

Kiowa-Tanoan agreement and agreement restrictions: IV

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

June 4, 2009

(1) **Today's aims**

- a. To look at Tewa, the last of the four branches of the Kiowa-Tanoan family (cf, Week I:(4)). Complete documentation about any dialect is lacking, though that might be because I'm overly narrowly interpreting some of the statements about when to use which prefixes.
- b. To highlight differences between the prefix system and the "passives" of Tewa and other the other languages we've examined.

(2) **Sources**

- a. Martinez 1983: San Juan Tewa. Relatively complete with respect to prefixes (see below on incompleteness), but few example sentences and no discussion/illustration of "passives".
- b. Speirs 1966: Rio Grande Tewa. Relatively complete with respect to prefixes but with several conflicting descriptions (see below), with discussion of "passives".
- c. Kroskirty 1985: Arizona Tewa. "For the sake of economy" (p. 308), only partial series of prefixes, but a comparatively rich discussion of "passives". (1985 \approx chapter 7, pp. 154–193, of his 1977 dissertation.)
- d. Melissa Axelrod has, I believe, an NSF-funded documentary project underway at the University of New Mexico with speakers of Nambe Tewa (**na:m-bí** 'our'; Kroskirty 1985: 309). It is possible that they may produce complete prefix paradigms.

(3) **SJT: Notation**

- a. Superscripted exclamation marks indicate prefixes used in the imperative.
- b. The notation "a $\langle b \rangle$" means that prefix a can be used either for animate or inanimate objects, but that b may only be used for animate objects. Similarly, "a | b >" means that a can be used either for animate or inanimate objects, but

Table 1: *San Juan Tewa Agreement Prefixes (Martinez 1983)*

	\emptyset	3S⟨A \bar{A} ⟩ ^a	3D⟨A \bar{A} ⟩	3P⟨A \bar{A} ⟩	RX
1S:	o	dó	dovâen ⟨dó	dovây dó⟩	dáy
1D:	ga	âen	âen	âen	æen
1P:	gi	ây	ây	ây	íví
2S:	un	nâa	wovâen ⟨nâa	ovây	bi, vi
¹ 2S:	un, ó?	ná	??	??	ó
2D:	da	dâen	dâen	dâen	dæen
¹ 2D:	da, bá?	bin	??	??	bá
2P:	í	bîn	bîn	bîn	úví
¹ 2P:	í, bí?	bin	??	??	bí
3S:	na	i óe⟩	i, ovâen	i ovây⟩	i
3D:	da	dâen óe⟩	dâen ovâen⟩	dâen ovây⟩	dæen
3P:	di	dây óe⟩	dây ovâen⟩	dây ovây⟩	díví
3 \bar{A} P:	na	óe	ovâen	ovây ⟨óe	—
2:1:	dí	??	??	??	??
¹ 2:1:	??	??	??	??	??
2:3S:	—	mân	ovâen	ovây	??
¹ 2:3S:	—	man	??	??	??
2:3D:	—	dâen	dâen	dâen	??
¹ 2:3D:	—	bin	??	??	??
2:3P:	—	bîn	bîn	bîn	??
¹ 2:3P:	—	bin	??	??	??
1:2S:	wí	wîn	wâen	wây	??
1:2D:	wâen	wîn	wâen	wây	??
1:2P:	wây	wîn	wâen	wây	??
1:3S:	—	dôn	dovâen	dovây	??
1:3D:	—	âen	âen	âen	??
1:3P:	—	ây	ây	ây	??
3:2S:	wóe	wôn	wovâen	wovây	??
3:2D:	wovâen	wôn	wovâen	wovây	??
3:2P:	wovây	wôn	wovâen	wovây	??
:1S:	—	dín	??	??	??
:1D:	—	gâen	??	??	??
:1P:	—	gín	??	??	??
:2S:	—	ú, ún	??	??	??
:2D:	—	dâen	??	??	??
:2P:	—	ún	??	??	??
:3S:	—	ûn	??	??	??
:3D:	—	dâen	??	??	??
:3P:	—	dín	??	??	??

