause nominative. In certain subordinate clauses subjects are indicated with a set of suffixes. The first and second person subordinate subjects are clearly related to the main clause subjects. It would be possible to analyze the main clause first singular and second person clitics as being composed of a *č̣* element with the suffixes *ṣ̣n* and *č̣x^w* as listed below. But this is certainly etymological rather than morphological. The *č̣* element has no identifiable function and the clitics are phoneme by phoneme cognate with the Interior Salishan intransitive subject clitics. We must presume that the **č̣ḳ* element of Proto-Salishan came from some pre-Proto-Salishan auxiliary.

The following paradigms show first a transitive example then an intransitive one. The $k^wə$ particle preceding the predicate introduces the subordinate clause and can be translated ‘if, when’ so that the first transitive form would be ‘if I see it’ and the first intransitive form would be ‘if I go.’

(3) Transitive:

	Singular	Plural
1st	$k^wə k^wmi ntn$	$k^wə k^wmi ntɬ$
2nd		$k^wə k^wmi ntɬ^w$
3rd		$k^wə k^wmi nts$

(4) Intransitive:

	Singular	Plural
1st	$k^wə hiyá?n$	$k^wə hiyá?ɬ$
2nd		$k^wə hiyá?x^w$
3rd		$k^wə hiyá?s$

3. Genitive. The genitive affixes are used in four functions. 1) On stems whose semantics allow for possession the genitive affixes indicate the person of the possessor (13.1). 2) On stems expressing emotion and those having inherent objects the affixes are part of a sort of inversion construction where the expected subject role is indicated by the genitive and the object role is indicated in the nominative or absolutive (13.2). 3) On ditransitive stems the genitive is used to mark the former subject in a second passive construction that puts the patient into subject position (13.3). 4) In certain subordinate clauses a subjective genitive is found similar to that found in many languages (13.4).

3.1. Possessor genitive. The genitive affixes are prefixes in the first person singular and second person; they are suffixes in the first person plural and third person. In the following the root is $c''t$ ‘father’. So, for example, the first form in the first row means ‘my father’.

(5)

	Singular	Plural
1st	$nc''t$	$c''tɬ$
2nd		$n'c''t$
3rd		$c''ts$

Each of the forms in (5) is actually an intransitive predicate and includes a zero third person absolutive. Thus $nc''t$ means ‘it/he is my father’, and so on. It is therefore possible to get intransitive subjects (1) with some of these:

(6)		1sGen	1pGen	2Gen	3Gen
	1sNom	-	-	n̄c"t cn	X
	1pNom	-	-	X	X
	2Nom	nc"t cx ^w	X	-	X
	3Nom	nc"t	c"t̄	n̄c"t	c"ts

The positions in (6) that are marked with a dash are semantically anomalous with this stem-first person possessing first person and second person possessing second person are not possible. The positions marked with X are semantically possible but are nevertheless nonoccurring. The expected forms are consistently and immediately rejected by all speakers, fluent and semifluent. Thus, *c"ts cn, *c"ts st, *c"ts cx^w, *c"t̄ cx^w, and *n̄c"t st are all rejected. The corresponding sense is expressed in periphrastic forms involving the predicative person deictics (15).

Although the positions in (6) marked with a dash are not possible with the stem given, it is possible to get at least some of these when the stem includes a lexical suffix. In such cases it is the referent of the lexical suffix that is interpreted as what is possessed as in (7):

- (7) n-č"q̄ = sən cn
 1gen-sprain = foot 1nom
 'I sprained my ankle.'

3.2. Main clause genitive inversion. In these constructions the genitive affixes indicate not possessors but experiencers or agents and are semantically transitive but syntactically intransitive.

The types of this construction are formally the same as the pattern shown in (6), but it seems useful to show them separately since the semantic relations are so different. There is a class of roots that semantically imply two participants but do not allow regular transitive constructions. Instead they participate in a construction similar to what has been called an inversion construction where the expected subject is in an oblique case and the expected object is in the nominative. This class can be divided into two types: roots expressing a psychological state and roots that have an inherent object.

3.2.1. Psychological roots. The first and the most common type is the root indicating a psychological state. These require two participants but are of very low semantic transitivity in that the semantic object is unaffected. Examples include the roots ʔéʔ 'like, want', x^wətín 'hate', ɣéʔc̄i 'shame', hák^w 'remember', and mim"ȳəq 'forget'. It is important to note that this class is not entirely semantically determined. There are two-participant 'psychological' roots that do not participate in this construction including ɣč 'know, figure, think', q̄^wáy 'believe', təŋʔáʔ 'crave', šít 'covet'.

