# Kiowa-Tanoan agreement and agreement restrictions: III

Daniel Harbour (harbour@alum.mit.edu)
Queen Mary University of London

May 27, 2009

(1) **Today's aims**

    a. To finish off / amplify the argument from last week against viewing Southern Tiwa "passives" as passives.

    b. To examine Southern Tiwa "incorporation" and see whether how much it's like incorporation (or whether we should stick with last week's terminology of 'skulking').

(2) **Passives or "Passives"?**

    a. "the frequencies associated with the direct/inverse opposition in connected discourse are borne out in the Tanoan languages. A small sample count of the case marked NPs in so-called passive clauses reveals that they do not correcpond to the frequencies reported for passives in narrative material (e.g., Givón 1979:59 for English) where agentless passives are by far the most frequent. Instead, in two Picuris narrative texts (Harrington and Roberts 1928) with specific and referential participants, the case-marked Agent is in fact more frequently present. The total number of passive clauses is small (barely 3%), but of those clauses fully 80% have an overt case-marked agent NP." (Watkins 1996: 12)

    b. Cf, Kroskrity's (1985) epigraph: "'All forms of linguistic expression are reducible to a common psychological ground, but this ground cannot be properly understood without the perspective gained from a sympathetic study of the forms themselves.' (Sapir & Swadesh 1946:104)"

    c. Note the tacit assumption about the uniformity of discourse tendencies crosslinguistically. If passives have different rates of usage across English and German (or between day-to-day talk and high-level register within English), is it not possible that the Southern Tiwa construction is a passive, but that passive usage is different from that of English? If so, does Watkins' comparison require further argument?

d. Our subsequent work may make it harder to maintain this auxiliary assumption. Specifically, in Harbour, Watkins, and Adger (2007)—though the insight is really Laurel's—we show that postverbal noun phrases in Kiowa have a very particular discourse function, namely, rounding off discourse segments (e.g., marking the passage from set up to complicating actions, or from one complicating action to the next, or from the complicating actions to the denouement). To my knowledge, this is not universal.

e. We can bolster Watkins' position with Southern-Tiwa-internal evidence.

(3) **Internal evidence I: prefixes**

a. To judge by the prefixes, Southern Tiwa "passives" involve chômeurization without advancement.

b. Consider the prefixes in the passives below:

   (i)   Liora-de- **ba**   in-     khwien-wia- **che-**   ban
          lady- BAS-**INST** :1S:3S-dog-   give-"**PASS**"-PAST
          'The lady gave me a dog'

   (ii)  Liora-de- **ba**   a-      khwien-wia- che-   ban  'u'u- de
          lady- BAS-**INST** :3S:3S-dog-   give-"**PASS**"-PAST child-BAS
          'The lady gave the child the dog'

The glossing system used here implies—deliberately—that the morphological constituents of the prefix are applicative and direct object agreement.

c. When one adds a licit (i.e., non-third-person) agent to the prefixes above what one gets can be straightforwardly morphologically compositional: an agent agreement morpheme added to the prefix :1S:3S and :3S:3S (though there are a number of complicating factors, such as allomorphy and some applicatives (second person) precluding any agent agreement). E.g.:

   (i)   :3S:3S, :3S:3D, :3S:3I = **a**, **ow**, **am**
       1S:3S:3S, 1S:3S:3D, 1S:3S:3I = **ta**, **tow**, **tam**

   (ii)  :1S:3S, :1S:3D, :1S:3I = **in**, **iw**, **im** (i+n/w/m?)
       2S:1S:3S, 2S:1S:3D, 2S:1S:3I = **ben**, **bow**, **bem** (be+i+n/w/m $\mapsto$ be+n/w/m?)
       (Note. 2S:1S = **bey** (be+i?))

d. Similar results for various prefix combinations in (i) Kiowa and (ii) Jemez. (Yes, I'm cherry picking. The provisos above—allomorphy and preferential agreement for some applicatives over some agents—apply here too.)