^a In general, $x:3S = x:RX:3S$, except that $1S:RX:3S = \mathbf{don}$ (e.g., **don-paa** ‘I made it for myself’) and $2S:RX:3S = \mathbf{mæn}$. Values for $z \neq 3S$ not given.

Table 2: *Rio Grande Tewa Agreement Prefixes (Speirs 1966)*

	\emptyset	3S	3D	3I	3P	RX
1S:	'o	dó	dovâen	dovê:	dó?	dé:
2S:	'ų (?!)	nâ: (ná!)	'ovâen(=!)	ovê:(=!)	nâ: (ná!)	bi (ó!)
3S:	na	'i	'i/'ovâen?	'ó:	'i	'i
1D:	ga	<		âen		> 'âen
23D:	da (?!)	<		dâen (bin!)		> dâen(bá!)
1I:	gi	<		'ê:		> 'íví
2I:	'í (?!)	<		bîn (bin!)		> úví (bí!)
3I:	di	<		dê:		> díví
3P:	na?	—	—	—	—	—
23:1:	dí(=!)	<		dîn(=!)		> ??
1:2S:	wí	<		wîn		> ??
1:2D:	<		wâen			> ??
1:2I:	<		wê:			> ??
3:2S:	wó:	<		wôn		> ??
3:2D:	<		wovâen			> ??
3:2I:	<		wovê:			> ??
1S:RX:	—	<		don		> ??
1S:3S:	—	<		dôn		> ??
1S:3D:	—	<		dovâen		> ??
1S:3I:	—	<		dovê:		> ??
1D:3/RX:	—	<		'âen		> ??
1I:3/RX:	—	<		'ê:		> ??
2S:RX:	—	<		mâen (=!)		> ??
2S:3S:	—	<		mân (=!)		> ??
2S:3D:	—	<		'ovâen (=!)		> ??
2S:3I:	—	<		'ovê: (=!)		> ??
2D:3/RX:	—	<		dâen (bin!)		> ??
2I:3/RX:	—	<		bîn (bin!)		> ??
3S:RX:	—	<		'i		> ??
3D:RX:	—	<		dâen		> ??
3I:RX:	—	<		dê:		> ??
3:3S:	—	<		'ôn		> ??
3:3D:	—	<		'ovâen		> ??
3D:3:	—	<		dâen		> ??
3:3I:	—	<		'ovê:		> ??
:1S:	—	<		dîn		> ??
:2S:	—	<		'ų		> ??
:3S:	—	<		'ûn		> ??
:1D:	—	<		gâen		> ??
:23D:	—	<		dâen		> ??
:1I:	—	<		gín		> ??
:2I:	—	<		'ų		> ??
:3I:	—	<		dín		> ??

that *b* may only be used for inanimate objects. (This notation mimics that in the column headings “⟨A| \bar{A} ⟩”.)

(4) **Imperatives and prefix syntax generally**

- a. As just indicated (3a), Tewa differs from other Kiowa-Tanoan languages in having developed a separate set of imperative prefixes (for some argument combinations).
- b. For Kiowa, I have argued (Harbour 2003, 2007; also Adger and Harbour 2007) that the features that make up the prefix are only those contributed by the verb’s arguments. Tewa looks like it might work differently, as though some kind of imperative feature is also spelled out in the prefix.
- c. However, an alternative is that the vocabulary items that comprise prefix are allomorphically sensitive to nearby imperative feature. For Kiowa, where it has been argued that the prefix is low (Adger, Harbour, and Watkins In press), this is hard to maintain. However, the syntax of prefixes may not be identical in all dialects of all Kiowa-Tanoan languages. For instance, in the negative particle in Picuris (Tiwa) intervenes between the prefix and the verb. (Examples from Harrington and Roberts 1928: 314, 310, 344. No glosses provided in the original. Those below are my rudimentary attempts for a language with which I’m only newly acquainted. *Caveat lector.*)

- (i) Heyo tcatthəi hele ’a- ya- pē- hon
 why today any 3S:3S-NEG-deer-kill.(NEG?)
 ‘Why did you not kill a deer today?’
- (ii) Nq p’ā- k’ēn’au ti- yai- t’ō- tci- ke- ko...
 I river-outside 1S:RX-NEG-tarry[?]-MOD[?]-REL[?]-because
 ‘I do not stay outside of the water so very long. [That is the reason that I am already about to go back in.]’
- (iii) ’I- tcətcattce, hexətciuko ’i- ya- tcətcattce
 2S:3I-tell enter why 2S:3I-NEG-tell enter
 ‘Tell them to come in. Why do you not tell them to come in?’

