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1 Introduction

Franz Boas, in his 1947 grammar of K’aḵwala, identifies a set of passive suffixes used to make syntactic subjects from various non-subject arguments. This paper furthers our understanding of K’aḵwala passivizing morphosyntax with an analysis of the syntactic and semantic factors determining the distribution of passive morphemes. After some background on the language and its grammar, I present an overview of the multiple passivizing morphemes available to K’aḵwala speakers and describe the function of each passive suffix. I compare the syntactic alignment of pronominal arguments with that of lexical arguments, and explore the various discourse motivations for passive constructions. Discussion and conclusions follow.¹

2 Background

2.1 Speakers and Location

Figure 1: The Wakashan, Chimakuan, and Salishan Families (adapted from Suttles 1990:ix)

¹ This research was made possible by the support of the Phillips Fund for Native American Research, the Jacobs Research Fund, the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program, and Robert Oswalt Fund for Research on Endangered Languages. I gratefully acknowledge the wisdom, humor and patience of the elders who have shared their knowledge of K’aḵwala with me: Lillian Johnny, Beverly Lagis, Gertrude Robertson, Daisy Sewid Smith, and Spruce Wamiss. I am also grateful to Bernard Comrie, Marianne Mithun, Patricia A. Shaw, and Sandra A. Thompson for their generous and insightful feedback. All errors are my own.
Kʷakʷula (Wakashan, KWK), formerly identified as Kwakiutl\(^2\), is the language of the Kʷakʷala nation located on Northern Vancouver Island and the neighboring mainland of British Columbia. It is severely endangered, with approximately 190 fluent speakers remaining.\(^3\)

The data discussed here are drawn primarily from Boas and Hunt’s documentation of the language in grammar, dictionary, and texts from 1893 to 1948, as well as some elicited data published by Levine in 1980, and a few examples from recent fieldwork (2008-present). This analysis should be understood as referring primarily to the language as spoken in the years between 1895-1980.\(^4\) Before we proceed to a description of passive constructions in Kʷakʷula, the next section provides an overview of grammar relevant to voice and valence, emphasizing patterns of alignment and reference tracking.

### 2.2 Grammatical Overview

This section provides an introduction to the grammatical structure of Kʷakʷula clauses and argument structure. First, a word about lexical classes: Kʷakʷula belongs to the Pacific Northwest Sprachbund for which the appropriateness of lexical classes such as ‘noun’ and ‘verb’ has been questioned (Jacobsen 1979; Kinkade 1983). In this paper, I assume that Kʷakʷula nouns and verbs exist as syntactic categories, defined according to derivational and inflectional marking in the context of the clause. The question of their status in the lexicon is more complex and will be set aside. A few derivational suffixes are specific to predicates, while others are restricted to arguments, but as Boas says: “[a]ny ‘verb’ preceded by an article is a noun … and any noun with predicative endings is a verb …” (Boas 1947:280). To avoid confusion, I will usually refer to predicates and arguments rather than verbs and nouns.\(^5\)

Kʷakʷula is polysynthetic.\(^6\) The language employs three core argument cases and one oblique case. Alignment of both lexical and pronominal arguments is thoroughly nominative-accusative. For this reason, I use the terms ‘subject’ and ‘object’ in a syntactically-constrained sense, to describe the grouping of single arguments of intransitive predicates (‘S’ in the sense used by

---

\(^2\) ‘Kwakiutl’, an anglicized orthographic representation of the name Kʷaguʔt, applies only to the band at Fort Rupert (Caygis) with which Franz Boas and George Hunt did most of their documentation. There are 16 bands in the Kʷakʷakʷakʷ nation and 5 dialects, each with their own name. Some bands prefer the alternate language name bakʷamkala. I use Kʷakʷala here to refer to all dialects.


\(^4\) Future work examines the use of passive constructions in new corpora gathered from 2008-present, comparing and contrasting this with earlier documentation. Examples from 2008 were gathered during the InField 2008 at UCSB, in the course “Kʷakʷala Field Training” with Patricia A. Shaw, Beverly Lagis, and Daisy Sewid Smith, made possible by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Aboriginal Strategic Research Grant to Patricia A. Shaw.

\(^5\) Referring to the lexicon, Boas comments that “[s]trictly speaking there are only three classes of words: predicative terms, syntactic particles which define the function of predicative terms, and exclamatory forms. Not withstanding the occurrence of nominalizing suffixes there is no clearcut distinction between noun and verb. Any “verb” preceded by an article is a noun … and any ‘noun’ with predicative endings is a verb. Stems are neither nominal nor verbal. A division may be made between stems of static and active meaning” (Boas 1947:280). In contrast to Boas’ use of the terms active/stative to describe a semantic contrast between stems, the term active is used in this paper for constructions which lack passive morphosyntax.

\(^6\) The term ‘polysynthetic’ refers here to the encoding of core arguments on the verb, allowing a single phonetic word to serve as a complete clause, as well as the language’s rich morphological resources, which combine in morphologically complex words.
Comrie 1978 and Dixon 1979) with the ‘A’ (actor or agent) argument of a transitive or ditransitive predicate, as opposed to the ‘P’ (most patient-like argument) of a transitive predicate. The three core argument types are identified here as ‘SUBJECT’ (S), ‘PRIMARY OBJECT’ (O₁), and ‘SECONDARY OBJECT’ (O₂). These terms correspond with Boas’ terms ‘subject’, ‘object’, and ‘instrumental’ (Boas 1947) and with Levine’s terms ‘subject’, ‘object’, and ‘oblique’ (Levine 1980).

My use of the terms ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ for Kwa’kala objects departs from previous traditions in order to avoid the use of the term ‘oblique’ for what I analyze as a third core argument, and to emphasize the core status of secondary objects. Paradigms of pronominal and adnominal enclitics exist for each of the three core arguments — subjects, primary objects, and secondary objects — while non-core arguments occur in prepositional phrases at the end of a clause. Boas and Levine refer to these prepositionally-marked arguments as ‘indirect’ (Boas 1947:206), but I reserve the term ‘OBLIQUE’ (OBL) for non-core arguments. Boas distinguishes between ‘prenominal’ and ‘postnominal’ adnominal case marking of lexical arguments; this paper adopts both terms.

Pragmatically-neutral phrases are predicate-initial, with ‘VSO’ word order. Predicates are distinguishable by their position at the front of the clause, the encliticized flagging of core pronominal arguments, and/or the adnominal marking of lexical subjects, and in some cases the use of derivational suffixes specific to predicate forms. Lexically-specified arguments are case-marked with preceding pronominal enclitics and deictic demonstratives (which, like case-marking, are phonologically grouped with the preceding constituent). A clause with three lexically-specified core arguments is presented below.

(1)

```
hónlędida
hón-l-?id=i=da
shoot-PST-MOM=SBJ=DEF
V
S
1

bágwánomaxa
bágwánoma=χa
man=OBJ1
S
O1

χayísaxa
χayí=sa
black.bear=OBJ2
O1
O2

hónłəmii
hónłəm-i
gun-T.DEM

The man shot the black bear with a gun.’ (Shaw: 2008_07_21_003DS)
```

Arrows direct our attention to the marking of lexical arguments on the preceding constituent with enclitics; in this case, the subject bágwánom ‘man’ is marked with the pronominal enclitic =i, the lexical primary object χayí ‘black bear’ with pronominal enclitic =χ(a), and the lexical secondary object hónłəm ‘gun’ with the pronominal enclitic =s(a) (and the third-person postnominal sentence-final =i). The general shape of pronominal primary-object-marking is a set of variations on =χ(a), and for pronominal secondary object markers on =s(a). Meanwhile, pronominal object-marking tends to include the uvular stop -q for primary objects and again the -s for secondary objects. Based on these shapes, I will sometimes refer to ‘χ-marking’ and ‘s-marking’ to discuss differences between primary and secondary objects. As we will see in section 3.1, these two object cases are also consistently distinguished through the use of different passive morphemes:

---

7 Following the tradition of labeling the primary agent or actor of a transitive verb with ‘A’ and the object argument of the transitive as ‘P’ (Comrie 1978).
8 The forms =χ(a) and =s(a) vary to reflect features of deixis and visibility; complete sets of related forms are provided in the appendix.
-su? for primary object and -ayu, -ano, and -əm for secondary objects.

A simple clause with specified lexical arguments has VS(O₁)(O₂)(X) order, with V representing a singly- or multiply-expressed predicate, S representing the subject, O₁ representing the primary object, O₂ representing the secondary object, and X representing an oblique argument in a prepositional phrase. The sequence of pronominal enclitics attached to the predicate corresponds directly with the VSO₁O₂ sequence of lexical arguments in a clause for which all three arguments are explicit. Thus one can form a complete transitive or ditransitive clause with a single prosodic word as in (2) and (3) below.

(2) ˈniːkənləaq
  ˈniːk =ən(ˈ) =aq
  say =1s.SBJ =3.OBJ1
  I said to him… (B1947:281, CX12.9)

(3) ˈχəsʔidəqs
  ˈχəsʔid(ə) =Ø =q =s
  strike-MOM =3.SBJ =3.OBJ1 =3.OBJ2
  He struck him with it. (B1947:281)

In example (2), the predicate ˈniːk- ‘to say’ encodes both the first-person singular subject =ən(ˈ) and the third-person primary object (O₁) =aq. In example (3), the third-person subject (S) is marked with a zero-morpheme =Ø, while both third-person primary (O₁) and secondary (O₂) objects are encoded on the verb with =q and =s, respectively. Returning to example (1), the prenominal SUBJECT marker =i (and definite marker =da) attach to the predicate stem ˈhən-l-ʔid- ‘shoot-PST-MOM’ preceding the lexical subject ˈbəɡʔanəm(a) ‘man’. The prenominal PRIMARY OBJECT enclitic =χa precedes the lexical primary object ˈbəɡʔanəm ‘man’ and the prenominal SECONDARY OBJECT enclitic =sa precedes the lexical secondary object ˈhənəm ‘gun’. The postnominal distal demonstrative form =i follows ˈhənəm. By comparing examples (2) and (3) with example (1), we can see that third person pronominal enclitics are in complementary distribution with lexical arguments. The domain of attachment for pronominal enclitics is the predicate, but in cases with multiply-expressed predicates, pronominal clitics can be distributed; the subject pronominal enclitic may attach to the first (auxiliary) predicate, and the object pronominals or prenominals may attach to the second predicate.⁹ See also examples (6) and (13). With lexical arguments, the prenominal demonstrative forms occur attached to the predicate or preceding element and specify deictic information about the following lexical arguments.

It is useful, while considering a dual-object system, to mention the connection between argument structure and typologies of ditransitive alignment. The valence of a Kʷakʷala predicate stem is lexically determined, and can be increased or decreased with derivational affixes. Some Kʷakʷala stems are inherently transitive and can take objects, while others are inherently intransitive and do not take objects (Boas 1947:280). This is true of English verbs as well: say can take two non-subject arguments, the thing-said and the recipient (the person to whom something is said); for English, the thing-said is marked as a DIRECT OBJECT and the recipient of

⁹ Because the third-person subject pronominal marker is -Ø, and because the initial discourse markers are in the process of grammaticalizing (only sometimes taking person-marking inflection), it is not always clear how to interpret where the third-person subject enclitic attaches.
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a statement as an INDIRECT OBJECT in a prepositional phrase (‘I said hello to him’). The \( K^\text{wakwala} \) stem \( ñik- \), translated as ‘say’ by Boas (1948:243), has a different argument structure. The recipient is the PRIMARY OBJECT of this stem, while the theme (the thing said) is marked as a SECONDARY OBJECT (see (21)).

Languages such as \( K^\text{wakwala} \) for which recipients of a ditransitive predicate are consistently marked in the same way as the single object of a transitive verb have been described as having secundative alignment, in contrast with indirective languages for which the theme of a ditransitive predicate groups with the single object of a transitive verb, as is the case for the English ditransitive verb say (Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie 2010:3). Many of \( K^\text{wakwala} \)’s ditransitive predicates of transfer such as \( ðåqala- \) ‘to name’, \( ðów- \) ‘to give’, and \( ðälåqa- \) ‘to pay’ follow a secundative pattern, as do stems describing communicative events such as \( ñik- \) ‘say’, \( ðøð- \) ‘ask’ and \( ðiða- \) ‘invite, call’.

Surprisingly, predicates of motion such as \( qaś- \) ‘to walk’ and \( siw- \) ‘to paddle’ — which are intransitive in English — are transitive in \( K^\text{wakwala} \), with the destination marked as PRIMARY OBJECT. Although we might think of ‘walk’ as an intransitive verb which (in English) would take oblique arguments indicating destination (I walk to the store) or accompaniment (I walk with my brother), this is not the case for the \( K^\text{wakwala} \) stem \( qaś- \). In an active construction, the primary object of the predicate \( qaś- \) ‘walk’ has a predictable interpretation as the goal or destination. For example, see (4) (also (29) and (30)).

(4)  Active: \( qaś- \) ‘walk’ with PRIMARY OBJECT destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>PRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ðæ )</td>
<td>( ðåqåli )</td>
<td>( qaśtuwixå )(^{12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ðæ )</td>
<td>( ðåqåli )</td>
<td>( qaś-(?i)d-o=(i)xå )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well, then it is said walk-MOM-away-\( \text{OBJ1}=T.\text{DEM} \) light-T.\( \text{DEM} \)

Well, then it is said, he walked toward the light. (B1906, III1.4)

The labelling of objects as ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ thus also reflects the typological profile of ditransitive constructions in \( K^\text{wakwala} \), and acknowledges some resonance with the systems discussed for other languages by Dryer (1986) and Genetti (1997).\(^{13}\) Recognizing the secundative pattern of alignment in \( K^\text{wakwala} \) exposes the syntactic properties of some of language’s passive suffixes, allowing us to identify a persistent contrast between the passive suffix \(-suñ\), which promotes primary objects, and the suffixes \(-ayu\), \(-ano\), and \(-óm\), which promote secondary objects. These are described in 3.1.

In contrast to the three core arguments (SBJ, OBJ1, OBJ2), OBLIQUE arguments are indicated in a prepositional phrase, constructed from a small set of grammaticalized predicates including \( la- \) ‘go’ and \( gaxñ- \) ‘come’, combined with deictically-appropriate demonstratives indicating

---

\(^{10}\) For this reason, it may be more appropriate to translate \( ñik- \) with the English verb ‘tell’, for which the recipient is also marked as a direct object. Thanks to Marianne Mithun for pointing this out.