   (i)   :3S:3S, :3S:3D, :3S:3P, :3S:3I = **á**, **én**, **án**, **ɔ́**
       1S:3S:3S, 1S:3S:3D, 1S:3S:3P, 1S:3S:3I = **gyá**, **nén**, **yán**, **gɔ́** (from g+á, g+én, etc., via standard phonology)

   (ii)  :3D:3S/P, :3D:3D/I = **i̱**, **i̱l**
       1S:3D:3S/P, 1S:3D:3D/I = **ti̱**, **ti̱l**

e. Methodological note. Week II (3a*i*) warned against excessive decomposing of Southern Tiwa prefixes in the absence of tone marking. However, not subjecting the constituency of the agreement prefix to any analysis (which may be what Allen, Frantz, Gardiner, Perlmutter and Rosen do) is evidently also dangerous. (And I'm less hostile than I once was to such attempts on Southern Tiwa, given the similarity to Jemez, where prefixes have uniform low tone).

(4) **Internal evidence II: PCC-escape**

a. But maybe (3) is just a fact about the morphology and doesn't reveal what's going on with the arguments themselves.

b. A hypothetical derivation:

   (i) Attempt to say 3s:1s:2s
   (ii) Knock out the agent to get :1s:2s
   (iii) Advance 2s to subject position, creating 2s:1s:∅
   (iv) Pronounce as **bey**

c. Passive is a PCC-repair in, e.g., English:

   (i) They showed me to you ≈ *They showed you me
   (ii) I was shown to you ≈ I was shown you

d. The documentation of the twists and turns of the Southern Tiwa "passive" is quite extensive. However, the possibility of this derivation is not noted. It can't be said for certain that the "passive" is unavailable here, but it is suggestive.

(5) **Internal evidence III: binding**

a. In- be- d'awiade- ban 'u- ide- ba
∅:1s:3s-self-listen.PASS-PAST child-BAS-INST
'The child listened to me'

b. Recall: because of the applicative, special reflexive agreement is unavailable (cf, Kiowa) and more generic means of reflexive marking must be used (singular agreement + direct object **be**). Like so many direct objects in Southern Tiwa, **be** skulks beside the verb.

c. Rosen (1990) suggests that, with reflexive agreement unavailable, Southern Tiwa is forced to adopt object camouflage: she suggests that **be** is like Italian **se stesso**. We might underline the plausibility of this suggestion if **se stesso** provides an escape hatch from the PCC (sentences yet to be judged by a native speaker):

   (i) Gianna se mi ha mostrato
      John SE me.CL showed
      'John showed me himself'

(ii) Gianna mi    ha mostrato se stesso
John    me.CL showed    SE same
'John showed me himself'

d. If so, the grammaticality of (a) is surprising: it involves binding from within a PP. Chiara told us that the analogous structure in Italian (*Se stesso è stato difeso (solo) da Chiara) is ungrammatical.

e. Again, this suggests that we are not dealing with a passive. However, it's not cut and dry. A difference between Italian and Southern Tiwa is that the derived subject in the passive is high in the former but, plausibly, low in the latter. In English, it's possible to say *The books were sent to Mary by herself*, where the agent binds out of its PP into a lower argument (though an indirect, rather than a direct, object). Could Southern Tiwa be like English in the relevant respects?

f. (Note. There is at least one difference between Southern Tiwa and English. In English, there is a leftness effect *The books were sent to Mary by herself* degrades substantially if the PP order is inverted: *?? The books were sent by herself to Mary*. This is apparently absent from Southern Tiwa, to judge by the word order in (a): *...**be**... subject-*INSTR.)

---

(6) **Skulking and agreement restrictions**

a. Unlike incorporation, skulking never reduces the valency of the verb. (Examples from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 294–295; my (deduced) starred examples.)