In Kiowa, the negative particle occurs higher and other particles/elements may intervene between it and the prefix.

- (iv) Hón an nós a- dǰǰ-mô
 NEG HAB I 1S-be- NEG
 ‘It’s never me’ (example concocted by me)

- d. So, it is reasonable to explore the possibility that the prefix is high enough in such languages for the imperative features to condition allomorphy. Clearly, however, more facts are needed (both from Tiwa and Tewa).

(5) **SJT: 3S, 3P**

a. Given the identity of the intransitive prefixes 3S and 3P (**na**), one might think that these are the same (i.e., that Tewa is like English in saying *It's hot* and unlike Kiowa in saying “*They're hot*” or “*Things are hot*” **gya-sál**.) However, these two clearly remain distinct:

(i) na-mæn
3S-go.IMPF
“He is going” (Martinez 1983: 70)

(ii) na-kw'ó
3P-lie(P?)
“They are lying there (things)” (Martinez 1983: 71)

(6) **SJT: completeness?**

a. Non-singular objects:

(i) All Martinez' $\emptyset:y:z$ examples involve $z=3S$ (e.g., ‘*y* needs it’, ‘*y*'s boy is sick’).

(ii) Examples of dative reflexives ($x:RX:z$) are likewise confined to $z=3S$.

(iii) Several imperatives are also only given for $z=3S$, if at all.

Note, however, that, in Speirs' description (Table 2) number of the object is irrelevant in these cases. Therefore, it is possible that Martinez' description is complete in this regard.

b. After giving the reflexive imperatives Martinez writes: “These imperative prefixes are also used with some verbs that occur with Series I prefixes”, i.e., $x:\emptyset$ in Table 1, i.e., basic intransitives (p. 72). She only gives one example (p. 74). It's not clear from this whether she means that a subset of intransitives are imperativizable but that all of that subset uniformly take these imperative prefixes, or whether only a subset of all the imperativizable ones do...

c. No information on how to say ‘I killed myself for him’ (as opposed to ‘I killed him for myself’) is given. When $\emptyset:y:RX$ is a possible argument combination, as it is in Kiowa, is unspecified, but possibly because one wouldn't think to mention that this is impossible unless you had Kiowa in mind already.

(7) **RGT: data and notation**

a. Speirs organizes his in tables linked via numerical notation to sentence frames. Examples of such frames are (p. 163):

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 3. na: (wí cé) rînté: ‘I need (a dog)’ | [i.e., $\emptyset:y:3S$] |
| 4. na: ré:c'â' ‘I cut myself’ | [i.e., $x:RX$] |
| 5. 'óc'a' ‘cut yourself’ | [i.e., $^1x:RX$] |

These numbers are retained below.

- b. The notation ‘ $x (y!)$ ’ means that y is the version of the prefix used (instead of x) in imperatives. Where these are identical, I write ‘ $x(=!)$ ’. Intransitive imperatives are not given. I have marked these as ‘ $(?!)$ ’. I assume that intransitives+datives cannot have imperative forms for reasons of felicity (they are non-controlled events). 5 is the imperative counterpart of 4: $4!=5$. Also, $6!=8$, $9!=10$, $13!=15+16$, $14!=17$, $18!=19$.
- c. Bold prefixes followed by a question mark are cases where I am unsure whether I have understood some aspect of Speirs’ notation.
- d. I don’t know whether direct objects can be reflexives when there is a dative. These are marked with ‘??’ below. Cf, (6c).