\(^{11}\) English, like many languages, has different alignment patterns for different verbs.

\(^{12}\) Here, as in all examples, the morphophonemic parsing provided in the second line of each example follows the rules governing fusion of phonological segments as identified by Boas in his 1947 grammar (Boas 1947:210-215)

\(^{13}\) ‘Primary object’ and ‘secondary object’ are used here to refer only to morphosyntactic alignment in \( K^\text{wakwala} \) grammar, not to the cross-linguistic generalizations proposed by Dryer in comparing direct/indirect object systems with primary/secondary object systems (Dryer 1986).
proximity, visibility, and (sometimes) possession. In example (5), the preposition la- includes prenominal \( =\chi \) marking the argument guk\(^w\) ‘house\(^1\) and the third-person possessive enclitic \( =i\) (specifically, the form used for referents which are both invisible and distal).

(5) Prepositional phrase marking OBL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ1</th>
<th>OBJ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{kwa}^{\circ}\text{it}=\text{la} )</td>
<td>Xatican</td>
<td>la( =\chi )</td>
<td>guk(^w)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{kwa}^{\circ}\text{it} )</td>
<td>Xatican</td>
<td>la( =\chi )</td>
<td>guk(^w)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit-in.house-CONT=SBJ</td>
<td>Xatican (NAME)</td>
<td>PREP=OBJ1=3.POSS house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Xatican was sitting in his house. (B1947:282, ClII 2.1)

As is true for many languages, certain types of lexical arguments in Kwak’ala, such as places, are predictably oblique in active clauses.

Pronominal and prenominal flagging on the predicate and adnominal case-marking on arguments allow referent-tracking at a high level of detail. We, as well as Kwak’ala speakers themselves, can thus confidently interpret the argument structure of most passivized predicates. Table 1 provides a table of pronominal and prenominal paradigms in order to enable readers to track referents in active and passive examples. Both sets of enclitics express an almost complete set of distinctions between subject (S), primary object (O\(_1\)) and secondary object (O\(_2\)), with the exception of the first-person forms (discussed below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>OBJ1</th>
<th>OBJ2</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>OBJ1</th>
<th>OBJ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>=( \text{n(( \chi ))} )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=( \text{n(( \chi ))} )</td>
<td>=( \text{i} )</td>
<td>=( \chi )</td>
<td>=( s )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>=( \text{n(?s} )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=( \text{n(?s} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>=( \text{nur(( \chi ))} )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=( \text{nur(( \chi ))} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>=( i )</td>
<td>=( \chi )</td>
<td>=( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{\text{ND}})</td>
<td>=( \text{s} )</td>
<td>=( u(( \chi ))</td>
<td>=( \text{us} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>=( i )</td>
<td>=( \chi )</td>
<td>=( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{\text{RD}})</td>
<td>=( \text{O} )</td>
<td>=( q )</td>
<td>=( s )</td>
<td>=( i )</td>
<td>=( \chi )</td>
<td>=( s )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Verbal enclitic pronouns and pronouns (adapted from Boas 1947:252)

I analyze the third-person subject pronominal as a morpheme with the shape -\( \text{O} \); when third-person subject pronouns are tagged on the verb, there is no ambiguity about the intended referent, because all other types of marking occur. Number is only marked in first-person, which also makes a distinction between inclusive and exclusive forms. Aside from marking number, the first-person forms in Kwak’ala are unusual in other ways. S and O\(_2\) marking are identical for first-person. Meanwhile the cells marking first-person O\(_1\) are ‘empty’, reflecting the fact that first-person primary objects are not indexed on the verb, but are instead expressed using a clause-final prepositional phrase derived from the verb ga\( \chi \)- ‘come’. This speaker-oriented construction based on ga\( \chi \)- ‘come’ echoes other-directed prepositional phrases marked with la- ‘go’, as seen above in example (5). Speakers know that a first-person primary object is expressed when the prepositional phrase ga\( \chi \)\( \text{e}n \) occurs. The example below illustrates the encoding of the first-person

\(^1\) Prepositional phrases can be analyzed as embedded predicates, but I see this as a diachronic fact rather than a synchronic one.
primary object with the prepositional phrase ga\č\on ‘to me’.

(6) First person primary object in a prepositional phrase

| la\½\½s | \l\®q\åla\½s | a\l\¾\®m | ga\č\on |
| la\½\½s=\®s | \l\®q\åla\½-\(\®s) | ?a\l\¾\®m | ga\č=\®n |

AUX-CONN-2.SBJ name-FUT=OBJ2 wolf PREP=1.SBJ

And so you will name me (with) wolf.\(^{15}\) (Anderson 2005:17)

The secundative alignment of the stem \l\®q\åla- ‘name’ is clear from the SECONDARY OBJECT case marking of the theme a\l\¾\®m ‘wolf’, the name given to the speaker. If the person (or object) being named were second- or third-person, the primary-object status of the speaker would be encoded on the verb with -ux (2.OBJ) or -q (3.OBJ), but for a first-person argument, the primary-object status becomes clear through the use of the phrase ga\č\on.

In addition to the pronominal and prenominal paradigms presented above, additional sets of third-person demonstrative forms express a six-way deictic contrast: demonstrative enclitics distinguish proximal, medial and distal locations, with visible and invisible status encoded for each. These distinctions are just as fully expressed in sets of possessive suffixes (which also encode a distinction between a subject possessor and a non-subject possessor), as well as in forms used for embedded purpose clauses. For those who wish to follow reference tracking in examples, the following additional tables are included in the appendix: (i) third-person ‘verbal’ (affixed to the predicate) demonstrative enclitics for subjects and pronominal forms; (ii) third-person pronominal demonstrative enclitics for subjects, primary and secondary objects; (iii) subject/primary object combinations; (iv) subject/secondary object combinations; (v) possessive forms; (vi) purposive clause forms; and (vii) special possessive marking in pronominal predicate clauses. In glossing third-person demonstrative forms, I will comment where the form allows one to disambiguate between multiple third-person arguments in the clause.

The next section provides a description of the morphosyntactic and combinatorial properties of passive suffixes in K\wak\wala.

3 Passive Morphosyntax in K\wak\wala

Before moving on to the descriptive portion of the paper, I briefly address my use of the term ‘passive’. Much has been written about what should be considered ‘passive’, and traditions of interpretation vary (Comrie 2008, Fox and Hopper 1994, Givon 1994, Klaiman 1991, Payne 1997, Siewierska 1984, Shibatani 2003, \textit{inter alia}). In what follows, K\wak\wala passives are described in terms of both morphosyntactic and discourse-contextual properties.

Comrie 2008 provides some useful cross-linguistic criteria for identifying passive phenomena, and as we will see, K\wak\wala passives conform to these tendencies. The first criterion is markedness: as is true of morphological passives in other languages, K\wak\wala passive constructions are formally ‘marked’ by the addition of a derivational affix to a base stem which, in its unmarked state, is considered active. Furthermore, the direction of derivation is

\(^{15}\) As one can see by comparing the secondary object marking of the theme a\l\¾\®m ‘wolf’ with the first-person primary object marking, \l\®q\åla- ‘to name’, like the verb \=i\®k- ‘to say’, marks the recipient (R) of a name (‘me’) as the primary object, and the name being bestowed upon the recipient (T) (as the secondary object).

\(^{16}\) Certain ceremonial objects, such as coppers and canoes, also receive names.
from active to passive\textsuperscript{17}, and passive forms are less frequent than active forms in connected discourse. These patterns of distribution will be clear in the description below. Secondly, Comrie suggests that passives share a quality of being ‘P-oriented’ rather than ‘A-oriented’. K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la passives can be described as P-oriented: they promote non-A arguments to subject position, whether for reasons of topic continuity or to make an argument accessible to relativization.

Cross-linguistically, passive suffixes reduce the transitivity of an active predicate stem and restructure the case-marking of arguments in certain cross-linguistically predictable ways. If an active predicate has subject ‘A’, the addition of a passive suffix to an active stem allows the \textbf{promotion} of non-‘A’ arguments to subject position and the \textbf{demotion} of ‘A’ from subject position. In many languages, active transitive predicates are made intransitive by passivization. But because K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la has three core arguments, and because demoted subjects are marked with \textbf{SECONDARY OBJECT} case (=\textit{sa}), passivized predicates are not necessarily intransitive, as they might be in languages with only two core arguments. While K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la passive morphemes reduce transitivity, they do not seem to reduce valence. In many passive clauses, the case-marking is restructured, but all three arguments would still be considered core according to the formal criteria established above. On the other hand, demoted subjects, while marked as secondary objects, are not obligatory, as we will see in many of the examples provided below. By this criterion, one might identify wish to separate demoted subjects from other arguments marked as secondary objects.

K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la is typologically unusual for having several passivizing suffixes with different functions.\textsuperscript{18} Passive morphology has been well described for another Wakashan language, Nuu-chah-nulth, but is limited to a single form with broad functional scope (Nakayama 1997), in contrast to the six forms used in K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la.\textsuperscript{19} The passive suffixes of K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la are presented in Table 2.

| PRIMARY OBJECT | -\textit{su}\textsuperscript{?} |
| SECONDARY OBJECT | -\textit{ayu}, -\textit{\textit{om}}, -\textit{ano} |
| EXPERIENTIAL | -\textit{t} |
| LOCATIVE | -\textit{\textit{tas}} |

\textbf{Table 2: K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la Passive Suffixes}

These morphemes occur in contrastive distribution in a slot suffixed to the predicate. The first two rows list syntactically-selected passive forms, while the third and fourth rows list semantically-selected passive forms.

The \textbf{PRIMARY OBJECT} passive -\textit{su}\textsuperscript{?} is used to promote primary objects of an active transitive or ditransitive predicate to subject status, while the \textbf{SECONDARY OBJECT} passives -\textit{ayu}, -\textit{\textit{om}}, and -\textit{ano} promote secondary objects with an active ditransitive predicate to subject status (the variation among these three forms is discussed below). As mentioned, many K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la

\textsuperscript{17} This is clear from the boundary effects of certain ‘hardening’ and ‘weakening’ suffixes on preceding coda consonants (Boas 1947:226).

\textsuperscript{18} Some Philippine languages, such as Tagalog, have voice systems also described as having multiple passives. A comparison between the K\textsuperscript{wa}\textsuperscript{w}\textsuperscript{a}la system and similar Austronesian systems is beyond the scope of this paper but is in preparation.

\textsuperscript{19} Nakayama finds ‘passive’ to be an inadequate term to capture the full range of functions of the -‘\textit{at} suffix he describes in Nuu-Chah-Nulth.
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ditransitive predicates with meanings such as ‘say’, ‘give’, and ‘pay’ mark the recipient as primary object and the theme — the item said, given, or paid, for example — as secondary object. Identifying the pattern of secundative alignment in Kʷaḵʷala thus reveals the consistently syntactic distribution of Kʷaḵʷala passive suffixes promoting primary and secondary objects in the data explored below.

Boas’ discussion of -suʔ and -ayu partially captures the syntactic character of these morphemes. In keeping with Boas’ analysis of primary objects as “objective” and secondary objects as “instrumental”, he labelled -suʔ as the “passive governing (the) objective form” and -ayu, -ano, and -əm as “passive of verbs with instrumental” (Boas 1947:242). On the other hand, Boas later appeals to a semantic distinction, saying “the passives in -əm and -ayu designate the thing used for doing something, while -suʔ designates the thing to which something is done”, while -t is “(the) passive of verbs expressing sensations and mental actions; also sensations produced by some outer action” (Boas 1947:270).

In his 1980 paper, Levine also described the function of these suffixes in partly syntactic terms, saying that “[t]he suffixes -suʔ and -ayu belong to a class of morphemes I refer to as focus elements, to emphasize that these forms shift attention to various participants in the situation, which is specified by the meaning of the stem […]. (F)ocus morphemes permit the apparent promotion to subject status of NPs containing -x and -s as determiners” (Levine 1980:242). On the other hand, Levine renames -suʔ a ‘goal focus passive’, -ayu an ‘instrument focus passive’, -t a focus morpheme referring to ‘lack of control’, and -ʔas a ‘location focus’ morpheme, suggesting a semantically-grounded interpretation of these forms. Levine does not address -əm and -ano, the other secondary-object promoting passives.

I argue here that both syntactic and semantic criteria are necessary for a complete description of the Kʷaḵʷala passive paradigm. As is clear from the terms employed in Table 2, the data show the PRIMARY OBJECT and SECONDARY OBJECT passives to be syntactically-selected, based on the argument structure of an active predicate stem. Meanwhile, one must look beyond syntax to explain the distribution of the remaining passives. Section 3.1 discusses the use of -suʔ to promote PRIMARY OBJECTS to subject status and the use of -ayu, -ano and -əm to promote SECONDARY OBJECTS to subject status. Section 3.2 discusses the semantically-governed use of the EXPERIENTIAL -t and the LOCATIVE -ʔas.

3.1 Syntactic Roles

Examples (7) and (8) below illustrate a contrast between active and passive forms of the same predicate, showing how the Kʷaḵʷala passive suffix -suʔ allows the promotion of a PRIMARY OBJECT into SUBJECT position.

---

20 I believe Levine intends the term ‘focus’ to refer to the shared attention of the speaker and listener captured by the subject position in a Kʷaḵʷala clause, rather than concepts of topic and focus as commonly used in discussing information structure in discourse.
(7) Active: \(\omega\lambda\)- ‘ask’

\[
\text{gálaho} \quad \text{gálí} \quad \text{qíqúndaxa} \quad \text{bág-anámi:} \quad \text{”Móʔínokọʔas?”}
\]

SEQ-QUOT ask=SBJ Gíxénd (name)=OBJ1 man “Of what tribe are you?”