(i) (Yede) seuan-ide **ti-**    mũ-ban
that    man- BAS 1S:3S-see- PAST
'I saw the/a (*or* that) man'

(ii) (Yede) **ti-**    seuan-mũ-ban
that    1S:3S-man- see- PAST
'I saw the/a (*or* that) man'

(iii) *(Yede) **te**-seuan-mũ-ban
that    1S-man- see- PAST
'I saw the/a (*or* that) man'

b. However, as observed by Rosen (1990; see also Heck and Richards to appear), the conditions under which nouns (may, must, mustn't) skulk are strongly reminiscent of Week II's agreement restrictions.

c. The way to think about things: (third person) nouns may have one of two syntactic representations, either as bare NPs or as something larger, say, DPs. (Rosen calls the latter 'HiSpec', reflecting her understanding of the discourse

function of free noun phrases.) Inanimate nouns are bad candidates for prominent discourse function (and when they assume this, they appear to be recategorized into the animate SDI noun class; examples below, from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 299). On the other hand, non-third persons can never be as small as NP. So, in general, distributional variability applies only to SDI nouns.

(i) **I**- mukhin-k'euwe-m
**3I**-hat- old- STAT.PRES
'The hat is old'

(ii) Mukhin-ide **∅**- k'euwe-m
hat- BAS **3S**-old- STAT.PRES
'The hat is old'

(7) **Agreement restriction I: \*3:1/2**                    Cf, Week II (14a)

a. Examples from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 295.

(i) Hliawra-de ∅- seuan-mũ-ban
lady- BAS 3S:3S-man- see- PAST
'The lady saw the man'

(ii) \*Hliawra-de ∅- mũ-ban seuan-ide
lady- BAS 3S:3S-see- PAST man- BAS
'The lady saw the man'

(iii) \*Seuan-ide ∅- mũ-ban
man- BAS 3S:3S-see- PAST
'She saw the man'

b. Note. In such examples $z$=3S. This is probably crucial.

c. Recall: to express \*3:1/2, a "passive" is used. This option is available for $x$=3 acting on $z$=3DP. Derived subjects may not be incorporated (presumably because DPs don't incorporate and it is DP-hood ($z$=3DP) that triggers the passive). (Examples from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 302.)[1]

(i) Kan- ide ∅- khwien-ẽdeuri-ban
horse-BAS 3S:3S-dog- kick- PAST
'The horse kicked the dog'

(ii) Khwien-ide ∅- ẽdeure- ban kan- ide- ba
dog- BAS 3S-kick."PASS"-PAST horse-BAS-INSTR

---

[1]The erstwhile agent may incorporate. Examples are given of horses and snakes incorporating. However, Allen et al. deny that this is instrument incorporation, because 'shoe' can't incorporate in 'I was hit with a shoe'. Is it uncontroversial that these instruments all bear the same relation to the event? Maybe instruments can incorporate, but only one causally involved. That's my hunch about Kiowa, and I think the same might be evident in English: *snake-bite*, *bee-sting*, possibly *horse-kick*, but definitely not *shoe-hit/strike/throw*.

"The dog was kicked by the horse"

    (iii) *∅- khwien-ẽdeure-    ban  kan- ide- ba
          3S-dog-    kick."PASS"-PAST horse-BAS-INSTR
          'The horse kicked the dog', 'The dog was kicked by the horse'

d.    Further evidence of the same. Cf, also (6cii). "The rarely occurring inanimate nouns as final subject of passive verbs cannot be incorporated. In these cases also, the noun takes the animate ending ... Thus it appears that "inanimate" nouns used as unincorporated subjects have been reclassified as animate."

    (i)    Kahun-ide  ∅- ẽdeure-    ban  seuan-ide- ba
          box-    BAS 3S-kick."PASS"-PAST man- BAS-INSTR
          "The box was kicked by the man"

    (ii)    Poaha-de  ∅- ẽdeure-    ban  seuan-ide- ba
          ball-    BAS 3S-kick."PASS"-PAST man- BAS-INSTR
          "The ball was kicked by the man"

(8)    **Agreement restriction II: *3:$y$:$z$**                Cf, Week II (14b)

a.    The restriction *3:$y$:$z$ overlaps with Agreement Restriction III, comprising two subparts: *3:$y$:1/2 and *3:$y$:3. The former is a less general version of *$x$:$y$:1/2; it is illustrated in (9). The only instances of 3:$y$:3 do indeed involve skulking objects (however, I don't think that it is explicitly stated that skulking is obligatory here; no starred non-skulking examples are given; examples from Allen and Frantz 1983: 308):