In the following the root is $\lambda'é?$ 'like, want', and the meaning of the first form in the first column, for example, is 'I like you.'

(7)		1sGen	1pGen	2Gen	3Gen
	1sNom	-	-	n's $\lambda'é?$ u cn	X
	1pNom	-	-	X	X
	2Nom	ns $\lambda'é?$ cx ^w	X	-	X
	3Nom	ns $\lambda'é?$ s $\lambda'é?$ †		n's $\lambda'é?$ s $\lambda'é?$ s	

3.2.2. Inherent object roots. The second type is a small class of agent oriented roots that are not low in semantic transitivity but have the object inherent in the root meaning. Examples include the roots q"ča? 'catch (game animals)' and ?íłən 'eat (food)'. These, shown in (8), follow the same pattern as (6) and (7):

(8)		1sGen	1pGen	2Gen	3Gen
	1sNom	-	-	n'sq"ča? cn	X
	1pNom	-	-	X	X
	2Nom	nsq"ča? cx ^w	X	-	X
	3Nom	nsq"ča?	sq"ča?†	n'sq"ča?	sq"ča?s

The meaning of the first form in the first column is 'I caught you.' The forms with the zero third person nominative in the last row of (8) can be translated the same as the possessor forms so that the possessor and agent roles overlap. The last form in the first column can, thus be translated either as 'I caught it' or 'it's my catch'. The forms in (7) can only very awkwardly be translated in this way. This is merely a problem of translation. This difference is not a property of Klallam but of the English noun/verb distinction, the exact like of which is not to be found in Klallam.

The types shown illustrated in (7) and (8) differ from the possessor genitives in another way. Forms corresponding to the expected semantics of the nonoccurring third person genitive forms in (7) and (8) can be achieved by omitting the genitive suffix. That is the expected form for 'he likes me' in (7) would be *s $\lambda'é?$ s cn but this is just the meaning one gets with s $\lambda'é?$ cn and so on for the rest of the column and for the last column of (8). On the other hand, the possessor forms such as c"t cn in (6) do not give 'I am his father' but 'I am a father'.

3.3. Genitive passive of ditransitive stems. There is a small set of roots in Klallam whose semantics imply two objects—a patient and recipient or source. Unlike the stems participating in the genitive inversion constructions, these roots may participate in ordinary transitive constructions (†4). In such constructions there are two explicit pronominal arguments: the subject (nominative or ergative) is the agent and the object (accusative) is the recipient or source while the optional patient is oblique. It is also possible to derive stems with these properties using the dative applicative (†4.3.2).

These ditransitive stems, both inherent and derived, can also participate in a genitive passive construction. In this construction there are three explicit pronominal arguments: nominative (or absolutive), genitive, and accusative. In the primary form of this construction the nominative/absolutive marks the patient, the accusative marks the recipient/source, and the genitive marks the agent. This construction must be considered structurally intransitive even though it has the accusative. See §4 for full accusative paradigms.

The following examples give the general picture. In (9) the ordinary transitive form is illustrated with a root that is inherently ditransitive. The final *c* is the morphophonemic realization of the *t* transitivizer and the second person accusative (see (18) in §4.1); the *cn* is the first person nominative, and the *-əŋ* is the first passive.

- (9) a. ?"ŋa-c cn 'I give (it) to you'
 b. ?"ŋa-t cn 'I give (it) to him/her/them'
 c. ?əŋá-t-əŋ cn 'He/she/they gave (it) to me'

In (10) the genitive passive form is illustrated. Here the agent is marked by the first person genitive prefix, the recipient is marked by the second person accusative as in (9) and the patient, the actual grammatical subject, is the zero third person.

- (10) n-s-?"ŋa-c 'I give it to you'

In such constructions at least one of the participants must be third person. Since the third person is zero in both intransitive subject and object, one can only infer it. In (11) it is the recipient (rather than the patient as in (10)) that is in the third person.

- (11) n-s-?"ŋa-t ca? cx^w cə n'-tán
 1gen-s-give-trans future 2nom det 2gen-mother
 'I'll give you to your mother.'