Then Gíxénd asked the man, “What tribe are you from?” (B1895: M665.10)

(8) Passive: \(\omega\lambda(a)\)- ‘ask’ with primary object passive -su?

\[
\text{gálaho} \quad \text{wólašwua:} \quad \text{” Másus yálagilisax?”}
\]

SEQ-QUOT ask-PASS-T.DEM Q=2.SBJ do-TR-on.beach=DEM

Then he was asked: “What tribe are you making on the beach?” (B1895: M666.23)

In example (7), the protagonist of the story, Gíxénd, asks a question. His status as subject is clear from the prenominal subject-marking clitic -i preceding his name. The man of whom he asks the question is \(\chi\)-marked as a primary object with the prenominal enclitic \(=\chi\text{a}\). Later in the story, a question is asked of Gíxénd; as the recipient of a question, Gíxénd would be the primary object of the active predicate \(\omega\lambda(a)\)- ‘ask’. Instead, the PRIMARY OBJECT passive suffix -su? in example (8) allows him, as the protagonist of the story, to remain in subject position. Meanwhile, the person asking the question does not appear.

Example (9) is from the same story containing examples (7) and (8) above, and this example illustrates the use of the SECONDARY OBJECT passive morpheme -ayu represented in bold type. At the moment excerpted below, the protagonist Gíxénd has finally found the final magical treasure he has been seeking, the decapitated heads of his rival chiefs; the decapitated heads (also in bold) are the subjects of these sentences.

(9) Passives: \(\dot{\omega}\)- ‘give’ and \(\text{tik}^\prime\)- ‘hang.on.body’ with secondary object passive -ayu

\[
\text{gáxla} \quad \text{gáyida} \quad \text{qáguk} \quad \text{la} \quad \text{Gíxénd.}
\]

SEQ-QUOT give-PASS=SBJ DEF heads PREP Gíxénd (name)

Now it is said the heads were given to Gíxénd.

\[
\text{Laʔám} \quad \text{tik}^\prime \text{itídayu} \quad \text{la} \quad \text{Gíxénd.}
\]

SEQ-OI hang.on.body-MOM-PASS=3.SBJ PREP Gíxénd (name)

Then they (the heads) were hung onto Gíxénd’s body. (B1895, M667.6-667.7)

The argument structures of these two predicates (\(\dot{\omega}\)- ‘give’ and \(\text{tik}^\prime\)- ‘hang.on.body’) require the secondary object passive -ayu rather than the primary object -su? in order to promote the heads to subject position. The predicate \(\dot{\omega}\)- ‘give’ is a ditransitive predicate with secundative alignment, for which the recipient is marked as primary object and the theme as secondary object; the SECONDARY OBJECT passive -ayu is thus used to promote the qáguk’ ‘heads’ given to Gíxénd, rather than Gíxénd himself (the recipient). In the first clause, the lexically-expressed subject is preceded by the subject enclitic -i; in the second clause, the third-person subject is
Passive Constructions in Kʼaḵwala

represented with a zero pronominal enclitic. Some elicited examples provided by Levine offer useful minimal pairs to illustrate the contrasting effects of the passive suffixes -su? and -ayu on a predicate and the surrounding clause. The first sentence is active.

(10) Active: SBJ is ‘child’

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{PRED} & \text{SBJ} & \text{O1} & \text{O2} \\
napidida & gənənamkə & gukwəsa & tisəm. \\
napid=ɨ=da & gənənəm=χə & gukw=sa & tisəm \\
\end{array}
\]

The child hit the house with a rock by throwing.
(The child pelted the house with a rock. - DR; Levine 1980:241)

The verb napid- ‘throw’ is perhaps closer to the English word ‘pelt’; the recipient gukw ‘house’ is the primary object, while the thing thrown (tisəm, ‘rock’) is the secondary object. When the primary object passive suffix -su? is added to the predicate stem napid- ‘throw’, we get example (11), with gukw ‘house’ promoted to subject position, and the demoted subject marked with =sa as a secondary object.

(11) PRIMARY OBJECT passive: promoted SBJ is ‘house’

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{PRED} & \text{SBJ} & \text{O1} & \text{O2} \\
napidswəida & gukwəsa & gənənəmsa & tisəm. \\
napid-su?=ɨ=da & gukw=sa & gənənəm=sa & tisəm \\
\end{array}
\]

The house was hit by a rock thrown by the child.
(The house was pelted with a rock by the child. - DR; Levine 1980:241)

The house, which would be a primary-object marked with =χə in an active predicate, here becomes the subject of the sentence with the addition of the primary object promotion morpheme -su?. The rock-throwing gənənəm ‘child’, the subject of the active sentence, is demoted to secondary object status. Meanwhile, the rock tisəm retains secondary object status, leading to a clause with two secondary objects with different syntactic origins. In many languages, the actor of a passivized transitive verb is marked as an oblique or non-core argument, but in Kʼaḵwala, the actor of a verb passivized with -su? is demoted to secondary object marking, rather than a prepositional phase. Should one consider the erstwhile subject of a

---

21 In both clauses, Giydan appears in a prepositional phrase. While this seems natural to English speakers, the argument structure of the Kʼaḵwala predicate daq- ‘give’ actually marks the recipient as primary object. In this case, the presentation of the primary object recipient Giydan in a prepositional phrase (rather than case-marked as a primary object) is due to the extraposition of a primary object in some double-object clauses, described by Boas: “Since Kwakiutl transforms the direct object -q into the indirect object laq whenever the verb takes an instrumental s, these forms must be considered as a substitute for the direct object ...” (B1947:283).

22 Thanks to Bernard Comrie for this gloss.

23 The ordering of these two ‘s-marked’ objects is also interesting; according to Levine, the order given, with animate (but adjunct) ‘child’ preceding inanimate ‘rock’, is the preferred order. Further research is underway to explore the strength of this preference among speakers.
passive construction to be a core argument? Despite the identity of the surface form \=sa marking secondary object arguments and demoted subjects, other criteria might lead us to identify demoted subjects as adjuncts; as we saw above in examples (7), (8), and (9), the demoted subject can be omitted. More work is needed to determine the syntactic status of the demoted subject.

Example (12) shows that the use of the SECONDARY OBJECT promoting suffix -ayu as a passive suffix allows the rock to be promoted to subject instead.

(12) SECONDARY OBJECT passive: promoted SBJ is ‘rock’

\[ \text{napidayuwida} \quad \text{tisom}^\chi a \quad \text{guk} ^\text{m} \text{sa} \quad \text{g\=anom}. \]
\[ \text{napid}-\text{ayu}=i=\text{da} \quad \text{tisom}=\text{xa} \quad \text{guk}=\text{sa} \quad \text{g\=anom}. \]

Throw-PASS=SBJ=DEF rock=OBJ1 house=OBJ2 child

The rock was (what was) thrown at the house by the child. (Levine 1980:241)

In contrast to the double secondary-object marking of example (11), here the house remains as an \( \chi \)-marked primary object of the passivized predicate; the demoted subject, the child, is again marked as a secondary object with \=sa.\textsuperscript{24} Knowing that Boas termed secondary objects ‘instrumental case’, we can understand why he called these suffixes ‘instrumental passives’; in this particular case, the rock fits an analysis based on its semantic role as the instrument of throwing. However, as we will see below, -ayu and the other so-called ‘instrumental passives’ are not governed by the semantic role of the promoted argument, but by its syntactic role.

Do the three SECONDARY OBJECT passive morphemes contrast semantically or otherwise? Boas doesn’t find recoverable differences between them; synchronically, their distribution seems lexically-determined and unpredictable. There may have been a historical difference; Boas describes -\( \chi \)-m as being restricted from combining with stems with certain endings, and -\( \text{ano} \) as used with stems that form transitivies with the MOMENTANEOUS allomorph -\text{nd} (Boas 1947:270). But of -\( \text{ano} \), Boas says “this suffix is used with a few words only, and is not freely available” (Boas 1911:36). As we will see in the discussion of frequency in discourse, -\( \text{ayu} \) is significantly more frequent than either of the other forms, and there is some indication that in the modern language, it is becoming the dominant alternative to -\( \text{su} \)?, retaining its productivity while -\( \chi \)-m and -\( \text{ano} \) become increasingly restricted. Further research is exploring distributional contrasts within the group of secondary object passives.

Samples from narrative discourse published by Boas and Hunt confirm the syntactic distribution of these passivizing suffixes, with -\( \text{su} \)? governing the primary object case, and -\( \text{ayu} \) governing the secondary object case, as we can see below by comparing active and passive forms for predicates with consistent argument structure. Several of these clauses are explored in detail below, in examples (13) through (31). These examples demonstrate the consistency with which -\( \text{su} \)? can be predicted to promote a primary object and -\( \text{ayu} \), -\( \chi \)-\( \text{m} \), and -\( \text{ano} \) can be predicted to promote a secondary object, whatever the semantic role of the argument being promoted.

In active examples (13) and (14), \textit{waci} ‘dog’ is the subject of the clause, the one who bites; the patient of the predicate \textit{\=q\=ax}- ‘bite’ (an unspecified third-person) is marked as a primary

\textsuperscript{24} Here Levine notes that the order of ‘house’ and ‘child’ is interchangeable. It would be surprising to find a secondary object before a primary one in the clause, but this could be a result of the animacy of the child. Current research is pursuing these questions.
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object, indicated with the pronominal suffix =q.\(^{25}\)

(13) Active sentence: \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)-‘bite’

```
AUX.PRED  PRED     SBJ
laʔom  \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)?idida  \(\dot{w}\acaq
laʔim  \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\?-id=da  \(\dot{w}\aca(a)q
SEQ-OI  bite-MOM=SBJ=DEF  dog=3.OBJ1
```

Now the dog bit him. (B1947:286, CIII12.19)

(14) Active sentence: \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)-‘bite’

```
PRON.PRED  SBJREL  PREDREL
hiʔida  \(\dot{w}\aci  \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)?idoq
hiʔim=da  \(\dot{w}\aci  \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\?-id=(a)q
3.PRED-OI=SBJ=DEF  dog-DEM  bite-MOM=3.OBJ1
```

That is the dog that bit him. (B1947:286)\(^{26}\)

(15) Passive sentence: \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)-‘bite’ with PRIMARY OBJECT passive -su?\(^{27}\)

```
PRON.PRED  PREDREL     SBJREL  O2REL
hiʔom  \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)?icowida  gonanomasa  \(\dot{w}\aci
hiʔim  \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\?-id-su?=i=da  gonanomasa=sa  \(\dot{w}\aci
3.PRED-OI  bite-MOM-PASS=SBJ=DEF  child=OBJ2  dog
```

That is the child (who was) bitten by the dog. (B1947:286)

In example (15), the PRIMARY OBJECT passive suffix -su? attached to the predicate \(\dot{q}\dot{x}\)-‘bite’ promotes gonanom ‘child’, the one bitten, to subject status. One can see the effect of the passive suffix -su? in both the word order, which has moved child into subject position following the predicate, and in the secondary object marking of the dog \(\dot{w}\aci\), who bit the child. Examples (14) and (15) are translated with initial ‘that’ in English, indicating additional discourse factors at work in relation to the use of passive here; these are actually predicative third-person pronouns. I return to the description of pronominal predicates in section 4.2.

As we saw in the earlier example (9), the stem \(\dot{c}\dot{w}\)-‘give’ also marks recipient as primary and theme as secondary. Example (16) shows the predicate \(\dot{c}\dot{w}\)-in an active form with secondary object marking of the theme \(\dot{y}\dot{a}\dot{x}^{"}\s\dot{n}\dot{i}\dot{a}\) ‘a bad thing’. The recipient in this clause occurs in a prepositional phrase as a result of extraposition of primary objects in certain syntactic contexts.\(^{27}\)

---

\(^{25}\) Examples (14) and (15) are complicated by the use of the person-marking predicate \(hi\)-, also described as a ‘verbal form’ of an independent pronoun, which leads to an appositive clause for which the second predicate is a relative-clause type complement. For this reason, the subject precedes the embedded predicate ‘bite’ (Boas 1947:258). These clauses are described in section 4.2.

\(^{26}\) Examples (13) and (14), in which a dog is subject-marked without triggering any special morphology in relation to a primary-object-marked human, suggest that passivization is not obligatory according to an animacy hierarchy, at least in the case of dogs biting humans. Inverse alignment systems are not uncommon in the region but the alignment here does not suggest such a pattern. For further argumentation against an inverse pattern in K'awak'ala, see section 3.3 below. Further research will pursue this hypothesis.

\(^{27}\) Close observers will notice that in the active clause, the pronominal mention of the recipient is actually marked as an oblique in the clause-final prepositional phrase \(laq\), rather than with the primary object pronominal morpheme =q on the predicate, as we would expect. Boas notes that while subject, primary, and secondary arguments
Active clause:  
\[ \text{Active clause: } \hat{\omega} \text{- ‘give’} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{AUX. PRED} & \text{PRED} & \text{O2} & \text{OBL (O1)} \\
la\hat{mi} & \hat{\omega} & \hat{y}a\hat{\chi}^w\hat{s}\hat{\sigma}^\alpha & laq \\
la\hat{m}=\hat{O}=i & \hat{\omega}=s\hat{a} & \hat{y}a\hat{\chi}^w\hat{s}\hat{\sigma}^\alpha & la-q \\
g-oI-3.SBJ=DEM & \text{give=OBJ2} & \text{a.bad.thing} & \text{to-OBJ1} \\
\end{array} \]

Then he gave him something bad. (B1947:342)

Passive clause:  
\[ \text{Passive clause: } \hat{\omega} \text{- ‘give’ passivized with -su?} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{AUX. PRED} & \text{PRED} & \text{O2} \\
l-a\hat{\omega}m\hat{\chi}^\alpha & \hat{\omega} & \hat{y}a\hat{\chi}^w\hat{s}\hat{\sigma}^\alpha \\
l-a\hat{m}-\hat{\omega}nt=\hat{O}=i & \hat{\omega}-\hat{su}=?sa & \hat{y}a\hat{\chi}^w\hat{s}\hat{\sigma}^\alpha \\
g-oI-evidently=3.SBJ=DEM & \text{give-PASS=OBJ2} & \text{a.bad.thing} \\
\end{array} \]

Then he was evidently given something bad. (B1947:342, CII32.13)

On the other hand, when \( \hat{\omega} \) - ‘give’ is passivized with SECONDARY OBJECT -su?, the theme \( \hat{y}a\hat{\chi}^w\hat{s}\hat{\sigma}^\alpha \) is promoted to subject.