    (i)    Liora-de- ba    a-      khwien-wia- che-  ban  'u'u- de
          lady- BAS-INSTR 3S:3S:3S-dog-    give-"PASS"-PAST baby-BAS
          'The lady gave the child the dog'

    (ii)    Liora-de- ba    in      /ka-      khwien-wia- che-  ban
          lady- BAS-INSTR 3S:1S:3S/3S:2S:3S-dog-    give-"PASS"-PAST
          'The lady gave me/you a dog'

b.    Note. There is no statement or evidence that "passive" can rescue DP objects in the presence of $y$-agreement. This is consistent with the argument above that there is no object advancement under "passive" (3) and with reading-between-the-lines that "passive" does not provide a PCC escape (4). (To spell out the latter point in more detail: the claim is that DP objects are structurally similar enough to local pronouns to trigger agreement restrictions; so, if "passive" can't save PCC configurations, then it can't license freestanding object DPs.)

(9)    **Agreement restriction III: *$x$:$y$:1/2, ∅:$y$:1/2**        Cf, Week II (14c)

a.  *$x$:$y$:1/2 for $y \neq 3$ (examples Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 303):

(i) Ka-    'u'u- wia- ban
    1S:2S:3S-baby-give-PAST
    'I gave you the baby'

(ii) *'U'u- de   ka-        wia- ban
     baby-BAS 1S:2S:3S-give-PAST
     'I gave you the baby'

b. *$x$:$y$:1/2 for $y$=3 (example from Allen and Frantz 1983: 312):

(i) Mim-    'u'u- wia- ban    seuan-in
    1S:3I:3S-baby-give-PAST man- I
    'I gave the men the child'

(ii) *'U'u- de   mim-      wia- ban   seuan-in
     baby-BAS 1S:3I:3S-give-PAST man- I
     'I gave the men the child'

Examples without agents (Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 305–307):

(i) Ka-     seuan-wan- ban  ('ĩ)
    ∅:2S:3S-man- come-PAST 2S
    'The man came to you'

(ii) *Seuan-ide ka-        wan- ban  ('ĩ)
     man- BAS ∅:2S:3S-come-PAST 2S
     'The man came to you'

(iii) Im-     musa-'ĩ-   hĩ
      ∅:1S:3I-cat-   come-FUT
      'My cats are coming'

(iv) *Musa-n im-      'ĩ-    hĩ
     cat-  I ∅:1S:3I-come-FUT
     'My cats are coming'

(10)    **Incomplete parallels: nonsingularity, humanness, modification**
a.    Although there are significant parallels between agreement restrictions and
      skulking, the parallels are not total. In (6a), for $z$=3S, the noun phrase could
      be free or not, irrespective of whether there was an independent modifier
      (demonstrative). Cf, also the following examples for a numeral:

(i) Wim'a seuan-ide  a-      mũ-ban
    one    man- BAS 2S:3S-see- PAST
    'You saw one man'

(ii) Wim'a a-       seuan-mũ-ban
     one    2S:3S-man- see-PAST
     'You saw one man'

Table 1: *Phi-conditions on animate object skulking/freedom*

| Human | Singular | Modified | Skulking |
|:-----:|:--------:|:--------:|:---------|
| + | + | − | optional |
| + | + | + | optional |
| + | − | − | obligatory |
| + | − | + | optional |
| − | + | − | obligatory |
| − | + | + | optional |
| − | − | − | obligatory |
| − | − | + | obligatory |

However, two features are crucial here: the object is singular and human. If either condition is relaxed, the available options shrink.

b. Restriction I: relaxation of singularity. If $z=3\text{ⅅ}$ or $z=3\text{ɪ}$, only three of the four options available to $z=3\text{s}$ are available: specifically, skulking is obligatory for unmodified human-denoting nouns; alternatively, freedom is available to nonsingular human-denoting nouns only when modified (by a demonstrative or numeral). (Examples from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 295–296.)

