

Kiowa-Tanoan agreement and agreement restrictions: V

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

June 25, 2009

(1) Today's aims

- a. To look briefly at Jemez agreement prefixes and syntax—previously (Week II) we looked only at noun classes—finishing off the last gap in our overview of the family.
- b. To conduct some micro- (though not nano- or pico-) morphological analysis of the prefix systems across Kiowa-Tanoan.

(2) Class notation

- a. Sprott (1992) uses the A/B/C class notation of the Southern Tiwa tradition. Just as that descriptive tradition found the notation inadequate, so Sprott found it necessary to introduce subtypes of agreement (specifically, Bi, Bii).
- b. As in Weeks II–III, we'll make the following changes: A=S, Bi=D, Bii=I, C=P.

(3) Reflexives

- a. “The Jemez language does not have a separate, discrete reflexive paradigm. Reflexive and reciprocal sentences are formed using the [P-agreement] prefixes of the transitive prefix set [plus reflexive pronoun **’ú** or reciprocal **póókwe**]” (Sprott 1992: 113).

(i) Níí ’ú tul- mú
1S REFL 1S:3P-see
‘I saw myself’

(Sprott 1992: 113—note: $lm \mapsto m$)

(ii) Hú’ú/wáása/hwúúla/wúhule tul- mú
sand/ice /hair /dough 1S:3P-see
‘I saw sand / ice / the hair / the dough [diffuse/uncollected]’

(Sprott 1992: 93–94—note: $lm \mapsto m$)

- b. “Kiowa does exactly the same thing” (p. 113). Actually, Kiowa uses (animate plural) A-agreement; different agreement is used for ‘sand’, etc. (The reflexive reading of (i) can be coerced by including **úúgo** ‘self’, but I suspect that this does not force it, as ‘self’ can be used as an emphatic pronoun.)

Table 1: *Jemez (Towa) Agreement Prefixes (adapted from Sprott 1992)*

	∅	3S	3D	3I	3P	RX
1S:	u	ta	t̥ɪl	te	tul	
1D:	ɨ	h̥a	h̥apa	h̥apa	h̥ol	
1I:	e	he	hepe	hepe	hel	
2S:	a	a	ɨl	é	kul	
2D:	m̥ol	m̥a	m̥ape	m̥ape	m̥ol	
2I:	ba	ba	bape	bape	bal	
3S:	∅	∅	ɨl	é	ul	
3D:	ɨl	̥a	̥ape	̥ape	ɨl	
3I:	é	é	épe	épe	él	
3P:	ul	—	—	—	—	
1:2S:	a	k̥o	k̥ol	k̥ol	k̥o	—
1:2D:	m̥ol	m̥o	m̥ol	m̥ol	m̥o	—
1:2I:	ba	ba	bal	bal	ba	—
1S:3S:	—	t̥o	t̥ol	t̥ol	t̥o	—
1S:3D:	—	t̥ɨ	t̥ɪl	t̥ɪl	t̥ɨ	—
1S:3I:	—	te	tel	tel	te	—
1D:3S:	—	h̥o	h̥ol	h̥ol	h̥o	—
1D:3D/I:	—	h̥apa	h̥apal	h̥apal	h̥apa	—
1I:3S:	—	he	hel	hel	he	—
1I:3D/I:	—	hepe	hepel	hepel	hepe	—
2:1:	bæ	bæ	bæl	bæl	bæ	—
2S:3S:	—	o	ol	ol	o	—
2S:3D:	—	ɨ	ɨl	ɨl	ɨ	—
2S:3I:	—	é	él	él	é	—
2D:3S:	—	m̥o	m̥ol	m̥ol	m̥o	—
2D:3D/I:	—	m̥ape	m̥apel	m̥apel	m̥ape	—
2I:3S:	—	ba	bal	bal	ba	—
2I:3D/I:	—	bape	bapel	bapel	bape	—
3S:3S:	—	o	ol	ol	o	—
3 ^S _D :3 ^D _S :	—	ɨ	ɨl	ɨl	ɨ	—
3 ^S _I :3 ^I _S :	—	é	él	él	é	—
3D:3D/I:	—	̥ape	̥apel	̥apel	̥ape	—
3I:3D/I:	—	épe	épel	épel	épe	—
∅:1S:	—	ɥ	ɥl	ɥl	ɥ	
∅:1D:	—	h̥o	h̥ol	h̥ol	h̥o	
∅:1I:	—	he	hel	hel	he	
∅:2S:	—	k̥o	k̥ol	k̥ol	k̥o	
∅:2D:	—	m̥o	m̥ol	m̥ol	m̥o	
∅:2I:	—	ba	bal	bal	ba	
∅:3S:	—	o	ol	ol	o	
∅:3D:	—	ɨ	ɨl	ɨl	ɨ	
∅:3:	—	é	él	él	é	