Passives:  
\[ \text{Passives: } \hat{\omega} \text{- ‘give’ passivized with -ayu} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\hat{G}\hat{\chi}\hat{x}^\alpha l\hat{a}=?i & \hat{\omega} & \hat{q}\hat{\alpha}g\hat{u}k^w & \hat{l}\hat{\alpha} & \hat{G}\hat{i}\hat{\chi}^\alpha d\hat{\alpha}n. \\
\hat{g}\hat{a}\hat{\chi}-l\hat{a}=?i & \hat{\omega}-\hat{ayu}=i=da & \hat{q}\hat{\alpha}g\hat{u}k^w & \hat{l}\hat{\alpha} & \hat{G}\hat{i}\hat{\chi}^\alpha d\hat{\alpha}n \\
\text{come-QUOT} & \text{give-PASS=SBJ=DEF heads} & \text{PREP heads PREP} & \hat{G}\hat{i}\hat{\chi}^\alpha d\hat{\alpha}n (name) \\
\end{array} \]

Now it is said the heads were given to \( \hat{G}\hat{i}\hat{\chi}^\alpha d\hat{\alpha}n. \)

As mentioned earlier and seen in the examples below, the predicate \( \hat{i}\hat{i}k \) - (translated as ‘to say’ by Boas but glossed as ‘to tell’ here) also has secundative alignment and marks hearers (the ‘recipient’ of the words spoken) with the primary object case. The active example (2) is reproduced below to illustrate this secundative alignment.

Active clause:  
\[ \text{Active clause: } \hat{i}\hat{i}k \text{- ‘to say, tell’} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\hat{\hat{n}}\hat{i}k=\hat{\alpha}n\hat{\lambda}q & \hat{\hat{n}}\hat{i}k=\hat{\alpha}n\hat{\lambda}q & aq & aq \\
\text{say=1S.SBJ>3.OBJ1} & \text{say=1S.SBJ>3.OBJ1} \\
I \text{ told him.} & \text{I told him.} (B1947:281, CX12.19) \\
\end{array} \]

When \( \hat{i}\hat{i}k \) - is passivized with the PRIMARY OBJECT passive -su?, the hearer \( \hat{\chi}m\hat{t}a\hat{l}a\hat{t} \) is promoted to the recipient with PRIMARY OBJECT -su? supports Boas’ analysis of primary objects as extravasated to prepositional phrases.
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to subject, immediately following the predicate and preceded by the prenominal subject-marker =i.

(20) Passive clause: ʔɪk- ‘to say, tell’ passivized with -su?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>ʔɪk-</td>
<td>-su?</td>
<td>-a=i</td>
<td>ʔ̱mtalaf=as ʔaniqifakw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>pay-PASS=3.SBJ=OBJ2</td>
<td>four-POSS.NSUB</td>
<td>blanket=DEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we would expect, the demoted subject ʔaniqifakw, who is telling ʔ̱mtalaθ something, is demoted to secondary object status and appears in clause-final position preceded by the secondary object enclitic =as. The example below shows the same verb ʔɪk- ‘to say, tell’, passivized with the SECONDARY OBJECT passive -əm (within a second-person purposive clause marked with the subordinator qa’s) to promote the theme rather than the hearer.

(21) Passive clause: ʔɪk- ‘to say, tell’ passivized with -əm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBORD</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...qa’s</td>
<td>ʔɪgəmsaχs</td>
<td>-a=us=ɑχs</td>
<td>ʔ̱wənəmə=us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...qa’s</td>
<td>ʔɪk-əm=Ø=us=ɑχs</td>
<td>ʔ̱wənəm=ɑ=us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see in this example, the subject-promotion of the theme (the thing being said) requires the SECONDARY OBJECT passive suffix -əm rather than the PRIMARY OBJECT passive -su?, but instead. 28

A similar contrast is evident with the stem ʔolaq- ‘pay’. When a primary object-marked recipient becomes the subject, as in examples (20) and (21), the suffix -su? is used. In (20) the secondary object s-marking of the theme (the four blankets) is maintained, as can be seen from the =sa marking on the predicate ʔolaqasu’sa.

(22) Passive clause: ʔolaq(a)- ‘pay’ passivized with -su?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>ʔolaqasu’sa</td>
<td>-muxsə</td>
<td>ʔ̱əłəqləsəmə?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>ʔolaq- su?=Ø=sa</td>
<td>mu-χsa</td>
<td>ʔ̱əłəqləsəmə=a?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>pay-PASS=3.SBJ=OBJ2</td>
<td>four-POSS.NSUB</td>
<td>blanket=DEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She is paid with four blankets. (B1947:270, CX249.40)

28 The case-marking of the second-person hearer as a secondary object with =us is unexpected. We would expect the hearer to be marked as a primary object. In addition, the demoted subject, ʔ̱wənəm ‘husband’, is not case-marked at all. I do not have an explanation for this, although several factors could be at work: the subordinate syntax of the purposive clause, the second-person status of the hearer, and/or the possessed status of the husband.
(23) Passive clause: *holaq(a)*- ‘pay’ passivized with -*su*?

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{AUX} & \text{PRED} \\
\text{le} & \text{holaqasu?} \\
\text{le} & \text{holaqa-*su*?} = \emptyset \\
\text{CONN} & \text{pay-PASS=3.SBJ}
\end{array}
\]

Then he is paid. (B1947:241)

However, when the *s*-marked theme, the payment, becomes the subject, as in example (24), the SECONDARY OBJECT passive suffix -*əm* is used to promote the secondary object.

(24) Passive sentence: *holaq(a)*- ‘pay’ passivized with -*əm*

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{PRED} & \text{SBJ} & \text{PRED} & \text{O1} \\
\text{hiwaxawíwise} & \text{waxa} & \text{holaqəmaxa} & \text{mámaýutšila} \\
\text{hi-wačə-wis-i} & \text{waxa} & \text{holaq-*əm*} = \chi a & \text{mámaýutšila} \\
\text{3P.PRED-OI-also-CONN-SBJ} & \text{amount} & \text{pay-PASS=OBJ1} & \text{midwife}
\end{array}
\]

That is also the amount that was paid to the midwife. (B1947:270, R 670.92)

The amount *waxa* is subject-marked with the prenominal enclitic =*i*, and the enclitic =*χa* preceding *mámaýutšila* ‘midwife’ marks it as retaining primary object status. As we saw with examples 14 and 15, the subject, the amount paid, or *waxa*, precedes the stem *holaq*- ‘pay’, rather than following it, because it is the subject of the verbal independent pronoun *hi*-. These ‘verbal pronouns’ are discussed in section 4.2.

The derived verb *hɔmgil(a)*- ‘to feed’, constructed from the stem *hɔm*- ‘eat’ and the transitivizing suffix -*gil(a)*, again illustrates the contrast between passivization of the primary object with -*su*? and passivization of the secondary object with a SECONDARY OBJECT promoting form, in this case -*ayu*. In (25), Stone Body, who is being fed, is the subject of the predicate *hɔmgil(a)*- ‘feed’ passivized with the PRIMARY OBJECT passive -*su*?.

(25) Passive sentence: *hɔmgil(a)*- ‘feed’ passivized with -*su*?

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{DISC ADV} & \text{PRED} & \text{SBJ} \\
\text{li maʔipəná} & \text{hɔmgilasowí} & \text{tisəngiti} \\
\text{li maʔipəná} & \text{hɔmgil(a)-*su*?} = i & \text{tisəngiti} = i \\
\text{then two-times feed-PASS=SBJ} & \text{Stone.Body=DEM}
\end{array}
\]

Then Stone Body was fed twice. - DR\(^{29}\) (B1947:270, CIII220.30)

In example (26), the subject of the predicate passivized with the secondary object passive -*ayu* must be understood as the food, rather than the recipient of the food.

---

\(^{29}\) Boas translates the first sentence as “Then Stone Body was twice given to eat,” and the second as “… to be given to eat (with it) to his tribe.” The translations provided above are my own. Boas’ translations of this and the following examples are based on a gloss of *hɔmgil* as ‘give to eat’, which allows for a less-intuitive translation. The English verb ‘feed’ can have secundative alignment, marking recipient as primary (direct) object (‘He feeds someone with something’), or indirective alignment (‘He feeds something to someone’).
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(26) Passive: həmgil(a)- ‘feed’ passivized with -ayu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qa?</td>
<td>həmgləyəɬəxəs</td>
<td>gúkʷəɬəti</td>
<td>gúkʷəɬəti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qa?</td>
<td>həmgil-ayu-s=Ø=iχ=is</td>
<td>gúkʷəɬəti=i</td>
<td>gúkʷəɬəti=i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.PURP feed-PASS-?=3.SBJ=OBJ1=3.POSS | tribe=DEM | in order that it be fed to his tribe. - DR (B1947:270, CIII 7.6)

The recipient, gukʷəɬəti ‘(his) tribe’ retains case-marking as the primary object with the prepositional enclitic =iχ.30

The verb gʷəɬəeq(a)- ‘pour over’ also has secundative alignment, and two examples illustrate the contrast between subject-promotion of the primary object with -su? and promotion of the secondary object with -əm. In the first example, passivized with -su?, the subject is understood as the ‘recipient’ or ‘destination’ of the liquid being poured while the material being poured is s-marked as a secondary object.

(27) Passive sentence: gʷəɬəeqa- ‘to pour over’ passivized with -su?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gʷəɬəeqa-su?=sa</td>
<td>wəda?stá</td>
<td>wapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʷəɬəeqa-su?=Ø=sa</td>
<td>wəda?stá</td>
<td>wap=a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour.over-PASS=3.SBJ=OBJ2</td>
<td>cold =water=T.DEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is poured over with cold water. (B1947:270, R516.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, in example (28), passivization with -əm results in the subject being understood as the liquid being poured.31

(28) Passive sentence: gʷəɬəeqa- ‘pour over’ passivized with -əm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>PREP</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qa?</td>
<td>gʷəɬəeqəmi?</td>
<td>laχə</td>
<td>líqəstəniʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qa?</td>
<td>gʷəɬəeqəq=əm=Ø=iʔ</td>
<td>la=χə</td>
<td>líqəstəniʔ=iʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PURP pour.over-PASS=3.SBJ=DEM.OBJ1</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>seaweed=DEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is poured on the seaweed. (B1947:270, CIII 7.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the pair of examples below illustrate the interpretive contrast between -su? and -ayu marking on the motion predicate qas- ‘walk’. For active motion predicates, the destination is encoded as primary object In (29), qas- is passivized with PRIMARY OBJECT -su?. The protagonist is being pursued. (That is, he is the destination of those ‘walking towards’ him.) He is expressed as a third-person subject, marked with -Ø, rather than the pronominal -q used to mark a primary object referent.

---

30 I am not sure what interpretation we should give to the morpheme -s following the -ayu in this predicate. It may be a pronominal marker indicating secondary object, in which case the translation should be ‘in order that it be fed to his tribe by him/them’; but in most sentences like this we would find the primary object ‘tribe’ extraposed to a prepositional phrase.

31 The seaweed, líqəstən, the destination (or ‘recipient’) of the liquid, is marked in a prepositional phrase here. Again, this may be a result of the extraposition of primary object to a clause-final prepositional phrase.
(29) Passive: qas- ‘walk’ passivized with -su?

```
DISC DISC PRED
Loʔám lawis qásʔidsaʔa
Then it is said walk-MOM-PASS-3.SBJ-T.DEM
Then it is said they went after him.
(Then, it is said, he was pursued by them. - DR; Boas 1895, M727.17)
```

On the other hand, in (30a) and (30b), qas- is passivized with -ayu, and in both examples the interpretation is that the protagonist is being walked by another character.

(30) Passive: qas- ‘walk’ passivized with -ayu

```
a. DISC PRED O2
Lálaʔi qásʔidayusa wíwaʔokʷ
Laʔ-laʔi qásʔid-ayu=sa wíwaʔokʷ
SEQ-QUOT walk-MOM-PASS=OBJ2 wolf
Then he was walked by the wolf. (B1895: M 666.21)

b. DISC PRED
Lálaʔi qásʔidayu
Laʔ-laʔi qásʔid-ayu=Ø
SEQ-QUOT walk-MOM-PASS=3.SBJ
Then it is said they walked with him

DISC OBL
lálaʔi laχa ƛɨχʔala
lálaʔi la=χa ƛɨχʔal-a
SEQ-QUOT PREP=OBJ1 beating.of.boards-T.DEM
then to the beating of boards.
(Then it is said he was walked (then) to the beating of boards. - DR; B1895: M 683.4)
```

I have not yet found an active example of qas- with a secondary object, but we might predict that a person being made to move in a certain way, or a pet being walked by its owner, would be encoded as the secondary object.

Examples (13) to (30) show that the distribution of the PRIMARY OBJECT passive morpheme -su? and the SECONDARY OBJECT passive morphemes -əm, -ayu, and -ano reflect the case-marked syntactic role of an argument rather than its semantic role. Further evidence can be found in the first clause of the example below, in which a semantic instrument (ləmŋayu ‘wedge’) is promoted to subject status, but with the PRIMARY OBJECT passive morpheme -su?. If the distribution of -su? and -ayu/-əm/-ano morphemes were based on semantic categories, the first predicate ʔəχ- ‘take’ would be marked with -ayu, -əm, or -ano, one of the passive morphemes identified as ‘instrumental’ by Boas, in order to promote the semantic instrument ləmŋayu to subject status. But the distribution is syntactically rather than semantically determined, as we see here.
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(31) Passive: ꩋχ- ‘take’ passivized with -su?, ṭ.beginPath‘beat (cedar bark)’ passivized with -ayu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>ꩋχʔidsˤida</td>
<td>ꩇʊmgayuwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>ꩋχʔ-ʔid-suʔ=ʔi=da</td>
<td>ꩇʊmk-ayu=ʔi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now is taken the wedge,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>PREP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qaʔs</td>
<td>ṭ.beginPathʔidʔayu=ʔiʔ</td>
<td>laʔq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and it is used for beating it (the cedar bark). (B1947:312, R296.82)

The active predicate ꩋχ- ‘take’ requires primary object marking for the thing being taken; passivization with -suʔ promotes this object — in this case a wedge, ᵇʊmgayu. Semantic interpretations of -suʔ would identify it as an ‘objective passive’ (Boas 1947:270) or a ‘goal focus’ morpheme (Levine 1980b:58), in contrast with -ayu, -ʔsm, or -ʔano, identified as the passives used to promote the “the thing used for doing something” or the “instrumental” (Boas 1947:270). The semantic role of the wedge taken here would certainly fit into the category ‘instrument’ and one might expect the passivizing suffix to be one of the ‘instrumental’ suffixes. However, because of the argument structure of the predicate ꩋχ- ‘take’, for which the wedge is a primary object of the stem, it must be passivized with -suʔ. In the subsequent predicate ṭ.beginPath, ‘beat cedar bark’, the same wedge is passivized with -ayu, because of the argument structure of the active lexeme ṭ.beginPath, which would mark the wedge as a secondary object.32

The suffix -ayu also occurs in the lexicalized word for wedge, ᵇʊmgayu, derived from the stem ᵇʊmk- ‘to split wood with wedge’. Here, ᵇʊmgayu clearly functions as an argument; it follows the prenominal subject-marker =ʔi attached to the predicate. The suffix -ayu functions in this form as an instrumental nominalizer. The question of whether these are the same morpheme or two polysemous morphemes is discussed below in section 3.4.