    (i)    Bi-    seuan-mũ-ban
         1s:3ɪ-man- see- PAST
         'I saw the men'

    (ii)  *Seuan-in bi-    mũ-ban
         man- ɪ   1s:3ɪ-see- PAST
         'I saw the men'

    (iii)  Wisi / yed- i bi-    seuan-mũ-ban
         two   / that-ɪ 1s:3ɪ-man- see- PAST
         'I saw two/those men'

    (iv)  Wisi / yed- i seuan-in bi-    mũ-ban
         two   / that-ɪ man- ɪ   1s:3ɪ-see- PAST
         'I saw two/those men'

c. Restriction II: relaxation of humanness to animacy. Skulking is obligatory for unmodified nonhuman-animate-denoting nouns; alternatively, freedom is available to nonsingular nonhuman-animate-denoting nouns only when modified (by a demonstrative or numeral). (Examples from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 296.)

    (i)    A-    diru-    k'ar-hi
         2s:3s-chicken-eat- FUT
         'You will eat the chicken'

(ii) *Diru- de a- k'ar-hi
chicken-BAS 2S:3S-eat- FUT
'You will eat the chicken'

(iii) Wim'a/ yed- e a- diru- k'ar-hi
one / that-BAS 2S:3S-chicken-eat- FUT
'You will eat one/that chicken'

(iv) Yed- e diru- de a- k'ar-hi
That-BAS chicken-BAS 2S:3S-eat- FUT
'You will eat that chicken'

d. Restriction III: relaxation of humanness to animacy and of singularity. Skulking is obligatory for nonsingular nonhuman-animate-denoting nouns; alternatively, freedom is unavailable to nonsingular nonhuman-animate-denoting nouns (even when modified by a demonstrative or numeral). (Examples from Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 296–297.)

(i) (Wisi / yed- i) ibi- musa-tuwi-ban
two / that-I 3I:3I-cat- buy- PAST
'They bought (two/those) cats'

(ii) *(Wisi / yed- i) musa-n ibi- tuwi-ban
two / that-I cat- I 3I:3I-buy- PAST
'They bought (two/those) cats'

e. Note: relative clause modification. Nouns can be modified by relative clauses, which apparently never skulk. However, the only nouns for which this is shown are inanimates (which all but always skulk) and the animate subject of an unaccusative (which never do). It is therefore impossible to say whether relative clauses are modifiers that permit nouns to escape skulking. (Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 297, 309.)

(11) **Unaccusatives**

a. There are few places in the language where freedom is obligatory. In general, as we've seen, it's skulking that is at times obligatory. However, for unaccusatives-without-applicatives, skulking occurs if, and only if, the argument is inanimate; i.e., lone animate arguments of unaccusatives must stand free. (Examples from Rosen 1990: 680–681; but recall the animatized inanimates (6cii), (7d).)

(i) Musa-n i- teurawe-ban / i- k'euwe-m
cat- I 3I-run- PAST / 3I-old- PRES
'The cats ran / are old'

(ii) *I- musa-{teurawe-ban / k'euwe-m }
3I-cat- run- PAST / old- PRES
'The cats ran / are old'

(iii) *K'uru i- k'euwe-m
dipper 3I-old- PRES
'The dipper is old'

(iv) I- k'uru- k'euwe-m
3I-dipper-old- PRES
'The dipper is old'

b. I assume that what's going on here is that every sentence needs to have a topic-like noun phrase. This means that any animate will be a DP rather than an NP; hence skulking will be impossible. However, as inanimates strongly resist DP status, this is not an option for them. For animates, it's only when another argument is present that DP-NP optionality can be entertained.
(It would be interesting to know how Southern Tiwa handles generic statements where the whole situation is regarded as generic: 'There was a terrible noise, as there is when wolves howl.' Harbour, Watkins, and Adger (2007) show that such generic statements involve low placement of the nominal in Kiowa (though skulking is not an option for independent reasons): would Southern Tiwa permit animate skulking here? Also, it would be nice to know whether having a topic PP can obviate obligatory freedom. These things can be tricky to elicit and generally emerge better through the study of naturalistic data.)