When it is the agent that is third person and the other participants are first and second person, the first passive is required just as in the basic transitive paradigms shown in §4. In (12) it is the agent that is third person. Compare this to (10) where the patient is third person and (11) where the recipient is third person.

- (12) n-s-?"ŋa-t-əŋ cx^w ?a? cə n'-c"t
 1gen-s-give-trans-psv 2nom oblique det 2gen-father
 'Your father gave you to me'

The function of the first passive is to put the recipient into subject position; the function on the second, genitive, passive is to put the patient into subject position.

In the basic transitive the subject is agent and the primary object is recipient as in (9). In the first passive the recipient becomes the subject while the agent, if mentioned, becomes oblique:

- (13) ʔəŋá-t-əŋ cɣ^w ʔaʔ cə n'c"t.
 give-trans-psv 2nom obl det your father
 'You were given (it) by your father.'

In the genitive passive it is the patient that becomes the subject while the displaced subject is in the genitive. In (12) both passives are found. The first passive has applied to put the recipient in subject position then the second passive puts the patient in subject position and moves the recipient subject to the genitive.

3.4. Subordinate subjective genitive. The genitive person markers are used as subjects in certain subordinate clauses. This construction is similar to the subjective genitives found in English and other languages. In these cases there seems to be no restriction on roots. Examples (14) and (15) are typical; one can change the genitive affix here to any of those given in (5) and get a corresponding change of meaning. Note that the form nshiyáʔ cannot occur as the main predicate since hiyáʔ 'go' does not fit into either of the classes shown in §3.2.

- (14) ʔ"y' či n-s-hiyáʔ.
 good det 1gen-s-go
 'I should go (lit. 'it's good that I go' or 'my going is good')'

- (15) ʔ"y' či s-hiyáʔ-s.
 good det s-go-3gen
 'He/she/it/they should go.'

It is also possible to get transitive forms. In these forms the third person subordinate subject is marked in both transitive and intransitive forms with the s third person genitive.

- (16) ʔ"y' či n-s-k^{wm}n-n--ŋə
 good det 1gen-s-see-trans-2acc
 'It's good that I see you.'

- (17) ʔ"y' či s-k^{wm}n-n--ŋə-s
 good det s-see-trans-2acc-3gen
 'It's good that he/she/it/they see you.'

4. Accusative. There are basically two morphologically conditioned object sets as there are in almost all Salishan languages-an s-set and an m-set. The s-set involves

an /s/ in the first and second person singular suffixes and occurs with the basic transitivizer (14.1) and with the causative (14.3.1) and dative (14.3.2) applicatives. The m-set involves an /ŋ/ in the first and second person singular suffixes and occurs in the non-control transitivizer (14.2) and in the locative (14.3.3), aggressive (14.3.4), and object of emotion (14.3.6) applicatives.

4.1. Basic transitive. The basic transitivizer, also called the control transitivizer, has the form nt and is cognate with the nt transitivizer of Interior Salishan languages. In unmarked active constructions this transitivizer indicates a controlling agent subject and an object whose semantic role is determined by the inherent semantics of the root. The object is thus typically a patient but in inherent ditransitives (see 13.3 especially (9)) the object is recipient or source.

In this paradigm the third person object is zero and the first and second person objects are homophonous. The /s/ of the objects merge with the /t/ of the transitivizer to yield /c/. This is not a general phonological process in Klallam. Note that the /s/ of the ergative suffix does not combine with the /t/ of this transitivizer (see (3)) nor does the /s/ of the third person genitive merge with a preceding /t/ (see (5)). When the agent is third person and the patient first or second person, the passive construction is required.

In (18) the complete subject/object paradigm is illustrated. The root is $k^w\text{an}$; with this transitivizer the stem is glossed ‘look at’.

(18)

Subj/Obj	1	1pl	2	3
1	-	-	$k^w\text{nc cn}$	$k^w\text{nt cn}$
1pl	-	-	$k^w\text{nc st}$	$k^w\text{nt st}$
2	$k^w\text{nc cx}^w$	$k^w\text{nt-ŋt cx}^w$	-	$k^w\text{nt cx}^w$
3	$(k^w\text{nt}\text{əŋ cn})$	$(k^w\text{nt}\text{əŋ st})$	$(k^w\text{nt}\text{əŋ cx}^w)$	$k^w\text{nts}$

4.2. Non-control transitive. The non-control transitivizer has the form náx^w if stressed, ná if stressed and followed by any suffix, n if unstressed and followed by any suffix, or nəx^w otherwise. This suffix indicates the presence of a patient (or recipient/source in ditransitives) and an agent that is not in conscious control. The agent is acting either with effort to finally manage to succeed or without effort and volition. The semantic difference between this and the basic transitivizer in 14.1 can be partially seen in the difference between English ‘look’ and ‘see’.