The section above argues that syntactic properties govern the distribution of passive morphemes -su and -ʔayu-ʔsm/-ʔano. The next section addresses the distribution of the remaining passive suffixes in Figure 2, -ʔf (EXPERIENCER) and -ʔas (LOCATIVE), whose function reflects semantic, rather than syntactic, properties of the argument.

3.2 Semantic Roles

Unlike the PRIMARY OBJECT and SECONDARY OBJECT passives -suʔ and -ʔayu-ʔsm/-ʔano, the passive morphemes described below are sensitive to the different semantic qualities of the argument they promote. The EXPERIENCER passive -ʔf is sensitive to the semantic quality of an event: it only applies to situations in which an event’s semantic transitivity is reduced due to lack of control (Hopper and Thompson 1980). On the other hand, the LOCATIVE passive -ʔas is sensitive to the semantic role of the promoted argument: it is only used to promote places to

32 Again in this example, we see the extraposition of a third-person pronominal primary object (‘it’) to the prepositional phrase laʔq.
subject position. We will see examples of both below. The analysis of these two passives draws much from Levine’s presentation in two 1980 articles concerning the K’wa’ala passive.

3.2.1 EXPERIENCER Passive -ť and Event Structure

Returning to Boas’ 1947 grammar, we find that he defines the suffix -ť as being the passive of ‘sensations’, ‘mental actions’, and ‘sensations produced by outside actions’ (Boas 1947:270). He gave examples such as the ones below:

(32) Stems which passivize with -ť (Boas 1947:377)
   a. wałət-  hear-PASS
   b. wałāx?alať- discovered by hearing (III 257.3, X 5.13)
   c. dūx?alať- see-SENSE.SUDD-PASS
   d. mis?alať- discovered by smelling
   e. ḋəx?alať- feel-SENSE.SUDD-PASS
   f. xɨcənt- witnessed
   g. laGʷ?)əl- affected by fire (burnt by fire wood) (CX208.32)
   h. qəbəl- affected by upsetting something on oneself
   i. pəndəl- affected by a blister (B1947:270)

Some of these predicates are derived from stems that would not take objects and therefore may not have an active counterpart to contrast with their passive form: laGʷ- ‘firewood’ (distinct from the stems mix(a)- ‘to start a fire’ or xiq(a)- ‘to be on fire’), qəp- ‘a hollow vessel upside down’, and pens- ‘be blistered’. Levine presents additional elicited examples of passivized predicates without active counterparts. The stem xədť- ‘be moldy’ is passivized with -ť as seen below.
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(33) \(xəd^2-\) ‘be moldy’ + EXPERIENCER passive -\(t\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(xəd^2ʔida)</td>
<td>(kʷənik^w(=sa)</td>
<td>(xəd^2oxa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xəd^2-t=da)</td>
<td>(kʷənik^w(=sa)</td>
<td>(xəd^2ox-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mold-PASS=SBJ=DEF bread(=OBJ2)</td>
<td>mold-T.DEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bread is moldy (with mold). (Levine 1980a:39)

The agent of the change of state, \(xəd^2ox\) ‘mold’, is optionally included in the clause as an \(s\)-marked (secondary object) argument, parallel to the way demoted subjects are marked in other passive constructions. Levine provides many parallel examples with meanings such as “the man is sore-ridden (with sores),” formed with the stem \(?amt-\) ‘be sore-ridden’, or “the man was burned,” formed on the stem \(xiq-\) ‘be on fire’. Surprisingly, Levine’s consultants seem to find it acceptable to include the inanimate agent of the event (mold, sores, flame) as a secondary object marked argument — even though this information is already contained in the predicate.

As Levine notes, what these examples seem to share is not the quality of mental sensation, but the lack of control exerted over an event by the experiencer, whether it is the experience of being discovered or the experience of having something suddenly spill on one’s lap. This is expressed in some cases by the English verb ‘affected by’, which also contains the sense of a lack of control on the part of the experiencer.

Levine presents several elicited examples to illustrate the non-control aspect of the -\(t\) suffix. In the first sentence, no deliberate actor is present.

(34) Passive clause: \(Gəls-\) ‘paint’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Gəl^2ʔutx^wda)</td>
<td>(ʔud^uyi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gəls-t=da)</td>
<td>(ʔud^u=i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint-PASS=DEM=DEF wall-DEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wall is overpainted. (Levine 1980b:5)

In example (35), Levine notes that the inclusion of a deliberate actor makes the sentence ungrammatical.

(35) Passive clause: \(Gəls-\) ‘paint’, secondary object not permitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREP</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(Gəl^2ʔutx^wda)</td>
<td>(ʔud^uy=isa)</td>
<td>(bəg^wanəm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wall was overpainted by a person. (Levine 1980b:5)

If an argument marked as a secondary object is included in the sentence, it must be the paint, as illustrated in (36).
(36) Passive clause: Gɔls- ‘paint’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>OBJ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gɔld’ɔtuχʷda</td>
<td>?úd’uiχsa</td>
<td>Gɔlyayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gɔls-ǂ=uχʷ-da</td>
<td>?úd’u=iχ=sa</td>
<td>Gɔls-ayu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

paint-PASS=DEM=DEF wall-DEM=OBJ2 paint-INST.NOM

The wall is overpainted with paint. (Levine 1980b:6)

The ungrammaticality of (35) and the role of the secondary-object argument in (36) suggest, as Levine argues, that the inclusion of an agent with control is semantically incompatible with the passive suffix -t. “Semantic considerations ... determine the appropriateness of co-occurrence between various elements in the surface form of sentences” (Levine 1980a:13).

The two clauses below illustrate the use of the EXPERIENCER passive in clauses with the stem duqʷ- ‘see’, first in an active sentence, and then in a clause passivized with -t.

(37) Active: duqʷ- ‘see’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>O1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>duqʷ-ɔluχʷ-da</td>
<td>bagʷánɔmaχa</td>
<td>gɔnánm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duqʷ-ɔla=uyχʷ-da</td>
<td>bagʷánɔma=χa</td>
<td>gɔnánm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

see-CONT=DEM=DEF man=OBJ1 child

The man saw the child. (Levine 1980b:39)

(38) Passive: duqʷ- ‘see’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>PRED_COMP</th>
<th>SBJ_COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hímɔn</td>
<td>duqʷ-ɔtida</td>
<td>?ixpɔmata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi-m-ɔn</td>
<td>duqʷ-ǂ=i=da</td>
<td>?ix-pɔmaɬ-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.PRON.PRED-O1-1.POSS see-PASS=SBJ=DEF good-play-T.DEM

That is my seen one it is a good play. (i.e., That one seen by me is a good play. - DR; B1947:286)

In example (38) passivization of the stem duqʷ- may be triggered by the use of the demonstrative third-person pronoun predicate hi-; this automatic passivization following independent pronoun predicates is discussed below in section 4.2. (Boas’ awkward translation is an expression of his analysis that the complement phrase beginning with duqʷ- is a possessed nominal.) In my current research, duqʷ- is the only predicate I have found to combine with either -su? or -t passive suffixes, indicating a difference in degree of control by the patient. However, initial findings suggest that the combination of the morphemes duqʷ- and -t to mean ‘discover’ is not transparent to speakers, suggesting that it has lexicalized.33

The functional constraints determining the distribution of this morpheme might be more specific than ‘lack of control’ or an ‘experiencer’ role for the subject. In documentation recorded in 2008, a speaker used -su? to passivize the example below, despite the subject’s lack of control.

---

33 Passive suffixes can co-occur with transitivizing suffixes such -(g)ila or the causative -amas, such as in the stem hám-giɬ-ayu ‘be fed’ (eat-TR-PASS) (B1947 R225.46). Levine’s example laGʷ-昶-amas-suʔ=i=da (burn-PASS-CAUS-PASS-SUB-DEF) ćedąqąya bagʷanam ‘The woman caused the man to be burned’ contains two passive suffixes (Levine 1980a:7). This seems to be a matter of semantic scope, but more research is clearly needed.
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(39) Passive: kilak- ‘attack’ with -su?

PRED O2
kilakasuwo?ysa xayiy
kilak-su?=(a)sa xayiy
attack-PASS=SBJ.DEM=OBJ bear-DEM
He is being killed (attacked) by the bear.
(Elicited: The bear is killing him; Shaw: 2008_7_17DS.340)

Interestingly, the subject of this clause is semantically an ‘experiencer’ of this event, but there is an animate being in control of the attack: the bear. One potential analysis is that the -t morpheme is only used in situations in which an event is perpetrated by a non-animate entity: blisters, a container full of liquid, one of the five senses, fire or wind. Another possibility is that -t is a Kwak’ala ‘middle voice’; part of the voice paradigm, but not a passive (Kemmer 1993).

Of course, it may also be the case that language shift has led to further grammaticalization of the passive suffixes. The same speaker who provided example (39) above used the secondary object passive -ayu for another context in which one might have expected -t to have been used previously: the stem yawí- ‘wind’ is stative, and the event described is not subject to animate control.

(40) Passive: yawí ‘wind’ with -ayu

PRED
yawísandanayuwolochw
yawí-sdana-d-ayu=O=O=ucw
wind-DIE.OF-MOM-PASS=DIST.PAST=3.SBJ=DEM
He was blown overboard by the wind (and died; Shaw:2008_7_17DS.340)

Further research will allow us to map the new distribution of passive morphosyntax in the contemporary language.

3.2.2 LOCATIVE Passive -?as and Semantic Role of Argument

Levine adds another suffix, the locative -?as, to the list of passive morphemes provided by Boas. This suffix is included in Boas’ long glossary of lexical suffixes, but he only provides examples of this suffix used in the creation of place names. Levine gives examples, however, where it is also used to promote a place to subject from what would otherwise be an oblique constituent of an active sentence.

(41) Active: SUBJECT is bogwanom ‘man’

PRED SBJ OBL
la la?uxwda bogwanomx laxwa ?owiagwis
la-la-uxw=da bogwanom=x la=xwa ?owiagwis
RED-go-DEM=DEF man=DEM.OBJ PREP=DEM village
The man goes to this village. (Levine 1980a:243)

In example (41), ‘village’ is expressed within a prepositional phrase, beginning with laxwa. In the
example below, it becomes the subject of the sentence.

(42) Passive: subject is ?əwɪn̓agʷis ‘village’

PRED SBJ O₂
lalaʔasuxʷda ?əwɪn̓agʷis sa bəgʷánom
lalaʔas=uxʷ=da ?əwɪn̓agʷis=sa bəgʷánom
RED-go-PASS-DEM=DEF village=OBJ2 man

The village is where the man goes. (The village is gone to by the man; Levine 1980a:243)

Levine notes that -ʔas can only be used to promote locative arguments to subject status; non-locative arguments (i.e., ləxə bəgʷánom ‘to the man’) can not be promoted with -ʔas.

Thus, semantic properties motivate the use of both locative passive -ʔas and experiencer passive -ʔ suffixes. In the case of the locative passive -ʔas, the semantics of the constituent determines the appropriateness of -ʔas. Locative phrases are always marked in a prepositional phrase, but not all prepositional phrases are eligible for subjecthood via the -ʔas suffix, only those referring to a place. On the other hand, in the case of the experiencer passive -ʔ, it is the semantics of event structure that determine whether -ʔ is appropriate. Constituents promoted to subjecthood may be primary objects of a predicate (as with duqʷ- ‘see’), or they may be the single patient of an intransitive verb which doesn’t have a simple active counterpart (as with qəbəʔ- ‘affected by upsetting something on oneself’). Meanwhile, neither suffix is syntactically constrained as the primary object and secondary object passives are. Further research comparing historical and contemporary discourse will help us determine whether the passive paradigm has further grammaticalized, and perhaps contracted, as a result of language change over the past century.

The preceding two sections identified the properties governing the distribution of K̓w̱aʔlə passive morphology. The next section compares the alignment of lexical and pronominal arguments.

3.3 Grammatical Relations in Passive Constructions

This section discusses the effect of passivization on the grammatical relations of a clause, comparing lexically expressed arguments with pronouns. In passive constructions with lexically expressed arguments, the resulting argument structure is predictable. The distribution of pronominal arguments is less predictable. This section describes the patterns of alignment for both lexical and pronominal arguments.

As we have seen in many examples, the promotion of lexical argument to subject in a passive clause results in two changes that indicate subject status: (1) prenominal subject inflection on the predicate, and (2) the immediate post-predicate position of an argument in the syntax. In most languages, demoted subjects of passivized predicates are marked as oblique, but as we have repeatedly seen, a K̓w̱aʔlə demoted subject takes secondary object marking, as in (43).
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(43) Passive: síxʷ- ‘paddle’ with -ayu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC</th>
<th>PRED₁</th>
<th>PRED₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wá!</td>
<td>Ləʔám</td>
<td>gax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wá!</td>
<td>Ləʔám</td>
<td>gax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now! Then come paddle-lead\(\text{PASS}=3.SBJ=OBJ2=3.POSS\)

Wa! Then they came, they took him home

OBJ2

nəgʷəmp  láwis  gókulot
nəgʷəmp  láw=ís  gókulot
father.in.law  and=3.POSS  tribe
his father-in-law and his tribe.

(Then he came paddled home by his father-in-law and his tribe. - DR; B1895 M679.17)

The father-in-law and tribe who paddle the subject home, nəgʷəmp láwis gókulot, are marked as secondary objects with the pronominal enclitic =s following the passive suffix. Meanwhile, the pronominal subject, the protagonist of this story, is marked with the third-person pronominal zero morpheme on the predicate, as we would expect.