- (i) Nóó de- /*gyat- bóú
 1 1S:3A-/ 1S:3P-see.PF
 ‘I saw myself/them (people/horses)’
- (ii) Péígya gyat- /*de- bóú
 sand 1S:3P-/ 1S:3A-see.PF
 ‘I saw sand’

c. Datives plus reflexives. These “must express the beneficiary [or cause] by means of a postpositional phrase: there is no other way” (p. 118):

- (i) Níí tul- hhú-huyul doo- sh é- ’ée-’e tæ’æ
 1S 1S:3P-kill- FUT DET-I 3I-be- NOM INSTR
 ‘I will kill myself for (or because of) them’ (note: *lhh* \mapsto *l*)

d. Recall that languages like Jemez do not permit empathic direct objects to occur with indirect objects—an effect plausibly connected to the PCC. In this light, the incompatibility of reflexives and datives is natural: just as in Kiowa, the reflexive is obligatorily (or formally) empathized with and so is treated like any other high-empathy object. It just so happens that Jemez (unlike Kiowa and, possibly, Rio Grande Tewa) lacks the morphological means for distinguishing such objects from simple, inanimate ones; however, it treats reflexives like other empathic objects in not permitting their cooccurrence with datives.

(4) “Passives”

a. Hale’s early informal work on Jemez (published only later and only to illustrate a point about field methods) identified the passive as obligatory “if the actor is third person and the patient is non-third” (1972: 107). However, he left other matters open: for 3:3, “My data indicate that the passive and active forms occur, but they also suggest that the choice is not free. There is some indication that nominal concepts are ranked (from highest to lowest: human, animal, inanimate, abstract) ... I suspect, on the basis of very limited data, that the passive is preferred if the patient outranks the actor, the active if the opposite is true.⁴” His endnote 4 (p. 133) reads: “Edward Dozier and I arrived at a very similar conclusion for Tewa when we taught a seminar together in 1964. Also, very strikingly, research on the Athabaskan language Navaajo at M.I.T. in 1968 disclosed a similar ranking of nominals in connection with the passive-like rule which determines the use of the /bi-/ and /yi-/ prefixes in third-person transitive sentences. See ...” Examples from Hale 1972: 106, correcting a typo (*ve-la* in (i) should be *ve·la* as in (ii)):

- (i) (Ní·) ve·la ta- tóse
 I man 1S:3S-hit

Table 2: *San Juan Tewa Agreement Prefixes (adapted from Martinez 1983)*

	∅	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.

- ‘I hit the man’
- (ii) (Ní·) ve·la-tæ ta- tós-æ
 I man-by 1S:3S-hit-PASS
 ‘I was hit by the man’
- b. Hale’s hunch has essentially been upheld by later studies (Sprott 1992, Yumitani 1998), though it has further been noted that passive is used when the direct object is topical (e.g., Sprott 1992: 178).
- c. Many of the same cautionary provisos against seeing the Southern Tiwa “passive” as a passive (Week III) apply here too. For instance: agreement gives no indication of object advancement:
- (i) Dô- tæ bélé ĭ- hâ- pæ
 that-INSTR bread (3S[?]):1S:3S-bake-PASS.PF
 ‘She baked bread for me’ (Yumitani 1998: 192; ĭ for barred ‘i’.)
- (ii) Ní ĭ- k’á- ’é bélé Ø- ší
 I :1S:3S-lie.S/D.STAT-NOM bread 3S-fall.PF
 ‘My bread fell off’ (Yumitani 1998: 188)
- (iii) Nê- tæ dá·bæ-š ĭl- g^y’l- æ
 that-INSTR door- I (3S[?]):1S:3I-close-PASS.PF
 ‘He closed the door for me’ (Yumitani 1998: 192—note: *lg^y* ↦ *ǰ*)
- (iv) Ní- t’æ dé’lì- (š) nĭ ĭl- k’yá
 that-I chicken- I I :1S:3I-lie.S/D.STAT
 ‘Those [two] chickens are mine’ (Yumitani 1998: 187—note: *lk^y* ↦ *č*)
- d. The two languages are not completely parallel however. For instance, the combination 3:3:3 does not force the passive in Jemez, though it is an option:
- (i) Yóshetq’è nǎǎ véla ’ǎki q- kéépæ
 God that man boy 3S:3S:3S-cure
 ‘God cured that man’s son’ (Sprott 1992: 160)
- (ii) Yóshetq’è-tæ nǎǎ véla ’ǎki q- kéépæ-y’e
 God- INSTR that man boy (3S[?]):3S:3S-cure- PASS
 ‘God cured that man’s son’ (Sprott 1992: 160)
- e. Some predicates take default P-agreement in the transitive. These include ‘sneeze’, ‘lie down’, ‘cough’, ‘jump’, ‘cry’, ‘sow’, ‘stumble’ according to Sprott (p. 116) as well as, according to Yumitani (p. 169), ‘yawn’, ‘shout’, ‘breathe’, ‘snore’, ‘work’, ‘crow’, ‘dance’, ‘sing’ and several others. From their ‘dummy’ P-agreement, it cannot be said whether these predicates are inherently reflexive (cf, *sit oneself down*) or just take a dummy object (cf, *hop it*)—both are common in Kiowa.