This transitivizer is followed by the m-set object suffixes. Unlike the s-set suffixes illustrated in (18), the first and second persons are distinguished in the m-set. In (19) the complete subject/object paradigm is illustrated. Here the root is the same as that in (18); with this transitivizer the stem is glossed ‘see’.

(19)

Subj/Obj	1	1pl	2	3
1	-	-	kʷnn-ŋə cnkʷnnəxʷ cn	
1pl	-	-	kʷnn-ŋə st kʷnnəxʷ st	
2	kʷnn-ŋəs cxʷ	kʷnn-ŋɬ cxʷ	-	kʷnnəxʷ cxʷ
3	(kʷnnəŋ cn)	(kʷnnəŋ st)	(kʷnnəŋ cxʷ)	kʷnnəs

4.3. Applicatives. Perhaps the six special transitivity morphemes included in this section should not all be lumped together. And perhaps they do not all fit in a category of what is traditionally termed applicative. In any case, what they have in common is that they signal that the participant indicated by the object morphology has a marked semantic relation.

4.3.1. Causative. There are three causative morphemes. The forms are $\dot{\text{istx}}^w$, tx^w , and -as. The first two are probably related, but at present there is no independent evidence for a separate $\dot{\text{is}}$ suffix. In both suffixes the x^w is absent when followed by other suffixes as it is in the non-control (14.2) and object of emotion (14.3.6) suffixes.

4.3.1.1. Subject of effect. The most common causative is $\dot{\text{istx}}^w$. This transitivity marker usually occurs with the s-set objects, but one speaker accepts either the m-set or the s-set with this transitivity marker. The participant indicated in the object suffix is a causee that is the subject of the effect. The causee in this construction is usually, though not necessarily, animate.

The vowel of this suffix reduces to schwa or is deleted when unstressed. As with the basic transitivity marker (14.1) the t of this suffix merges with the s of the first and second person objects to form an affricate c.

In (20) the root is $k^w\text{ən}$, which with this suffix produces a stem meaning ‘show’. Note that in this paradigm as in the others the combinations of third person subject with first and second person objects require the passive. There is also no occurrence in the data of the ergative in this paradigm. Thus, the combination of third person subject with third person object is also in the passive. Repeated attempts with various speakers to elicit the ergative in this paradigm have failed. Although in all paradigms the ergative affix is rare compared to the passive when both participants are third person, the ergative with the basic and non-control transitivity markers, in contrast with the causatives, does occasionally appear in texts and it is fairly easy to elicit.

(20)

Subj/Obj	1	1pl	2	3
1	-	-	kʷnisc cn	kʷnistxʷ cn
1pl	-	-	kʷnisc st	kʷnistxʷ st
2	kʷnisc cxʷ	kʷnist-ŋɬ cxʷ	-	kʷnistxʷ cxʷ
3	(kʷnistəŋ cn)	(kʷnistəŋ st)	(kʷnistəŋ cxʷ)	(kʷnistəŋ)

4.3.1.2. Object of effect/imperative. The second causative is is^{w} . Unlike the is^{w} causative, this transitivizer occurs with the m-set objects. Functionally it contrasts with the -istx^{w} causative in that this suffix indicates a causee that is the object of the effect and is thus usually inanimate as in hiyá? ‘go’, $\text{hiyá?tx}^{\text{w}}$ ‘take’.

The primary difference between is^{w} and tx^{w} is illustrated in (21).

- (21) a. $\text{ʔčistx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn} \quad \text{cə sn}^{\text{w}}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\text{ɬ}$ ‘I sank the canoe’
 b. $\text{ʔčtx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn} \quad \text{cə sn}^{\text{w}}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\text{ɬ}$ ‘I made the canoe deep’

The root here is ʔč ‘deep, below, under’, and either (21a) or (21b) could be translated ‘I caused the canoe to become deep’. (21b) can only mean that the canoe has been carved deep. In (21a) the canoe is the subject of the ‘deepening’ effect while in (21b) the canoe is the object of the effect. The pattern of uninterpretability shown in (22) also illustrates this difference.