The possessive markers in the example above also help us track referents and identify syntactic roles. K'wak'wala third-person possessors distinguish between subject and non-subject possessors, and =ís marks a subject possessor, as opposed to -a~-Ø for the corresponding non-subject possessor. Thus, we know that =ís refers to the syntactic subject — the protagonist being paddled home — and not nəgʷəmp, his father-in-law. (See Appendix III, Tables 8 and 9 for the full paradigm of third-person possessors.)

The enclitics above confirm that third-person arguments, whether expressed lexically or pronominally, behave predictably in passivized clauses. What about other pronominal arguments? Many languages treat speech act participants (first- and second-person) separately; the grammar might resist demoting a speaker or listener out of subject position. Example (44) shows us that second-person pronominal arguments do not resist demotion from subjecthood.

(44) Pronominal arguments in passive constructions: second person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dúqʷ-ataχs</td>
<td>?əχʔiʔsdəsuʔaʔus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dúqʷ-ata-χs</td>
<td>?əχʔiʔsd-suʔ-ì=us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

see-CONT-2.POSS  desire-PASS-FUT-3.SBJ>2.OBJ2

See what will be desired by you. (See your desired-by-you thing; B1947:255, CIII409.29)

The active version of this phrase might be something like ‘see what you will desire’, with a second-person pronominal subject =ás of the verb ?əχʔiʔsd- ‘desire’.\(^{34}\) In the passivized clause above, the second-person actor is demoted to secondary object status, reflected in the SECONDARY OBJECT enclitic =us, used for transitive verbs with third-person subjects acting on second-person secondary objects (paradigms of these pronominal referents are provided in

\(^{34}\) In this sentence, a matrix imperative ‘see’ precedes a nominalized (and possessed) complement predicate, ‘desired-by-you thing’; the second person pronominal possessive form -χs is used (for possessive paradigms, see tables 8 and 9 in Appendix III) but unlike third-person, no distinction is made between subject and non-subject, so this does not give us additional information about syntactic status of the possessor.
As we might expect, when a speaker is promoted to the syntactic subject of a passivized sentence, the argument structure follows suit, as in (45).

(45) First-person promoted subjects in passive constructions: *laʔiŋa*- ‘enter’

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{PRED}_1 & : \text{laʔiŋa}\hbox{wəm} \hbox{laʔ<}\hbox{gən} \\
\text{PRED}_2 (\text{ADV}) & : \hbox{Gʷəʔiʔcik} \\
\text{enter-PASS}=1\hbox{s.SBJ}>3\hbox{.OBJ1}=1\hbox{.POSS} & : \text{thus.in.house-inside-DEM} \\
\end{align*} \]

I was the object of entering (i.e., someone entered and came to me) when I was in my house here. (I was entered upon in my house. - DR; B1947:270)

The person who enters the house does not appear in the clause; the speaker is subject, and the primary object marking in the 1.SBJ>3.OBJ1 form =ənəkə refers to the nominalized (and possessed) phrase Gʷəʔiʔcik ‘inside (of) my house’. Example (46), with SECONDARY OBJECT passive =əm promoting the first-person from secondary object status to subject status,\(^{35}\) illustrates this as well.

(46) First-person promoted subjects in passive constructions: *laʔiŋa*- ‘enter’

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{PRED} & : \text{laʔiŋa}\hbox{məm} \hbox{laʔa} \quad \text{guk}^\prime \\
\text{OBL} & : \text{laʔa} \quad \text{guk}^\prime \\
\text{enter-PASS}=1\hbox{s.SBJ} \quad \text{PREP}=\text{OBJ1} & : \text{house} \\
\end{align*} \]

I am used for entering (i.e., I am taken) into the house. (I am brought into the house. - DR; B1947:270)

However, first-person arguments do indeed seem to resist demotion from syntactic subject status. See the series of examples below, produced in 2012. In 47a, the money retains its secondary object marking; in 47b, Pearl takes secondary object marking as the demoted subject.

(47) Avoiding demotion of first-person subject

a. Active *həlaq(a)*- ‘pay’: third-person subject  
*Hə́lqasuwi*  *Porlasa*  *dala.*  
*hə́laqa*-suʔ=i  *Porl=*sa  *dala*  
*pay-PASS=SBJ*  *Pearl=OBJ2*  *money*  
Pearl was paid the money. (Rosenblum 2012jul23_BL_09)

\(^{35}\) The motion predicate *laʔiŋa*- ‘to enter’, like *gas*- ‘to walk’ and *siχʷ*- ‘to paddle’, seems to have a ditransitive argument structure, with primary object marking for goals/destinations and, in this case secondary object marking for a person who is made to move in this way (‘brought into’).
b. Passive həlaq(a)- ‘pay’: first-person promoted subject

\[
\begin{align*}
Həłáqasuwənλas & \quad Pərl. \\
 həłáqa-suʔ=ənλas & \quad Pərl \\
pay-PASS-1.SBJ>3.OBJ2 & \quad Pearl \\
I was paid by Pearl. (Rosenblum 2012jul23_BL_09)
\end{align*}
\]

c. Passive həlaq(a)- ‘pay’: first-person demoted subject

\[
\begin{align*}
Həłáχʔidənλaχ & \quad Pərl. \\
həłáq-xʔid=ənχəx & \quad Pərl \\
pay-PASS-1.SBJ>3.OBJ1 & \quad Pearl \\
Elicited: Pearl was paid by me. \\
\text{Translation: I paid Pearl. (Rosenblum 2012jul23_BL_15)}
\end{align*}
\]

In (47c), however, despite the requested passive sentence, the speaker offered the active clause. Speakers easily provided full paradigms of passive constructions with second- and third-person demoted subjects, but consistently offered active formulations when prompted to translate English passive forms with demoted first-person subjects (expressed as oblique in ‘by’-phrases in English). Alternatively, they used the Kwak’wala first-person pronominal predicate with an active predicate, as in (48).

(48) Alternate construction

\[
\begin{align*}
núGʷaʔəm & \quad qʷáxʔidamasga & \quad gíŋənanəm \\
núGʷa=əm & \quad qʷáx-(x)ʔid-amas-sga & \quad gíŋənanəm \\
1.PRED=1.SBJ & \quad \text{grow-MOM-CAUS-DEM.OBJ2 children} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Elicited: The children were raised by me. \\
Translation: I am the one who raised the children.

In the narratives published by Boas and Hunt, relevant examples are sparse, but (49) presents the possibility that first-person pronounals resist other non-subject syntactic slots as well. According to the translation provided by Boas and Hunt, the speaker should be marked as the primary object (the recipient) of the payment; instead, it is marked as the subject.
Based on the translation, the first predicate *hālaq* - ‘to pay’ refers to the payment made to the speaker by someone else; the second predicate is a phrase meaning, in effect ‘the person of whom we were ashamed’. Both are passivized with *-ayu* suffixes, which we know make subjects from secondary objects. The embedded predicate is framed by a purposive clause construction from the first person point of view (see Appendix III, Table 10), but within the embedded predicate, the alignment is as one would expect; the third-person subject is marked with =Ø (rather than primary-object *-q* or secondary *-s*). On the other hand, the grammar of the matrix predicate suggests a completely different interpretation than the translation offers: a demonstrative form signalling a third-person pronominal primary object =oq*! precedes the first-person acting on third-person OBJ2 form =on*λas. (These forms are available in Appendix III Tables 6 and 7.) Having become familiar with the secundative alignment of the verb *hālaq* - ‘pay’, we know that if the recipient of payment (the speaker) were the intended subject, the verb would have been passivized with *-suʔ*, but this clause refers to the amount paid, and is hence passivized with *-ayu*. And yet, the use of =oq*! shows that the pronominal marking maintains subject status for the speaker. Meanwhile, the referent of primary object demonstrative =oq*! is unclear.36

Levine’s work adds to the puzzle; he provides three examples of passives in which speaker retains subject status despite passivization, without commenting on the argument structure (the examples are provided to illustrate a different argument).

(50) First-person pronominals in passive constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>PURP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nap</em>ʔid-suʔ-nuk*!-χ斩获*</td>
<td><em>qanc</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink-MOM-PASS-have-EVID-1SBJ</td>
<td><em>qanc</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be that I had something to drink. (Levine 1980a:51)

---

36 Because this is a purposive clause with an embedded phrase, we can also note the use of the inclusive first-person form of the purposive framing construction *qanc*...=ac (see Appendix III Table 10); the paradigm of K*waʔ*ala purposive constructions marks person but (like possession) only distinguishes between subjects and non-subjects in the third-person.
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First-person pronominals in passive constructions

PRED
max?id-su?-iɛsd-ɔn
max-x.id-슈-su?-iɛsd=ɔn
strike-MOM-PASS-DESID=1.SBJ
I want to get hit. (Levine 1980a:51)

First-person pronominals in passive constructions

PRED
duχʷ-iipeduukʷ=ɔn
duqʷ-x.id-슈-su?-nukʷ=ɔn
see-MOM-PASS-have=1.SBJ
I went to look at something. (I’ve got something looked-at. - DR; Levine 1980a:52)

The translations of these clauses rely on lexical passives in English (‘I’ve got…’), or other ways of reducing agency (and hence, transitivity) on the part of the speaker; however, a passive interpretation would mean that the speaker is not the subject. All three of these constructions, unlike the example taken from Boas, contain aspectual suffixes following the passive derivation (-nukʷ ‘have’ and -iɛsd ‘DESID’); both act to reduce the telicity (and thus the transitivity) of the predicate (Hopper and Thompson 1980). This may also play a role in argument structure. Perhaps these are lexicalized stems for which second- and third-person subjects would also behave as if the predicate is active. Or it may be that the presence of valence-reducing suffixes such as -nukʷ and -iɛsd following a passive derivation trigger different argument structures. Further research will explore the relationship of aspectual suffixes to passive morphology and alignment of first-person arguments. The preliminary analysis suggests a different pattern of alignment for passives with first-person arguments than for other pronominal arguments, but additional data from connected and spontaneous speech are necessary to support the claim.

Prompted by the prevalence of inverse systems in neighboring languages, some might suggest that the divergence of first-person pronominal alignment is evidence of an inverse system (Forrest 1994, inter alia). Such inverse systems reflect the grammaticalization of some type of a semantic hierarchy ranking the expected topicality of participants in a clause: first- or second-person arguments may be more topical than third-person arguments, or human arguments over animal arguments, leading to special marking in clauses which reverse this hierarchy (with a horse kicking a man, for example).

Does the divergence of the first-person pronominal agreement in K’awak’wala suggest an inverse system? I would argue that it does not, for several reasons. In a prototypical inverse system, such as the Plains Cree system described by Dahlstrom, neither the transitivity of the predicate nor the grammatical relations of arguments are changed: “both the inverse and direct form are transitive and active: that is, both map agent onto subject and patient onto object” (Dahlstrom 1986:74). But as we have seen in the examples above, passive derivations consistently reduce transitivity and reorganize argument structure in predictable ways in K’awak’wala clauses. For example, in (53), we see again that the second-person argument (the agent of the predicate wəłə- ‘ask’) is marked as a SECONDARY OBJECT with the suffix =us.
Pronominal arguments in passive construction with -\textit{su}?

PRED: \textit{hīmaʔis} (or \textit{hi-mi-is})

SBJ: \textit{ənəšəwu}s


That is what was asked by you. (B1947:286, III64.4)

Nakayama’s analysis of the “passive” suffix -\textit{at} from the neighboring Wakshan language Nuu-chah-nulth also explored the question of whether an inverse analysis might be appropriate. While he found that -\textit{at} is sensitive to an animacy hierarchy (based on speaker empathy, Nakayama 1986:429), he concludes that the pattern of pronominal indexing in -\textit{at} does not support an inverse analysis (Nakayama 1986:422).\footnote{Nor does Nakayama choose to characterize the Nuu-chah-nulth suffix -\textit{at} as “passive” (Nakayama 1986:429).}

K\textsuperscript{w}a\textsuperscript{k}al\textsuperscript{a}la grammar does not seem to be sensitive to an animacy hierarchy, as we might remember from examples (12), (13), and (14), in which a dog bites a child. The active clause (12), with no special marking, is reproduced here.

(54) Active sentence: \textit{\textit{q}a\textit{x} ‘bite’}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
AUX.PRED & \textit{laʔom} \textit{\textit{q}a\textit{x}ʔi\textit{di}da} \textit{\textit{w}acaq} \\
SBJ & \textit{la-mi=Ø} \textit{\textit{q}a\textit{x}ʔi\textit{di}=i=\textit{da} \textit{\textit{w}ac=(a)q} \\
SEQ-OI=3.SBJ & \textit{bite-MOM=SBJ=DEF} \textit{dog=3.OBJ1} \\
\end{tabular}

Now the dog bit him. (B1947:286, CIII12.19)

The third-person pronominal object \textit{\textit{\textit{a}q} encliticized to the subject \textit{\textit{w}ac ‘dog’ refers to the person being bitten. Languages with an animacy hierarchy triggering inverse-marking might require ‘dog’ to be marked as ‘obviative’ and the third-person object to be marked as ‘proximate’, but there is no such marking here.

On the other hand, as we saw in examples (47) through (52), K\textsuperscript{w}a\textsuperscript{k}al\textsuperscript{a}la alignment of passive constructions does seem to be sensitive to a hierarchy with respect to the speaker in relation to other participants (1 > 2,3). I would argue that these clauses should tentatively be interpreted as passives with a resistance to demotion of the first-person speaker from subject position. The behavior of pronominal marking in passive constructions in contemporary K\textsuperscript{w}a\textsuperscript{k}al\textsuperscript{a}la discourse is a key target for further research.

The next and last part of this section addresses the combinatorial properties of these suffixes with respect to predicates and arguments, and the question of their status within the lexicon.

