The Kiowa-Tanoan continuum and the dual role of agreement

Agreement workshop, Goethe Universität, Frankfurt, 14 July 2016
Daniel Harbour, Queen Mary University of London

(1) Two aims of syntactic theory

   (a) restrictive theory of crosslinguistic variation
   (b) a restrictive inventory of syntactic primitives

(2) Aims today

   (a) to present a continuum of person-conditioned argument structure restrictions in Kiowa-Tanoan
   (b) to show that relatively minor alterations in the feature structure of argument selecting heads generates a significant portion of that continuum

(3)

	Kiowa	Tewa	Jemez, Taos	Isletan	Southern Tiwa
*:y:1/2, *x:y:1/2 (PCC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
differential object marking		✓	✓	✓	✓
*3:1/2, *3:1/2:3			✓	✓	✓
*3:3:3				(✓)	✓

(4) Structure of the talk

   (a) Kiowa: take a syntactic account of syncretisms and show that it derives the person case constraint
   (b) Tewa: take what distinguishes third person applicatives from third person objects in Kiowa, apply it within third person objects and show that it derives object "advancement" (Tewa as *leísta* Kiowa)
   (c) Jemez, Taos, Isletan/Southern Tiwa: take the argument selection mechanism for Kiowa applicatives, apply to external argument selection, and show that it derives restrictions on third person agents

(5) Other issues

   (a) Jemez, Taos, Isletan/Southern Tiwa: how to get 1/2:2/1, 1/2:2/1:3
   (b) Jemez,Taos (and Isleta): how to get 3:3:3 without 3:1/2, 3:1/2:3
   (c) Precise syntactic loci and featural specifications of all the morphological bits and bobs: agent markers, argument structure affixes, agreement, ...
   (d) Weak person case constraints

(6) Case syncretism

   (a) French: *me*, *te*, *nous*, *vous* are morphologically invariant between applicative (DAT) and object (ACC) readings; third person varies, applicative *lui*, *leur* vs object *le*, *la*, *les*

(b) Kiowa: similar (dis)parities, but because agreement is a tightly fused prefix registering features of up to three arguments, greater scrutiny is required. Simple example: *máu* is transitive 3S:2D ('it saw you') and applicative 2D:3S ('you have it') vs nonsyncretic transitive 3S:3D *ę* ('it saw them') and applicative :3D:3S *mé* ('they have it')

(c) Interpretation: third person applicatives differ from third person objects featurally, and the thing that being an applicative adds is something that first and second person already have

(7) ±participant

    (a) ±participant partitions persons into nonthird vs third (1/2 vs 3)

    (b) Claim I: nonthird persons are inherently specified for ±participant, third persons are not (for them, number (and gender) information suffices semantically)

    (c) Claim II: Appl comes equipped with number features to check the object and with ±participant with which it selects its specifier

    (d) Rationale for selection by ±participant: being an applicative argument is about being an experiencer (of benefit, possession, transfer, . . .); first and second persons, the interlocutors, are prime examples of such experiencers; so, their defining feature can be used in the syntax as a proxy for a sui generis experiencer feature

(8) Consequences

    (a) Case syncretism: third person objects have just number, but third person applicatives have number *and*, via the mechanism of selection, −participant. The two thus diverge featurally; hence their morphological disparity. In contrast, first and second person arguments must be specified for ±participant, or else their semantics isn't derivable

    (b) Person case constraint: if the direct object is specified for ±participant (is first or second person), then it will agree with Appl's ±participant feature, exhausting the selectional feature before the specifier is merged—complementary distribution

(9) Thought experiment I: what if a language could just assign −participant to third person objects?

    (a) Interpretative effect: −participant-objects bear the proxy feature for experiencerhood, so must be capable of experience

    (b) Case syncretism for third person: applicative and object become featurally indistinguishable

    (c) Person case constraint for third person objects

    (d) Objects may pattern with applicatives in other language-particular ways

(10) Interpretative effect: animate versus inanimate objects

Table 1: (In/di)transitive agreement prefixes (San Juan Tewa)

			:3INAN
1s	*o*		*dó*
1d	*ga*		*ân*
1i	*gi*		*ây*
2s	*un*		*nâa*
2d	*da*		*dân*
2i	*í*		*bîn*
3s	*na*		*i*
3d	*da*		*dân*
3i	*di*		*dây*
3p	*na*		
2/3:1	*dí*		*dîn*
1:2s	*wí*		*wîn*
1:2d		*wân*	
1:2i		*wây*	
3:2s	*wóe*		*wôn*
3:2d		*wovân*	
3:2i		*wovây*	
1s:3s.AN	*dó*		*dôn*
1s:3d.AN		*dovân*	
1s:3i.AN		*dovây*	
1d:3AN		*ân*	
1i:3AN		*ây*	
2s:3s.AN	*nâa*		*mân*
2s:3d.AN		*ovân*	
2s:3i.AN		*ovây*	
2d:3AN		*dân*	
2i:3AN		*bîn*	
3:3s.AN	*óe*		*ôn*
3:3d.AN		*ovân*	
3:3i.AN		*ovây*	

(a) *óe- mû'*
3S:3S.AN-saw
'He (coyote) saw him (rabbit)'

(b) *i- mû'*
3S:3S-saw
'He (coyote) saw it (cloud)'

(c) *óvây- t'e'yan*
3S:3I.AN-scolded
'He (chief wolf) scolded them (wolves)'

(b) *i- mû'*
3S:3P-saw
'He (coyote) saw them (clouds)'

(11) Dative likeness

(a) Inanimate third person object agreement is invariant for number (examples b, d). Animate third person objects vary for number (a, c), just as, e.g., second person objects do (e.g., 1:2S *wí*, 1S:2I *wây*).