- (22) a. $\text{ʔčistx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn} \quad \text{cə sɲant}$ ‘I sank the rock’
 b. $\text{*ʔčtx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn} \quad \text{cə sɲant}$
 c. $\text{ʔčtx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn} \quad \text{cə šx}^{\text{w}}\text{c}^{\text{w}}\text{y}^{\text{w}}\text{q}^{\text{w}}\text{əŋ}$ ‘I made the hole deep’
 d. $\text{*ʔčistx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn} \quad \text{cə šx}^{\text{w}}\text{c}^{\text{w}}\text{y}^{\text{w}}\text{q}^{\text{w}}\text{əŋ}$

On the stems mentioned in 4.3.2.2, which have an inherent object and require an animate subject, such as ʔifən ‘eat’, it forms a special ‘let’ imperative. This difference between is^{w} and tx^{w} is illustrated in (23) where the causee must be animate.

- (23) a. $\text{ʔəfənistx}^{\text{w}}$ ‘feed him/her/it/them’
 b. $\text{ʔifəntx}^{\text{w}}$ ‘let him/her/it/them eat’
 c. $\text{ʔəfənistx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn}$ ‘I feed him/her/it/them’
 d. $\text{*ʔifəntx}^{\text{w}} \text{cn}$

The imperative is usually indicated, as in English, by the absence of an overt subject. The ungrammaticality of forms like (23d) was confirmed by attempted elicitation from different speakers and from same speakers at widely different times. This last

example shows that where the causee must be animate the t^w form can only be imperative.

In (24) the stem allows for an inanimate causee. In such cases the t^w form has two readings-one a ‘let’ imperative and one a simple causative.

- (24) a. hiyá?tx^w ‘let him/her/it/them go (somewhere)’ or
‘take it (somewhere)’
- b. $\text{hiyá?tx}^w \text{ cn}$ ‘I take it (somewhere)’ or
‘I put him/her (somewhere)’

Consultants insist that (24b) cannot mean ‘I take him/her’, a sense which would be expressed using a different root meaning ‘accompany’. If the object of (24b) is animate, especially human, the interpretation is with ‘put’ and the person is seen as being treated as an inanimate object of the effect.

In (25) the full paradigm for the stem shown in (24) is given. In this paradigm as in (20) the only form recorded for third person subject and object was a passive.

(25)

Subj/Obj	1	1pl	2	3
1	-	-	$\text{hiya?t-}\eta\text{ə cn}$	$\text{hiyá?tx}^w \text{ cn}$
1pl	-	-	$\text{hiya?t-}\eta\text{ə st}$	$\text{hiyá?tx}^w \text{ st}$
2	$\text{hiya?t-}\eta\text{əs cx}^w$	$\text{hiya?t-}\eta\text{ł cx}^w$ -	$\text{hiyá?tx}^w \text{ cx}^w$	
3	$(\text{hiyá?tə}\eta \text{ cn})$	$(\text{hiyá?tə}\eta \text{ st})$	$(\text{hiyá?tə}\eta \text{ cx}^w)$	$(\text{hiyá?tə}\eta)$

4.3.1.3. Locative causative. The locative causative has the form t^w as when stressed and $\text{t}^w\text{əs}$ or t^ws when unstressed. This affix occurs only on a few roots, most of which have inherent locative semantics. The following is a complete list of roots the locative applicative has been found on: yəx^w ‘release’, ɬuy ‘leave’, nəw ‘be in’, səq ‘be out’, čəyəx^w ‘enter’, k^wan ‘lose’, k^way ‘hide’, čač ‘chase’, cak^w ‘be down’, čan ‘move’, čuk^w ‘use’, $\text{x}^w\text{ək}^w$ ‘be low, be down’, $\text{ɬə}\eta$ ‘remove’.

Given the meaning of the root, most of the time this suffix seems to function as a transitivizer no different from the basic -t transitivizer or the - tx^w causative. There are however cases where it contrasts with the basic transitivizer and with the object of effect causative. This contrast shows that the presence of this suffix indicates that the direct object is caused to be at a particular location. Examples (26) through (29) show this contrast.