### 3.4 Derivation, Lexicalization, and Polysemy

As mentioned briefly in the introduction to the language, some derivational suffixes attach only to predicates, and others only to arguments; these suffixes contribute to the distinctions we can draw between syntactic predicates and arguments in the K\textsuperscript{w}a\textsuperscript{k}al\textsuperscript{a}la clause. However, there is also ambiguity; some derivational suffixes can be used with either predicates or arguments. This is the case with four of the passive suffixes in K\textsuperscript{w}a\textsuperscript{k}al\textsuperscript{a}la. The \textit{SECONDARY OBJECT} suffixes \textit{-\textit{\textit{\textit{a}yu and -\textit{om — two of Boas’ so-called ‘instrumental’ passives — are used extensively to nominalize

\footnote{Nor does Nakayama choose to characterize the Nuu-chah-nulth suffix -\textit{at} as “passive” (Nakayama 1986:429).}
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transitive stems, usually to create a word for the tool or instrument which performs an action. The LOCATIVE suffix -ʔas is used widely in placenames. On the other hand, the PRIMARY OBJECT suffix -suʔ and EXPERIENCER -t seem never to occur in a non-predicative context.

This raises the question of the status of such morphemes in the lexicon: are the nominalizers the same as the passivizing morphemes used to derive predicates? Boas considered these morphemes to be one and the same, serving different functions in a predicative context versus a nominalizing one. I would argue that they are not. Based on the lexicalization of instrumental forms in nouns, the grammaticalization of -suʔ and -ayu/-ano/-ano in relation to the syntax of argument structure, and the fact that not all of the passive forms have a nominalizing function, I consider the nominalizing forms of -ayu, -əm, -ano, and -ʔas to be separate lexemes, distinct from the homophonous passivizing suffixes to which they are historically related.

We have seen some of the nominalizations formed by attaching -ayu and -əm to transitive stems. Example (31) contains the word λəmkayu ‘wedge’, a combination of the stem λəmk- ‘to split wood with wedge’, and the suffix -ayu. The word Gəlyayu in example (34) combines the stem Gəls- ‘to paint’ with -ayu to form ‘paint’ (the substance). The Kʷakʷala lexicon is full of such forms. The word nítəbayu ‘shoes’ derives from the reduplicated form of tɨp- ‘to step on’ (because there are two shoes) and -ayu (Boas 1948:176). The word dənəm ‘rope’ combines the stem dən- ‘to pull a rope’ and -əm (Boas 1948:151). The words sìwwayu ‘paddle’, kəwayu ‘knife’, kiəm ‘fishing net’, and qəmdəm ‘song’ are further examples of nouns created with instrumental suffixes.

The suffixes are clearly very productive, but it is not likely that these forms are created anew each time. There is further evidence that certain combinations of forms are lexicalized. Boas contrasts qənəyu ‘thread’ with qənəyu ‘needle’, both from combinations of qən- ‘sew’ with -ayu (B1947:312). Another contrasting pair employs two different ‘instrumental’ suffixes with the same stem náq- ‘to drink’, leading to contrasting semantic values: -ayu in náGayu ‘drinking tube’ and -əm in náGəm ‘bucket’. In still other cases, the productivity of these suffixes leads to formal variability with semantic constancy: both mənəyayu and mənəyəm ‘ruler, instrument for measuring’, derived from məns- ‘measure’, are judged acceptable by Boas’ consultants, although he says that mənəyayu was more commonly used (B1947:302).

The different functional distributions of the argument and predicate suffixes further support a polysemous interpretation. As we have seen, the semantic role of a syntactic SECONDARY OBJECT is sometimes ‘instrument’, but not always. For ‘transfer’ ditransitives such as ‘give’, ‘pay’, or ‘send’, the SECONDARY OBJECT will be the transferred object (while the recipient is marked as PRIMARY OBJECT), and for ‘motion’ predicates such as ‘walk’ and ‘paddle’, the SECONDARY OBJECT will be the one made to move in that way (while the destination is marked as PRIMARY OBJECT). As we saw in example (31), -əm and -ano do not always promote an ‘instrument’ to subject status: the semantic role of λəmkayu ‘wedge’ is the instrument which is taken (and used) in this clause, but the selection of the object-promoting passivizing suffix depends on the syntactic case of an argument. The predicate ?əxʔid- ‘take’ must be passivized with PRIMARY OBJECT passive -suʔ to allow promotion of λəmkayu to subject status.

It is not yet obvious whether some stems used in a predicative context have lexicalized with

---

38 This is likely the origin of Boas’ use of the term ‘instrumental’ for the secondary object case, because he linked this suffix in its form as a nominalizer to its relationship with the secondary object paradigm of pronouns and demonstratives.

39 The two forms -ayu and -yə are allomorphs of the same form: -yə tends to follow vowels, /l/, /n/, /n/, and /w/, but Boas notes “it (the passive morpheme -ayu) is somewhat irregular in its behavior” (B1947:312).
passive morphology. Levine gives the example *hanîxʔîdsuňułkwən*, ‘I’ve got something to eat’, as an example of the suffix -*suʔ* in a lexicalized context.

(55) PRED

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hanîxʔîdsuňułk}\text{wən}^{40} \\
\text{haʔm-xʔid-suʔ-nuk}=\text{on}
\end{align*}
\]

eat-MOM-PASS-have=1.SBJ

I’ve got something to eat. (Levine 1980a:242)

Like examples (50) to (52), this stem includes a valence-reducing suffix -*nuk* following the passive suffix -*suʔ*. Again, the first-person subject pronominal =*on* is attached to the predicate, and the translation includes a first-person subject. It is not clear what function the passive suffix plays here. As mentioned earlier, perhaps this is a lexicalized derived stem which can now behave as an active predicate and take subject-like subjects. More research on the alignment of pronominal arguments in active and passive constructions will help answer this question definitively.

4 Discourse Motivations for Passivization

Section 3 focused on the morphosyntactic picture of passive constructions in Kwakwala: what the individual morphemes are, what their functions are, what syntactic and semantic considerations determine their distribution, and what alignments of arguments they trigger. But passive constructions are grammaticalizations of the patterns of use in a speech community: the tendency to promote a participant to subject arises in certain discourse contexts. Over time, these tendencies can become an obligatory and unconscious feature of the grammar. This section examines the discourse context in which passive constructions are used in Kwakwala. Both types of discourse motivations are explored in this section: (1) passivization as an optional strategy within a speaker’s repertoire, used in ways that reflect the speaker’s choice to focus the listener’s attention on something topical; and (2) passivization as an obligatory strategy triggered by certain syntactic patterns within discourse. The preliminary analysis of discourse data presented here draws on Boas’ texts and grammar alongside elicited material from Levine and data from recent fieldwork.

Figures 2 and 3 summarize the findings from seven interlinearized narratives recorded by Boas and Hunt (Boas 1895; Boas 1906).

---

40 This example is misspelled in Levine; it should be *haʔm*- ‘eat’.
Passive constructions are far less frequent than active predicates; out of a total of 650 clauses (one predicate per clause), only 36 predicates, or 5.5%, were passivized. Kwakwaala passive constructions can thus be considered pragmatically and functionally ‘marked’ in contrast to neutral active forms.

Perhaps because the PRIMARY OBJECT promotion suffix -su? applies to both transitive and ditransitive stems, it occurs more frequently in the texts examined than the three SECONDARY OBJECT promotion suffixes (-ayu, -ano, -om) combined: 22 uses of PRIMARY OBJECT -su? compared with 12 uses of SECONDARY OBJECT -ayu (8), -ano (1) and -om (3). The EXPERIENCER passive -f was found in one predicate. No locative passives were found in the narrative texts. The

---

41 Clauses were counted according to predicates. Because some of the secondary object passive forms also occur in lexicalized nominals, passive forms were only counted when they were suffixed to a predicate stem and influenced the argument structure of the clause.
use of passives in the examined texts was primarily promotional, to allow a protagonist to maintain subject status, for example, or to maintain an important topic in subject position. These frequency counts should be considered in the light of the genre-limitation to origin tales. Forthcoming work analyzes the use of passive morphosyntax in a newly collected corpus of spontaneous interaction.

In many of these contexts, passivization is a narrative tool sensitive to speaker decisions about what is topical. Commonly-cited cross-linguistic motivations for using passive morphosyntax include topic continuity, argument structure of relativized clauses, and ‘foregrounding’ or ‘featuring’ of a significant participant (cf. Shibatani 1988 *inter alia*). These expectations are fulfilled in this sample of Kwaŋala narrative discourse. However, passivization is obligatory in two syntactic contexts, described in the next two sub-sections: (1) relative clauses and (2) with independent pronoun predicates. These syntactic patterns are relatively rare in discourse, and much of the existing documentation relies on elicitation, which poses some challenges to interpretation, discussed below.

### 4.1 Passivization and Relative Clauses

In Kwaŋala, relativized arguments must be presented as subjects of embedded predicates in relative clauses. The hierarchical constraint on accessibility to relativization, first described by Keenan and Comrie (1977), is common to many languages. In Kwaŋala, when one wishes to relativize a non-subject argument of an active clause, one passivizes the embedded predicate to promote the argument to subject status and allow relativization. Levine’s elicited examples suggest that almost any argument from the matrix clause can be relativized if it can be made a subject (Levine 1980a:245-248). The syntactic status of the relativized argument determines whether a passive is needed and if so, which passive is used in the embedded predicate. In the first three examples, no passivization is needed because the relative is the subject of the *active* form of the embedded predicate.

(56) Active RC: Relative is OBJ1 of Main, SBJ of RC

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{duq”len} & = \text{OBJ1 of Main, SBJ of RC} \\
\text{bog’w} & = \text{OBJ2 of RC} \\
\text{man} & = \text{OBJ1 of RC} \\
\text{see} & = \text{SBJ of Main} \\
\text{throw} & = \text{OBJ2 of RC} \\
\text{I saw the man who threw the stone.} & \text{(Levine 1980a:245)}
\end{align*}
\]

(57) Active RC: SBJ of Main, SBJ of RC

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qolku} & = \text{OBJ1 of RC} \\
\text{med} & = \text{OBJ2 of RC} \\
\text{tired} & = \text{OBJ1 of RC} \\
\text{strike} & = \text{T.DEM} \\
\text{The one who hit is tired.} & \text{(Levine 1980a:245)}
\end{align*}
\]
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(58) Active RC: OBJ1 of Main, SBJ of transitive

duqʷə̱nːaλaχʷə̱mex?i̱diχ

duqʷ-l=ən(λ)=χʷə̱a mex?i̱d=iχ

see-PST=1.SBJ=OBJ1 strike=T.DEM

I saw the one who hit. (Levine 1980a:245)

In the next examples, the relativized arguments are not the subject of an active form of the predicate within the relative clause; passivization of the embedded predicate thus promotes the relativized argument to subject status and allows relativization. In (59), the primary object of the stem duqʷ- ‘see’, the one seen by the speaker, would be the primary object of an active form of mexʔid-. Thus, the PRIMARY OBJECT passive -suʔ is used to promote the relativized argument, ‘the one who got hit’, to become the subject of the relative clause and allow it to be relativized.

(59) Passivized RC: OBJ1 of Main, SBJ of passivized RC (< OBJ1)

duqʷə̱nːaλaχʷə̱mexʔidseʔiχ

duqʷ-l=ən(λ)=χʷə̱a mexʔi̱d-suʔ=iχ

see-EXP=1.SBJ=OBJ1 strike.with.fist-MOM-PASS=T.DEM

I saw the one who got hit (punched - DR). (Levine 1980a:245)

In the next example, both predicates are passivized. The subject of the main predicate, the speaker (indicated by pronominal =ənλ) is the recipient of the gift, hence the use of PRIMARY OBJECT passive -suʔ to promote the recipient to subject of the matrix clause. As a result of passivizing the matrix predicate, the demoted actor (who gave the gift) is s-marked as a SECONDARY OBJECT with =sa. This actor, the gift-giver, is the relativized argument, ‘the one who was hit’.

(60) Passivized RC (and passivized main PRED):

OBJ2 of Main, SBJ of passivized RC (< OBJ1)

cusə̱wə̱nːaλasa mexʔidsuʔ

cə̱w-suʔ=ən(λ)=sa mexʔi̱d-suʔ
give-PASS=1.SBJ=OBJ2 strike.with.fist-MOM-PASS

I was given (it) by the one who was hit (punched - DR). (Levine 1980a:245)

He (or she) is the recipient of the punch, and would be marked as PRIMARY OBJECT in an active clause, but in order to allow relativization, PRIMARY OBJECT passive -suʔ promotes this person to subject. Interestingly, the gift itself, which would also be marked as a secondary object does not appear in the K’tak’wala clause; there seems to be no space for it.

The example below shows the addition of further arguments to the relative clause; passivization within an embedded relative requires the same process of demotion of the actor (and secondary object marking) that one would expect in a main clause.
Note that the lexically-expressed relativized argument $bêg^*anam$ ‘man’ precedes the embedded predicate for which it is the subject, and no subject-marking appears on $mox?idiswasa$. (With the lexical subject following the predicate, we would expect the prenominal subject marker $=i$.) Note also that this is translated as a presentative clause, with ‘That is...’. The matrix predicate $hi?om$ is an independent pronoun predicate (which for the third-person forms are also equivalent to demonstratives meaning ‘this’, ‘that (near)’, and ‘that (far)’ (Boas 1947:258); we have seen other examples of the pronominal predicates above. These so-called ‘verbal pronouns’ (Boas 1947:258) also trigger passivization and are further discussed in the next section.

Levine presents the next example as proof of the ungrammaticality of non-subjects in relative clauses. This seems very likely, but there are other ambiguities which may have obscured the grammaticality judgement of a consultant; the prenominal subject marker $=i$ refers to the woman $çodaq$, but confusingly, the prenominal marker $=çXa$ is used in the constructed example to refer to the man ($bêg^*anam$) who was hit, which precedes rather than follows the relativized predicate.

It is not clear how the relativized argument should be expressed in the embedded predicate, and whether a different type of marking (such as the third-person PRIMARY OBJECT pronoun $=q$) or any marking at all would have been appropriate.

This example highlights the challenge of constructing examples for the elicitation of grammaticality judgements. Further research will pursue the question of relativization in both the corpus of spontaneous speech and in a context of carefully considered elicitation, and focus on the pronominal and prenominal marking of subjects in relative clauses.