Table 3: *Rio Grande Tewa Agreement Prefixes (Speirs 1966)*

	\emptyset	3S	3D	3I	3P	RX
1S:	'o	dó	dovâen	dovê:	dó?	dé:
2S:	'u (?!)	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:		> 'ívi
2I:	'í (?!)	<		bîn (bin!)		> úvi (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:	—	<		'ú		> ??
:3S:	—	<		'ûn		> ??
:1D:	—	<		gâen		> ??
:23D:	—	<		dâen		> ??
:1I:	—	<		gín		> ??
:2I:	—	<		'ú		> ??
:3I:	—	<		dín		> ??

f. Interestingly, even these predicates undergo passive, although, semantically, there object to promote (for discourse, or other purposes):

(i) ð̃l- 'ê-te
3S:3P-run.PF
'He ran' (Yumitani 1998: 169)

(ii) Doo-tæ níí ùl- 'ét- æ
DET-INSTR 1S (3S?):1S:3P-run-PASS
'He ran for me' (Spratt 1992: 120)

(iii) tɔl- zæ·'ô·
(3S?):1S:3P-sing
'I sang for him' (Yumitani 1998: 193—note: lz ↔ d)

(iv) ð̃l- zæ·'o-bæ
(3S?):1S:3P-sing- PASS.PF
'He sang for me' (Yumitani 1998: 193—note: lz ↔ d)

g. The object agreement above has been labeled ':3P'. Discussing reflexives, we said simply that these take 3P agreement. According to Spratt, these predicates fall halfway between reflexive and inanimate plural agreement. If reflexives, they would not occur with benefactive agreement all ('I killed myself for them' requires a PP). But equally, if simple P-agreement, we'd expect absence of -I from the prefix (cf Table 1), Spratt asserts. I myself can't find anywhere in his dissertation or elsewhere a Jemez sentence with a combination of arguments that would force the prefix $x:y:3P$. Could be that I'm missing it... However, Yumitani's description (p. 182) implies that -I is present under such circumstances. If Yumitani is right, then we're merely looking at dummy objects; if Spratt is, I'm not quite sure what to say.

(5) Semi- and non-agreement

a. There are a few places where argument combinations that out to be illicit survive simply in virtue of the offending argument failing to agree for person. Neither Spratt nor Yumitani comments on this.

(i) Níí do'ò úwa tɔ- páéé
1S DET 2S 1S:3S:"3"s-make
'I made you (singular) for him' (Spratt 1992: 167)

(ii) Yóshetɔɔ'e-tæ úwa níí kɔ- páé- y'e
God- INSTR 2S 1S (3S?):2S:"1"s-make-PASS
'God made me for you (singular)' (Spratt 1992: 168)

(iii) George-tæ náéé 'ówa úmi-sh ɔl- shíí- y'e
George-INSTR DET woman 2- I (3S?):3S:"2"P-make-PASS
'George found you (plural) for that woman' (ibid.—note: *lsh* ↔ *j*)