(8) **RGT: multiplicity**

- a. The descriptions of some prefixes overlap either within a single sentence frame, or between frames that are identical with regard to argument structure but possibly not with regard to morphological marking of the arguments.
 - (i) **3S:3D**. (11) $3S:3 = \text{'i}$. (13) $3:3D = \text{'ov\hat{a}n}$. In (13), for animate objects, S may be suffixed with **ri**; otherwise, for inanimate objects, arguments are marked identically in (11) and (13). Is (13) supposed to be limited to animates?
 - (ii) **3D:3D:3** (14) $2S/3:3D:3 = \text{'ov\hat{a}n}$. (14) $2D/3D:3D:3 = \text{b\hat{i}n}$. Similar problems arise for $3D:3S:3$, $3D:3I:3$, namely: **b\hat{i}n** conflicts with $3:3S:3 = \text{'\hat{o}n}$, $3:3I:3 = \text{'ov\hat{e}}$.

(9) **Kroskirty’s critique**

- a. “For ethnolinguists, whose research interests span both languages AND the people who animate them, Chomsky’s understanding of linguistics as a branch of cognitive psychology (1972:1) is severely limited in both aims and methods. Ferguson (1977:2), in exploring the merits of an alternative approach to language which adopts anthropological methods, emphasizes a ‘concern for the role of language in culture and society’. He outlines the four distinctive attributes of such an approach: holism, cross-cultural perspective, historical emphasis, and reliance on naturalistic observation... I like to equate this more holistic approach with what Sapir & Swadesh ... termed ‘a sympathetic study of the forms themselves’.” (p. 307)
- b. Kroskirty goes on to argue that “AT has two distinct passive structures: an IMPERSONAL (or agentless) passive, and a SEMANTIC passive”. (p. 308)
- c. This approach raises two sets questions. Is the criticisms of methodology accurate? Independent of its motivation, are the conclusions of the investigation of Arizona Tewa passives correct? (One might add a third question: if

the methodological criticisms are incorrect but the empirical analysis is correct, can the results be replicated within a theoretical linguistic framework. However: see the next point.)

- d. I'll skip the methodological considerations here (other than to say that I'm not sure what holism means but that cross-cultural perspective, historical emphasis, and naturalistic observation seem to me to be uncontroversially indispensable, the last two being points I've sought to emphasize in my own (joint) work).
- e. Main point: I think the context we've built up over the past few weeks enables us to be more Tanoanistically sympathetic than Kroskrity is. The conclusion: passive skepticism.

(10) **“Impersonal passives”**

a. Characteristics:

- (i) “passive” morphology
- (ii) “stative” agreement prefixes
- (iii) no agent PPs (though surface-similar instrument PPs are permitted)

b. Examples:

(i) hæ'i sen næ'i sæmele mán- há:bé:
 that man this pot 3S:3S-break
 ‘That man broke this pot’ (active; p. 309)

(ii) næ'i sæmele na- khá:bé-n
 this pot 3S.“STAT”-break- “PASS”
 ‘This pot was broken’ (passive; p. 309)

(iii) sæmele na- han
 pot 3S.“STAT”-be broken
 ‘The pot is broken’ (stative agreement; p. 308)

(iv) *hæ'i sen- di hæ'i tú na- c'á:la-tí:
 that man-OBL that meat 3S.“STAT”-cut- “PASS”
 ‘The meat was cut by that man’ (passive + agent PP; p. 310)

(v) na:-bí ciyó- di hæ'i tú na- c'á:la-tí:
 I- GEN knife-OBL that meat 3S.“STAT”-cut- “PASS”
 ‘The meat was / has been cut with my knife’ (pass. + instr. PP; p. 310)

- c. The exact analysis of this construction isn't crucial. It reminds me of the Kiowa detransitive. I haven't got speaker-verified examples to hand, but I'd bet that characteristics (ai)–(aiii) and examples (biv)–(bv) hold for Kiowa too. (Kroskrity does not give any information about the possibility of applicative agreement with these, though he does give the equivalent of stative (biii) with an agreeing applicative. In Kiowa, it is possible.)

- d. Kroskirty doesn't comment on the consonant ablaut in (bi)–(bii). However, Kiowa has a similar process (and so do other Tanoan languages, this point being one of the early and key arguments for linguistic affiliation of Kiowa with Tanoan; Harrington 1928, Hale 1962) and it occurs only when the verb root is in a nonverbal environment (e.g., nominalized, incorporated). It would be interesting to know the circumstances under which this alternation operates in (Arizona) Tewa.
- e. Given the constellation of properties (ai–iii), as well as the possible nonverbhood of (d), a plausible analysis of these (following suggestions from David and Klaus) is as adjective passives—in which case, the suffixes (bii) **n** and (biv–bv) **tí:** might be analyzed as forms of the copula.