- (26) a. $\text{čix}^w\text{ás cn}$ ‘I took/brought it in (there)’
- b. $\text{č}^w\text{yəx}^w\text{tx}^w \text{ cn}$ ‘I let/made it enter’

- (27) a. k^wáyəs cn ‘I hid it (there)’
 b. k^wáyət cn ‘I hid it away’
- (28) a. čánəs cn ‘I moved it (there)’
 b. čánət^w cn ‘I moved it (somewhere)’
- (29) a. yəx^wás cn ‘I undid it’
 b. yəx^wıt cn ‘I freed it’

In these examples the locative causative appears in the a sentences and contrasts with one of the other transitivity markers in the b sentences. In (26) through (28) the semantic contrast is clear. Example (29) needs some explanation.

In (29a) the meaning seems to be ‘I freed it by doing something at a particular location.’ The word yəx^wás is thus usually translated as ‘untie’ or ‘unlatch’. In (29b) there is no particular location. This difference comes out more clearly when a specific object is mentioned as in (30).

- (30) a. yəx^wás cn cə x^wé?ləm ‘I untied (a knot in) the rope’
 b. yəx^wıt cn cə x^wé?ləm ‘I let the rope loose’

This transitivity marker uses a modified version of the m-set objects. Unlike the m-set objects used in (19) and (25) there is no /-/ but in its place is /ŋ/. As in the other applicative paradigms the ergative does not occur; the passive is required when there is a third person agent. In the following paradigm the root is the same as that in (29) and (30).

(31)

Subj/Obj	1	1pl	2	3
1	-	-	yəx ^w əŋíŋə cn	yəx ^w ás cn
1pl	-	-	yəx ^w əŋíŋə st	yəx ^w ás st
2	yəx ^w əŋíŋəs cx ^w	yəx ^w əŋíŋɪ cx ^w -	yəx ^w ás cx ^w	
3	(yəx ^w áŋ cn)	(yəx ^w áŋ st)	(yəx ^w áŋ cx ^w)	(yəx ^w áŋ)

4.3.2. Dative. The dative applicative has the form [̀]si. This form may actually be composed of two morphemes: [̀]si ‘dative’ and the [̀]t ‘basic transitivity marker’. However, the objects with this form, although using the s-set, deviate from those of the simple basic transitivity marker. Note the first and second person objects in (32), [̀]sícəŋ, and compare them with the objects in (18), [̀]c. The presence of the [̀]əŋ is unexpected if

this applicative included the basic transitivizer. Some speakers can, indeed, get forms such as $k^w n\acute{s}ic\ c\acute{n}$ in more or less free variation with, but preferring, the 1/2 form given in (32). Other speakers get only the forms shown in (32). As in the causative paradigms, the ergative does not occur at all. Unlike the basic and non-control transitivizers, the presence of a third person agent requires the passive.

The presence of this affix creates a ditransitive stem with a recipient/beneficiary/source direct object and an implied patient. Stems with this applicative include $\acute{x}e\?s\acute{i}t$ ‘write (something) to someone’ and $q\acute{a}m\acute{s}\acute{i}t$ ‘beg (something) from someone’. In (32) the root is the same as in (18), (19), and (20). Here the stem meaning is ‘look at (something) for someone’; the first form in the first column, for example, means ‘You look at (something) for me.’

(32)

Subj/Obj	1		1pl		2		3
1	-		-		$k^w n\acute{s}ic\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{n}$		$k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\ c\acute{n}$
1pl	-		-		$k^w n\acute{s}ic\acute{a}\eta\ s\acute{t}$		$k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\ s\acute{t}$
2	$k^w n\acute{s}ic\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{x}^w$	$k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\text{-}\eta\acute{t}\ c\acute{x}^w\text{-}$			$k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\ c\acute{x}^w$		
3	$(k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{n})$	$(k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\acute{a}\eta\ s\acute{t})$	$(k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{x}^w)$		$(k^w n\acute{s}i\acute{t}\acute{a}\eta)$		

4.3.4. Aggressive. The form of this morpheme is $\acute{s}^n\acute{n}\acute{s}$ and does not vary. It occurs only on some roots of motion and location. It has been found, so far, only on the following roots: $n\acute{a}w$ ‘be in’, $\acute{c}\acute{a}y\acute{x}^w$ ‘enter’, $\?-\acute{x}^w$ ‘go to’, $h\acute{i}y\acute{a}\?$ ‘go’, $\?n\?a$ ‘come’, $t\acute{a}\acute{c}\acute{i}$ ‘arrive here’, and $k^w n\acute{a}\eta\eta\acute{u}t$ ‘run’.