Table 4: *Southern Tiwa agreement prefixes (adapted from Rosen 1990)*

	∅	3S	3P	3I	RX
1S:	te	ti	te	bi	te
1D:	in	in	kin	imim	kin
1I:	i	i	kiw	ibi	kibe
2S:	a	a	ku	i	a
2D:	men	men	men	mimim	men
2I:	ma	ma	mow	bibi	bebe
3S:	∅	∅	u	i	be
3D:	in	in	in	imim	in ^a
3I:	i	i	iw	ibi	ibe
3P:	u	—	—	—	—
1:2S:	i	ka	kow	kam	ka ^b
1:2D:	men	mim	miw	mim	mim? ^b
1:2I:	ma	mam	mow	mam	mam? ^b
1S:3S:	—	ta	tow	tam	ta ^b
1S:3D/I:	—	mim	miw	mim	mim? ^b
1D/I:3:	—	mim	miw	mim	mim? ^b
2S:1S:	bey	ben	bow	bem	ben? ^b
2D:1S:	bey	men	mow	mem	men? ^b
2I:1S:	bey	mim	mow	mim	mim? ^b
2:1D/I:	?/ku	mim	mow	mim	mim? ^b
2S:3S:	—	a	ow	am	a ^b
2S:3D/I:	—	mim	miw	mim	mim? ^b
2D/I:3:	—	mim	miw	mim	mim? ^b
∅:1S:	—	in	iw	im	
∅:1D:	—	ki(m)	kiw	kim	
∅:1I:	—	ki	kiw	kim	
∅:2S:	—	ka	kow	kam	
∅:2D:	—	mam	mow	mam	
∅:2I:	—	bim	bow	bim	
∅:3S:	—	a	ow	am	
∅:3D:	—	im	iw	im	
∅:3I:	—	im	iw	im(im)	

^a Leap records **ibe**

^b plus obligatory incorporation of **be** ['self']

- b. A possibly related phenomenon is what Sprott calls “deponence” (Yumitani does not make any comment on this, I think). A full⁷ list of “deponent” verbs is: **t’áetye** ‘hear’, **kímatye** ‘buy’, **gyátæ** ‘smell, sniff’, **sóqtæ** ‘choose, approve’, **só’e** ‘hunt’, **túúwe’e** ‘look for’, **péeyumi** ‘pity’, **wáámi** ‘want’ (p. 123). (One might be tempted to look for a semantic characterization of two subclasses: some senses, some intensional predicates. Sprott also provides some morphological commentary: identifying endings reminiscent of **’éé** ‘be’, **mí** ‘feel’, and the passives **-(y)e/-æ**.)
- c. For argument combinations where transitive (non-passive) verbs occur happily—1/2:z and 3:3 (though no actual 3:3 examples are given)—these predicates do nothing more remarkable than ignore the object. I.e., they agree as though intransitives (object-less), like Kiowa ‘want’.
- (i) Níí doo- (sh) u- sóqtæ
1S DET- I 1S-choose
‘I chose her/them’ (Sprott 1992: 126)
- (ii) Níí úwa u- t’áetye
1S 2S 1S-hear
‘I hear you’ (Sprott 1992: 125)
- (iii) Úwa Doris a- t’áetye
2S Doris 2S-hear
‘You chose Doris’ (Sprott 1992: 125)
- (iv) Nós báou-(gɔ) a- óndɔɔ
1 cat- I 1S-want
‘I want one/two/several cats’
- d. However, for argument combinations where passive would occur—3:1/2 (no information is given about 3:3 with high empathy objects)—agreement is :1/2:3. I.e., they agree as though the patient (choosee, smellee, heeree, ...) were the experiencer and the agent (chooser, smeller, hearer, ...) the object of their experience—which, I guess, is an inversion of the normal roles suggestive to Sprott’s mind of deponence. (I don’t have information on Kiowa ‘want’ for these argument combinations.)
- (i) Doo níí ʉ- sóqtæ
DET 1S :1S:3S-choose
‘She chose me’ (Sprott 1992: 125)
- (ii) Doo-sh níí ʉl- sóqtæ
DET-I 1S :1S:3I-choose
‘They chose me’ (Sprott 1992: 125)
- e. Summary. For these verbs, 3:1/2 \mapsto :1/2:3 and $x:z \mapsto x$ otherwise. Maybe these predicates are of the form, e.g., :wantee:wanter, but only :1/2:3 can be realized like this (exploiting the suppression-of-person-agreement tactic).