(11) “Semantic passives”

- a. Characteristics:
- (i) no “passive” morphology
 - (ii) special “passive” agreement prefixes
 - (iii) agent PPs
- b. Agreement restrictions:
- (i) Impossible: 1/2:3
 - (ii) Optional: 3:3
 - (iii) Obligatory: $x:1/2$, $x:1/2:3$ (e.g., ‘I was shot by the men / you’, ‘You were given a bracelet by that man’) (no information on 3:3:3)
- c. Examples:
- (i) na: {sen- en / 'u }-di dí- kwekhwǎdi
I {man-P / you}-OBL 2/3:1-shoot
‘I was shot {by the men / by you}’
(‘hit’ “sem. pass.”; dí=“1/–1.PAS”; p. 311)
 - (ii) u khóto hẹ'i sen- di wó:- máegi
you bracelet that man-OBL 3:2:3-give
‘You were given a bracelet by that man’ (‘give’ “sem. pass.”; p. 311)
 - (iii) hẹ'i 'enú 'ayú phé- dí mán- khwǎdi
that boy girl stick-OBL 3S:3S-hit
‘The boy hit the girl with a stick’ (active 3:3; p. 316)
 - (iv) 'ayú hẹ'i 'enú-dí phé- dí ó:- khwǎdi
girl that boy- OBL stick-OBL 3S:3.“PASS”-hit
‘The girl was hit by the boy with a stick’ (“sem. pass.” 3:3; p. 316)
- d. Usage: notations of topicality / centrality with respect to discourse seem to be at play in the use of optional “semantic passives”. For instance, (iv) would be an answer to ‘What happened to the girl?’ (p. 316). Similarly

Table 3: *Arizona Tewa “Active” Agreement Prefixes^a (Kroskrity 1985)*

	∅ (“STAT”)	3 (“ACT”)	RX (“RX”)	∅: ... :3 ^b (“POSS”)
1S:	'o	dó	déh	dín
2S:	'u	ná:	bi	úh
3S:	na	mán	'i	'ú:
1D:	ga	án	an	gáh
2D:	da	den	den	déh
3D:	da	den	den	dǽn
1P:	gi	í:	'íbí	gíh
2P:	'i	'óbí	'óbí:n	'óh
3P:	di	dí:	díbí	do:

^a “For the sake of economy, this table excludes benefactive prefixes.” The parenthetic column headings in scare quotes are Kroskrity’s.

^b I.e., ∅:1s:3, etc. This would normally be a separate set of rows (∅:1s:), underneath the ‘3’ column. For the sake of economy, I’m diverging from the usual layout.

Table 4: *Arizona Tewa “Passive” Agreement Prefixes (Kroskrity 1985)*

2/3:1	dí
1:2	wí
3:2S	wó:
3:2D	wó:bén
3:2P	wó:bé
3:3S	ó:
3:3D	ó:bén
3:3P	ó:bé

(and recalling other Tanoan languages), inanimates and indefinites, which have difficulty holding the central/empathic role in the discourse also have difficulty, also resist “semantic passives” (e.g., *sem.pass. ‘This water was drunk by that man’; and, complementarily, *active ‘Some bobcat bit this dog’; p. 315, omitting Tewa examples under pressure of time).

(12) **Semantic passive or “semantic passive”?**

- a. It’s a bit difficult (for me) to be convinced by a holistic analysis that doesn’t present the whole system of prefixes. (It’s further difficult, following Klaus’ comments, to be convinced that we’re dealing special stative agreement, unless we’re shown that non-stative intransitives take different agreement.)
- b. Observe how similar Table 3 is to the top and bottom portions of Tables