The presence of this transitivizer indicates that the direct object is approached by an agent with a particular intent. The usual interpretation is that the intent is hostile. This can be seen in the glosses in (33) through (35)

(33) $\acute{c}\acute{i}x^w n^s\ c\acute{n}$ ‘I barged in on him/her/them’

(34) $\acute{c}\acute{i}x^w n^s\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{n}$ ‘They barged in on me’

(35) $\?n\?a\acute{n}\acute{s}\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{n}\ \?a\? \ c\acute{a}\ s\acute{q}\acute{a}\acute{x}\acute{a}\?$ ‘The dog came at me’

Out of context speakers gloss the form in (35) as given and feel that it means that the dog is attacking. But this form also appears in a story where the dog is coming to rescue a person. Other examples of this suffix are not interpreted as hostile intent:

(36) $t\acute{c}\acute{i}n\acute{s}\ c\acute{n}$ ‘I got here for (to get) him’

(37) $t\acute{c}\acute{i}n\acute{s}\acute{a}\eta\ c\acute{n}$ ‘He got here for me (e.g. to take me somewhere)’

(38) k^wənəŋ-tnəs cn ‘I ran after it’

Only third person objects occur with this applicative and any third person agent requires the passive. In order to specify a first or second person object a fairly rare periphrastic form is used with the first and second person predicative deictics (15). The basic pattern is shown in (39).

(39) ʔənʔánəs cn ʔaʔ n^wk^w ‘I came for you’

4.3.5. Object of emotion. The basic form of this transitivizer is -tax^w. This morpheme has not been found in many contexts. In general this indicates that the direct object is the object of an emotion expressed in the meaning of the root and felt by the subject. Its form is similar to the causatives (§4.3.1.1, 4.3.1.2), but it differs from them in three ways.

First, the form of the objects differs. This takes the m-set objects but has stressed /á/ rather than the /-/ of the -tx^w causative. Compare the paradigms (25) and (40).

Second, the resulting meaning is quite different. The object is not a causee in this construction. When added to the root ʔəy ‘good’ the result is not ‘cause to be good’ but ‘enjoy, feel good toward’. When added to xəl ‘hurt’ the result means not ‘cause to hurt’ but ‘feel bad for’.

Third, the ergative does occur in this paradigm. As in the basic (18) and noncontrol (19) transitivizer paradigms and unlike all of the other applicatives the ergative -s marks the subject in the 3/3 slot in the paradigm. As in all the other transitive paradigms the passive is required in the 3/1 and 3/2 slots.

The following paradigm involves the root ʔəy ‘good’, which becomes ʔiʔ when unstressed. The resulting stem means ‘enjoy, feel good toward’. The forms with second person subjects are acceptable only as questions so that the first form in the first column means ‘Do you enjoy/feel good toward me.’

(40)

Subj/Obj	1	1pl	2	3
1	-	-	ʔiʔtájə cn	ʔiʔtáx ^w cn
1pl	-	-	ʔiʔtájə st	ʔiʔtáx ^w st
2	ʔiʔtájəs u cx ^w	ʔiʔtájł u cx ^w	-	ʔiʔtáx ^w u cx ^w
3	(ʔiʔtáj cn)	(ʔiʔtáj st)	(ʔiʔtáj cx ^w)	ʔiʔtás

5. Predicative person deictics. In the previous sections the paradigms given show the affixes of person reference. The paradigm in (41) shows the set of roots having person reference. These forms are actually intransitive predicates meaning, for example, ‘it is I’. They can be transitivized using the -tx^w imperative causative so that, for example, ʔ^wctx^w means ‘let me (do it)’, but transitivized they cannot take object suffixes.

(41)		Singular	Plural
	1st	ʔ ^w c	ʔnɪŋʔ
	2nd	n ^w k ^w	
	3rd	nɪʔ	nənɪʔiyə

6. Conclusion. This paper presents the various person paradigms found in the Klallam language. Details of the morphophonemics, function, and distribution of the constructions require further study.

reference

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: a preview. In Jesse Sawyer, ed. *Studies in American Indian Languages*. UCPL.