Table 5: *Kiowa Agreement Prefixes (adapted from Harbour 2007: 161)*

<i>x:y:</i>	<i>z</i>					
	∅	3S	3D	3P	3I	3A
1S:(3A:)	a	gya	nen	gyat	dé	de
1I.EX:(3A:)	e	é*	et	ét*	ét	ét
1I.IN:(3A:)	ba	bá*	bet	bát*	bét	bé
2S:(3A:)	em	a	men	bat	bé	be
2D:(3A:)	ma	má*	mén	mán*	mén*	mé
2I:(3A:)	ba	bá*	bet	bát*	bét	bé
3S:(3A:)	∅	∅	ɛ	gya	é	em
3D:(3A:)	ɛ	é*	én	én*	én	én
3I:(3A:)	e	é*	et	ét*	ét	ét
3A:(3A:)	á	á*	et	gyá*	et	ém
3P:	gya	—	—	—	—	—
∅/2S/3S:1S:	é	é	né	yá	nó	D~I
any:1I:	dó	dó	dét	gyát	dót	D~I
∅/1S:2S:	em	gyá	nén	yán	gó	D~I
other:2S:	gɔ	gó	dét	gyát	gót	D~I
any:2D:	mó	mó	mén	mán	món	D~I
any:2I:	bó	bó	bét	bát	bót	D~I
1S:3S:	—	gyá	nén	yán	gó	D~I
∅/2S/3S:3S	—	á	én	án	ó	D~I
any:3D:	—	mé	mén	mén	mén	D~I
any:3I:	—	bé	bét	bét	bét	D~I
1I.EX:3S:	—	êi*	édêi*	égîi*	édôɔ*	D~I
1I.IN:3S:	—	bâa*	bédêi*	bágîi*	bódôɔ*	D~I
2D:1S/3S:	mâa*	mâa*	ménêi*	mánîi*	mónôɔ*	D~I
2I:1S/3S:	bâa*	bâa*	bédêi*	bágîi*	bódôɔ*	D~I
3D:1S/3S:	êj*	êj*	énêi*	énîi*	énôɔ*	D~I
3I:1S/3S:	êi*	êi*	édêi*	égîi*	édôɔ*	D~I
3A:1S/3S:	âa*	âa*	dêi*	gyâa*	dôɔ*	D~I

Note: in the last five rows, the leftmost prefix is only usable for 1s.

This case is characterized by the direct object being featurally smaller than the indirect object. For $:y:1/2$ and $:3:3$, on the other hand, the object is always at least as big, featurally speaking, as the indirect object. Maybe this precludes agreement by the indirect object (but how exactly?). It would be nice to know how applicative+unaccusative combinations (‘I came to you’, ‘The dog came to you’, ‘You came to the chief’, ‘The dog came to the child’) are handled...

- f. Note: there’s a structure in Kiowa that’s always puzzled me. In ‘I came to see you’, the ‘you’ is entirely unexpressed. It may just be implied, but, on the other hand, it might be a non-agreeing argument. We’d need to test (iii)–(iv) to know, I think.

(i) Ógɔ̄ k!yáááhîī ∅- póú- xán- de hó Lawton-gu ∅- báá
 SUB man 3S-see.NV-arrive.PF-NOM Q Lawton-LOC 3S-go.PF
 ‘Did the man who came to see you go to Lawton?’ (Watkins 1984: 212)

(ii) A- póú- xán em-khóp-dǒǒmêi- nɔ̄
 1S-see.NV-arrive.PF 2S-sick- be.IMPF.EVID-CONJ[≠]
 ‘I came to see you because (I heard) you were sick’ (ibid.: 237–238)

(iii) Ám a- /∅- póú- xán
 2 1S-/3S-see.NV-arrive.PF
 ‘I/he came to see you’ (sentence requiring speaker judgment)

(iv) K!yátááik!ii a- /em-póú- xán
 chief 1S-/2S-see.NV-arrive.PF
 ‘I/you came to see the chief’ (sentence requiring speaker judgment)

References

- Hale, Kenneth. 1972. A new perspective on American Indian linguistics, with appendix by Albert Albarez. In Alfonso Ortiz, ed., *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, 87–133, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2007. *Morphosemantic Number: From Kiowa Noun Classes to UG Number Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Martinez, Esther, ed. 1983. *San Juan Pueblo Téwa Dictionary*. Portales, NM: Bishop Publishing Co., a production of the San Juan Pueblo Bilingual Program.
- Rosen, Carol. 1990. Rethinking Southern Tiwa: The geometry of a triple agreement language. *Language* 66:669–713.
- Speirs, Randall H. 1966. Some aspects of the structure of rio grande tewa. Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Sprott, Robert W. 1992. Jemez syntax. Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago.
- Watkins, Laurel J. 1984. *A Grammar of Kiowa*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Yumitani, Yukihiro. 1998. A phonology and morphology of Jemez Towa. Ph.D. thesis, University of Kansas.
-