### 4.2 Independent Pronoun Predicates

Another situation in which passivization seems to be obligatory involves the unusual Kwakwala paradigm of demonstrative pronoun ‘predicates’ used in appositive constructions and presented in Table 3 below. These forms occur in clause-initial position and take predicate derivation and inflection as necessary although they do not take subject-marking enclitics. They must be followed by a complement which completes the clause and was analyzed by Boas as a type of relative clause; the complement takes special terminal marking triggered by the pronominal predicate.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Terminal Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>négv’a</td>
<td>=∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.INC</td>
<td>négv’onc</td>
<td>=∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.EXC</td>
<td>négv’ənχ’w</td>
<td>=∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>=əs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PROX</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>=ək</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.MED</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td>=ux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.DIST</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>=i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Predicate demonstrative pronouns and terminal markers (adapted from B1947:258)

When the complement is a simple NP, two constituents are juxtaposed, the predicate and the complement, as in the example below.

(63) Second-person demonstrative pronoun predicate

\[
\begin{align*}
PRED & \quad \text{COMP} \\
\text{súʔəm} & \quad Síwidəs \\
\text{sú=əm} & \quad Síwid=əs \\
2.\text{PRON.PRED-OI} & \quad \text{Siwid=2.PR.DEM} \\
\end{align*}
\]

You are (the one who is) Siwid. (B1947:258)

Sometimes, the complement is another predicate, and the complement predicate is stativized, as below with -\text{nuk}’w.

(64) Second-person demonstrative pronoun predicate

\[
\begin{align*}
PRED & \quad \text{COMP} \\
\text{súʔəm} & \quad kísʔu\text{-nuk}’w \\
\text{sú=əm} & \quad kísʔu-nuk’w \\
2.\text{PRON.PRED-OI} & \quad \text{own.crest-having.NOM} \\
\end{align*}
\]

You are the one who owns the privilege. (…who is the crest-owner - DR; B1947:258, CX 66.18)

However, in other cases, when the complement predicate is transitive, Boas observes that “when the subject is emphasized by a demonstrative pronoun, the predicate is expressed by a passive” (B1947:286). Boas’ ‘subject’ seems to refer to the subject of the complement predicate, and it seems that passivization ensures an interpretable relationship between the referent of the ‘pronominal predicate’ and the subject of the embedded predicate. In the first example below, passivization with -\text{suʔəm} allows coreference between the demonstrative \text{hiʔəm} and the liked-thing to which it refers (which would normally be expressed as a primary object).
(65) Predicate demonstrative pronouns and passivization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED.PRON</th>
<th>PRED.COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>híʔan</td>
<td>?oxʔ?xsdəsaʔs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hí-û-Ø</td>
<td>?oxʔ?xsdə-šuʔ=øs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.DEM.PRON.PRED-OL-3.POSS like-PASS=2.PR.DEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is what he likes. (lit. that is his liked one; B1947:286)

In the next example, the construction is very similar. Here the first-person possessor -øn precedes the complement. Again, passivization permits coreference between the pronominal predicate híʔ- ‘that’ and the subject of the complement, [that lamux ?oxʔ?xsdəsdəwu] ‘my very much liked thing.’

(66) Predicate demonstrative pronoun and passivized complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hímʔon</td>
<td>lamux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hí-û=øn</td>
<td>lamux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.DEM.PRON.PRED-OL-1.POSS like-PASS=3PR.DEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is what I like very much. (That is my liked thing. - DR; B1947:286)

(67) Predicate demonstrative pronoun and passivized complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hímaʔis</td>
<td>wołásaʔos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hí-û=is</td>
<td>wołá-suʔ=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.DEM.PRON.PRED-OL=2.POSS ask-PASS=3PR.3POSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is what was asked by you. (That is your asked for thing. - DR; B1947:286)

The prenominal possessive markers are familiar (see Appendix III), but the postnominal possessive markers =s seen in example (61) and (63) above and =øs in example (65) are not the same forms found in the standard possessive paradigm (see Appendix III, Tables 8 and 9), and are described as a special set of possessive markers used only in predicative pronominal constructions such as these (Boas 1947:259; see Appendix III, Table 11).

The three examples provided above are relatively straightforward to interpret; they also seem to be elicited examples, rather than spontaneously occurring ones. The next example, from one of Boas and Hunt’s texts, is less intuitively understood.

---

42 Despite the homophony between 1.SBJ =øn and 1.POSS =øn, a first-person subject would not make sense in this context.
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(68) Second-person predicate demonstrative and passivized complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>súʔəm</td>
<td>məxʔicuʔgʷitə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>súʔəm</td>
<td>məxʔid-suʔ-gʷitə=ś</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PRON.PRED-OI punch-MOM-PASS-reason=3PR.3POSS
You are the reason of his being struck. (… the reason he was punched. - DR; B1947:258, CX 66.18)

In this example, the second-person demonstrative pronoun predicate súʔəm precedes a passivized complement meaning ‘reason for being punched’. The derivational suffix -gʷit ‘reason for’ follows the primary object passive suffix -suʔ; we don’t know the argument structure of an active form of məxʔid- ‘punch’ combined with -gʷit ‘reason for doing something,’ but based on our analysis of the distribution of -suʔ, the primary object of the active verb form would have to be ‘the reason’ for which someone was punched. Passivization seems to allow coreference between the listener and the promoted subject of the complement predicate, the reason for punching.

The preceding examples employ the PRIMARY OBJECT passive -suʔ, but other passives also occur in these appositive constructions. Example (38) is repeated below.

(69) Passive: duqʷ ‘see’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>PRED_COMP</th>
<th>SBJ_COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hiʔmon</td>
<td>duqʷxida</td>
<td>?ixpómatə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi-mən</td>
<td>duqʷ=t=da</td>
<td>?ix-pómatə-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. PRON.PRED-OI-1.POSS see-PASS=SBJ=DEF good-play-T.DEM
That is my seen one it is a good play. (i.e., That one seen by me is a good play. - DR; B1947:286)

Here, the embedded predicate duqʷ ‘see’ is passivized with the EXPERIENCER passive -t enabling the play ?ixpómatə to be the subject, coreferential with the third-person demonstrative pronoun ‘that’.

The use of passivization in special syntactic contexts is intriguing, but definitive claims are limited by the rarity of these constructions and the reliance on elicitation contexts to explore their occurrence. The development of searchable corpora for both legacy texts and newly collected spontaneous speech will hopefully further illuminate the use of passivization to serve the needs of speakers.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

The rich passive morphosyntax of K’wák’wala adds to our typology of voice systems in the world’s languages. The K’wák’wala passive paradigm reduces transitivity without reducing valence. Meanwhile, the distribution of passive morphology is shaped by both syntactic and semantic forces. The PRIMARY OBJECT passive suffix -suʔ and the SECONDARY OBJECT suffixes -ayu, -əm and -ano are governed by syntactic criteria: the former used to promote n-marked primary objects into subject position, the latter used to promote s-marked secondary objects into subject position. On the other hand, the functions of passive suffixes -t and -ʔas are determined by
semantic considerations of different types. The use of the EXPERIENCER suffix -l is determined by the event structure of the clause, expressing a lack of control on the part of the patient or an experience resulting from a non-animate agent. The LOCATIVE suffix -las is only used to make subjects from a geographic place.

This description of the passive morphosyntax of Kwak’wala reveals only the tip of the iceberg. There are several issues remaining to be explored in emerging corpora. The behavior of pronominal arguments, and in particular, the behavior of first person pronominal arguments in passivized predicates, invite further study to determine whether first person arguments indeed retain their subject status. The passivization of stative predicates and the question of what voice is expressed by EXPERIENCER -l also invite further study. One might also ask whether predicates containing passive suffixes have lexicalized and can be used as the stems of active constructions.

The corpus of contemporary interactive speech in Kwak’wala in progress will allow us to explore the use of passive suffixes in more recent speech. By comparing modern examples with those taken from Boas and Hunt’s texts recorded a century ago, we will be able to examine ways in which the usage or distribution of such morphemes may have changed, and flesh out our picture of passive morphosyntax in Kwak’wala.
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Appendices

Appendix I: List of Abbreviations Used in Glossing

1 first person  
2 second person  
3 third person  
A agent-like argument of canonical transitive verb  
ADJ adjective  
ADV adverb(ial)  
AUX auxiliary  
CAUS causative  
CONN connective  
CONT continuative aspect  
DEF definite
Passive Constructions in *Kʷakʷala*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTR</td>
<td>distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation, negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer/nominalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>old (known) information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ1</td>
<td>primary-object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ2</td>
<td>secondary object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>patient-like argument of canonical transitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR.POSS</td>
<td>special possessive postnominal marking complements of predicative pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>predicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal/proximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle/marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECP</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM.PST</td>
<td>remote past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>single argument of canonical intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.DEM</td>
<td>sentence-closing demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Orthographies and Phonetic Correspondences

Note: All examples have been transliterated to the ‘NAPA’ (North American Phonetic Alphabet) orthography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>Boas</th>
<th>U’mista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥ</td>
<td>p!</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>t!</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gw</td>
<td>gw</td>
<td>gw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kw</td>
<td>kw</td>
<td>kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḳ</td>
<td>k!</td>
<td>ḳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṫw</td>
<td>k!w</td>
<td>ṫw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gw</td>
<td>gw</td>
<td>gw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qw</td>
<td>kw</td>
<td>kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>q!</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṧw</td>
<td>q!w</td>
<td>ṧw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>d Ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λw</td>
<td>Lw</td>
<td>d Łw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dż</td>
<td>dz</td>
<td>dz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ć</td>
<td>ts!</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł Ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xw</td>
<td>xw</td>
<td>xw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ł</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>łw</td>
<td>xw</td>
<td>xw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m̄</td>
<td>m̄</td>
<td>‘m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ń</td>
<td>ń</td>
<td>‘n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ł</td>
<td>ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ł̄</td>
<td>Ł̄</td>
<td>‘ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ły</td>
<td>ły</td>
<td>‘y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix III: Tables of Pronouns and Demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.DEM</th>
<th>Attached to Predicate</th>
<th>Postnominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>Prenominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX.VIS</td>
<td>=k</td>
<td>=ga(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX.INV</td>
<td>=ga?</td>
<td>=ga(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED.VIS</td>
<td>=uχ</td>
<td>=uχ(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED.INV</td>
<td>=u?</td>
<td>=uχ(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST.VIS</td>
<td>=iq</td>
<td>=i(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST.INV</td>
<td>-i?</td>
<td>i(da)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: 3rd person demonstrative verbal enclitics and postnominals (adapted from Boas 1947:252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.DEM</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Prenominal</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Prenominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>OBJ1</td>
<td>OBJ2</td>
<td>SBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX.VIS</td>
<td>=k</td>
<td>=qak</td>
<td>=sak</td>
<td>=ga(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX.INV</td>
<td>=ga?</td>
<td>=χga?</td>
<td>=sga?</td>
<td>=ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED.VIS</td>
<td>=uχ</td>
<td>=qχ</td>
<td>=suχ</td>
<td>=uχ(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED.INV</td>
<td>=u?</td>
<td>=q, =qu?</td>
<td>=su?</td>
<td>=uχ(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST.VIS</td>
<td>=iq</td>
<td>=q</td>
<td>=s</td>
<td>=i(da)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST.INV</td>
<td>-i?</td>
<td>=qi</td>
<td>=si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: 3rd person pronominal and adnominal demonstrative enclitics (adapted from Boas 1947:252)

Boas named these demonstratives according to their proximity to speech participants, as ‘Demonstrative of 1st person, visible, Demonstrative of 2nd person, visible, etc.’ It is not clear whether this reflects additional referential qualities other than proximity, such as discourse relevance. However, the labels Proximal, Medial and Distal are more transparent and one can infer some metaphoric or deictic extension.
### Table 6: Transitive predicates with primary object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Primary Object</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2^ND</th>
<th>3^RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=©ηλοχ̃</td>
<td>=©ηλαq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=©ηνυχ̃ωχ̃</td>
<td>=ηυηχ̃αq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=ηνυχ̃αq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^ND</td>
<td>gαχ̃ην</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>gαχ̃ηνυχ̃ω</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=ηλχ</td>
<td>=q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3^RD</td>
<td>gαχ̃ην</td>
<td>gαχ̃ηνχ</td>
<td>gαχ̃ηνυχ̃ω</td>
<td>=ηλχ</td>
<td>=q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Transitive predicates with secondary object (adapted from Boas 1947:253)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Secondary Object</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2^ND</th>
<th>3^RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=©ηχοσ</td>
<td>=©ηχασ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=©ηςασ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=ηυηχ̃αq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^ND</td>
<td>=secην</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=secηνυχ̃ω</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=ης</td>
<td>=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3^RD</td>
<td>=ην</td>
<td>=ςν</td>
<td>=ηυηχ̃αq</td>
<td>=ις</td>
<td>=s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Possessive enclitics for 1st and 2nd person (adapted from Boas 1947:253)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.DEM</th>
<th>Prenominal</th>
<th>Postnominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROX.VIS</td>
<td>PROX.INV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>=gin</td>
<td>=ginc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>=gη</td>
<td>=gης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>=gην</td>
<td>=gηςας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^ND</td>
<td>=g=</td>
<td>=gα=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3^RD</td>
<td>=g=</td>
<td>=gα=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Possessive enclitics for 3rd person (adapted from Boas 1947:254)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.DEM</th>
<th>Possessor subject of sentence</th>
<th>Possessor not subject of sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prenominal</td>
<td>Postnominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX.VIS</td>
<td>=gas</td>
<td>=k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX.INV</td>
<td>=gα?</td>
<td>=q (=ιχ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED.VIS</td>
<td>=us</td>
<td>=q (=ιαχ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED.INV</td>
<td>=i</td>
<td>=q (=ιαχ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST.VIS</td>
<td>=is</td>
<td>=a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Passive Constructions in *K’awak’ala*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>qən...a(?ən)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>qənc...a(?ənc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXCL</td>
<td>qənuχw...(a(ʔuʔχw))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>qaʔs...ʔus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD (POSSESSOR ≠ SUBJECT)</td>
<td>qaʔ...is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD (POSSESSOR = SUBJECT)</td>
<td>qaʔs...a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Purposive clauses (adapted from Boas 1947:274)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.POSS</th>
<th>2.POSS</th>
<th>3.POSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>nugwʔəms ...=us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sumən ...=s</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hímən ...=Ø</td>
<td>híʔəms ...=Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Terminal markers on possessed nominals occurring with pronominal predicates (adapted from Boas 1947:259)
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