---

(12) **Causatives ("union")**

a. If a transitive predicate is causativized, then the inner object is obligatorily incorporated. Only a few examples are given (Allen, Gardiner, and Frantz 1984: 305–306; Allen, Frantz, Gardiner, and Perlmutter 1990):

(i) I- 'u'u- kur- 'am- ban
1S:2S-baby-hold-cause-PAST
'I made you hold the baby'

(ii) *'U'u- de i- kur- 'am- ban
baby-BAS 1S:2S-hold-cause-PAST
'I made you hold the baby'

(iii) Ti- seuan-p'akhu-kumwia-'am- ban wisi te- khaba-'i
1S:3S-man- bread- sell- cause-PAST two 1S:3P-bake- SUBORD
'I made the man sell the two breads I baked' (surprising relative?)

(iv) Seuan-ide ti- 'u'u- koy-'am- ban
man- BAS 1S:3S-baby-lay- cause-PAST
'I made the man lay the baby down'

b. The term 'incorporation' was used deliberately in (a). Note, first, that the prefixes do not register the inner object (in contrast to skulking, which has no influence on agreement): (i) uses 1S:2S **i**, rather than 1S:2S:3S **ka**; and (ii) uses 1S:3S **ti**, rather than 1S:3S:3S **ta**. Second, although Kiowa does not

have anything like Southern Tiwa skulking (Adger, Harbour and Watkins, in press: appendix after chapter 6)—

(i) *Belle ę́– khɔ́ɔ́- ɔ́ɔ́méí
Belle 3S:1S:3S–shawl-make.PF
'Belle made me a shawl'

(ii) Belle khɔ́ɔ́ ę́– ɔ́ɔ́méí
Belle shawl 3S:1S:3S–make.PF
'Belle made me a shawl'  (note: K. **ɔ́m** 'make' ≈ S.T. **'am** 'cause')

—it does have a construction just like this one, which we have identified as VP incorporation:

(iii) Ę́– étpáthéí-pholąąhįį-khɔɔ- tot
3S:1S–forced- rabbit- get.NV-send.PF
'She forcibly sent me to get a rabbit'

(iv) Gya– íítháá- pǫų- ai
1S:3P–daughter-see.NV-start out.PF
'She set off to see her daughter'

(v) Ba–hɔ́ndé- mɔthem- xanma
2P–something–learn.NV-arrive.IMPF
'You're coming to learn something'

c. I assume that the inner object is therefore embedded within an embedded VP from which it is inextractable. Hence, absence of a free alternative (contra Rosen 1990: 695–697, who regards these nouns as potentially free and uses her hierarchy to block their occurrence; the two accounts could be teased apart by looking at the sentence 'I made the dogs kill the man': I would predict 'man' to be incorporated, whether or not the dogs skulk; Rosen, I believe, would predict that man could be free. However, the data is not available.)

---

**References**

Adger, David, Harbour, Daniel, and Watkins, Laurel. In press. Mirrors and Microparameters: Phrase Structure Beyond Free Word Order. Cambridge University Press.

Allen, Barbara and Frantz, Donald. 1983. Advancements and verb agreement in Southern Tiwa. In David Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*, 303–314, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Allen, Barbara, Frantz, Donald, Gardiner, Donna, and Perlmutter, David. 1990. Verb agreement, possessor ascension and multistratal representation in Southern Tiwa. In Brian Joseph and Paul Postal, eds., *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Allen, Barbara, Gardiner, Donna, and Frantz, Donald. 1984. Noun incorporation in Southern Tiwa. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50:292–311.

Harbour, Daniel, Watkins, Laurel, and Adger, David. 2007. Noun phrase positions in Kiowa discourse, ms. Queen Mary, University of London and Colorado College.

Heck, Fabian and Richards, Marc. to appear. A probe-goal approach to agreement and incorporation restrictions in Southern Tiwa. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* ??:??–??

Kroskrity, Paul. 1985. A holistic understanding of arizona tewa passives. *Language* 61:306–328.

Rosen, Carol. 1990. Rethinking Southern Tiwa: The geometry of a triple agreement language. *Language* 66:669–713.