- 1–2. Observe also that the putative passive prefixes (Table 4) look very like the dative prefixes (middle portions) of Tables 1–2—though, as Kroskirty notes, Arizona Tewa has undergone simplification with regard to number for 1:2(SDP).
- c. As emphasized in Week I (following Adger and Harbour 2007), direct objects that are specified for [\pm participant] look just like indirect objects. In Kiowa, third person objects specified for [\pm participant] if, and only if, they are indirect objects. However, in Week III, in contemplating the impossible/optional/obligatory conditions on skulking in Southern Tiwa, we raised the idea that skulking versus non-skulking nouns are featurally different, with the latter being larger.
- d. Hypothesis: “semantic passives” are just what you get when the direct or indirect object is specified for [\pm participant]. This is basically as in Southern Tiwa, but with three differences:
- (i) Tewa is not so big on skulking (though there is a skulking ‘sheep’ in a ditransitive; Kroskirty 1985: 312).
 - (ii) In the configuration 3:3[–participant], Arizona Tewa is able to treat this a ditransitive like construction (with agreement for agent and applicative), but Southern Tiwa is forced completely to demote the agent to a non-agreeing PP.
 - (iii) The nominal suffixes **-ba** in Southern Tiwa and **-dǐ** in Arizona Tewa are quite different: **-ba** creates a full PP which blocks agreement between the verb and the noun phrase, but **-dǐ** is transparent to agreement. It’s more like a phi-sensitive case marker (which takes into account the phi-features of two arguments).
- e. Supporting evidence (for the idea that **-dǐ** is phi-sensitive and transparent to agreement). Speirs’ sentence frames (1966: 163–164) have **-ri** on first and second person pronouns whenever there is an indirect object of any person and whenever there is an animate direct object. (Examples omitted for lack of time.) In fact, Watkins 1996, citing unpublished work by Speirs, says that third person agents receive **-ri** under the same circumstances. I.e., whenever a lower argument is [\pm participant], if we continue the line of reasoning above. Importantly, however, as Table 2 makes clear, agreement prefixes are not invariant for the **ri**-marked person under these circumstances (e.g., 1:3:3 \neq 2:3:3).
- f. Cautionary note (against getting too carried away with Tiwa/Tewa comparisons). Watkins (1996): “Given the differences in distribution as well as form [of the agentive (and instrumental) suffix], it is plausible to argue that these suffixes developed independently albeit along a universal trajectory ... [Southern/Taos/Picuris/Isletan] Tiwa **-pa/-ba**, Towa [=Jemez] **-tǣ:**, and

Tewa **-di**[/-ri] should probably be considered to have developed something independently of each other.” She notes also a likely Tewa/Towa cognate in the Kiowa instrumental **-do** (though this has not agentive uses).

References

- Adger, David and Harbour, Daniel. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the Person Case Constraint. *Syntax* 10:2–37.
- Adger, David, Harbour, Daniel, and Watkins, Laurel. In press. Mirrors and Microparameters: Phrase Structure Beyond Free Word Order. Cambridge University Press.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1962. Jemez and Kiowa correspondences in reference to Kiowa-Tanoan. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 28:1–8.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2003. The Kiowa case for feature insertion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:543–578.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2007. *Morphosemantic Number: From Kiowa Noun Classes to UG Number Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Harrington, John P. 1928. *Vocabulary of the Kiowa Language*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Harrington, John P. and Roberts, Helen H. 1928. Picuris children’s stories with texts and songs. In J. Walter Fewkes, ed., *Forty-Third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute: 1925–1926*, 289–447, Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- Kroskrity, Paul. 1977. Aspects of Arizona Tewa language structure and language use. Ph.D. thesis, Indiana University, Indiana.
- Kroskrity, Paul. 1985. A holistic understanding of Arizona Tewa passives. *Language* 61:306–328.
- Martinez, Esther, ed. 1983. *San Juan Pueblo Téwa Dictionary*. Portales, NM: Bishop Publishing Co., a production of the San Juan Pueblo Bilingual Program.
- Speirs, Randall H. 1966. Some aspects of the structure of rio grande tewa. Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Watkins, Laurel J. 1996. Reconstructing person and voice in Kiowa-Tanoan: Pitfalls and progress. In David Librik and Roxanne Beeler, eds., *Special Session on Historical Issues in Native American Languages*, number 22 in Berkeley Linguistics Society: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, 139–152, Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.