(b) Moreover, the form of animate object agreement looks dative.

(c) Nonsingular: full going syncretism. Just as transitive 1:2D *wân* and ditransitive 1:2D:3 *wân* are identical, so are transitive 1:3D.AN *dovân* and ditransitive 1:3D.AN:3 *dovân*

(d) Singular: morphological composition. Just as transitive 3:2S *wóe* differs from ditransitive 3:2S:3 *wôn* via *-ˆn* (and vowel length), so transitive 3:3S.AN *óe* differs from ditransitive 1:3S:3 *ôn* via *-ˆn* (and vowel length).

(12) Third person case constraint

(a) Suppression of animacy marking in cases where it would bleed licensing of an applicative

(b) *Nǎ́we dovân- 'ąh- khęh- hon*
here 1S:3D.AN-foot-chase-bring
'This is where I've tracked them (kitten and lamb) to'

(b) *Dîn- ts'úḏe-í i- n to khän p'ônbay*
2:1:3-bring in.FUT the-I anaph lion head
'Bring me the skull of the lion'

(c) *Dîn- pee- yôn*
2:1:3(D.AN)-exit-command.IMP
'Tell them (kitten, lamb) to come out for me'

(d) *2:1+:3D.AN = *dí+ovân*

(13) Other applicative-like patterning: incorporation only for ±participant-free objects

(a) *Naa-ḏi wây- píví- má'í*
I- AGT 1:2I:3-meat-bring.FUT
'I'll bring you the meat'

(b) *Naa-ḏi wí píví wîn- hóewayni*
I- AGT some meat 1:2S:3-go get.FUT
'I'll go get you some meat'

(c) *I pu'ay óe- yóe'an i P'osewhâa Sedó- ḏi*
the rabbit.DIM 3:3S.AN-left the coyote old man-AGT
'Old Man Coyote left the little rabbit'

(d) **Óe- pu'ay- yóe'an i P'osewhâa Sedó- ḏi*
3:3S.AN-rabbit.DIM-left the coyote old man-AGT
(such examples are absent from the corpus)

(14) Thought experiment II: what if a language selected third person agents as Appl selects applicatives?

(a) Direct objects marked as animate cannot be acted on by third person agents
(b) Third persons cannot act on applicatives of any kind

(15) Southern Tiwa
(a) *Hliawra-de Ø- seuan-mu-ban*
woman- BAS 3S:3S-man- see-PST
'The woman saw the man'

(b) **Hliawra-de seuan-ide Ø- mu-ban*
woman- BAS man- BAS 3S:3S-see-PST
'The woman saw the man'

(c) *(Hliawra-de- ba) seuan-ide Ø- mu-che- ban*
woman- BAS-by man- BAS 3S-see-PASS-PST
'The man was seen by the man'

(16) ±participant marks discourse centrality, rather than (just) discourse animacy (only one third person can be so designated per clause; cf, obviative/proximate) — the (non-function-word) glossing is very approximate, Picurís (Northern Tiwa) is a language I've yet to grapple with

(a) *K'ōlomate Ø- p'ā- tai- mẹn 'ạ- kāl- wān.*
by gourd 3S:3S-water-pour-as :3S:3S-wolf-came
'As she was pouring water with a gourd, a wolf came to her.'

(b) *"Heyo 'ạ- t'a-hu?" tcexạmẹn Ø- 'ọm-mia.*
what 2S:3S-do-PROG then 3S-tell- PASS
'"What are you doing?" she was asked.'

(c) *"Ti- p'ā- tai- hu," łīu- enẹ Ø- kāl- 'ọm-ẹ.*
1S:3S-water-pour-PROG woman-BAS 3S:3S-wolf-tell- PST
'"I'm pouring water," the woman told the wolf.'

(d) *"'Ạ 'el- łai xui," tcexạmẹn kāl- enẹ pa Ø- 'ọm-mia.*
2S:RX back-climb then then wolf-BAS by 3S-tell- PASS
'"Climb on my back then," she was told by the wolf.

(e) *… Tcexąmęn kāl- enę* **pa łīu-** **enę** *p'įm-* *mākwil* Ø- **'ǫ[li]a.**
    then   wolf-BAS by woman-BAS mountains-wards 3S-take.PASS
    'And the wolf took the woman up to the mountains.'

(f) *… Męntcoho nǫpēn'au* *węn* *sḗn- enę* **pa** *łīu* *enę* Ø- *thą̄-* **mia.**
    then   at midnight some man-I   by woman BAS 3S-find-PASS
    'And then at about midnight the woman was found by one man [DH: some of the men[?]].'

(g) *Wel* *'i- wan- 'aiten 'i-* **łīu-** *łḗwe wēwe thëppiu.*
    other 3I-arrive-when 3I:3S-woman-take back home
    'When the rest of the men arrived, they took the woman home again.'

(h) *Łīu-* *enę sḗn- enę* **pa** Ø- *t'ëpha-***lia-** *hu.*
    woman-BAS man-I   by 3S-scold- PASS-PROG
    'The woman was very much scolded by the men.'

(17) Prediction: passive for all ditransitives with third person agents
    (a) Any applicative, whether third or nonthird, bears ±participant, which bleeds *v* of the selectional feature for third person agents, forcing an agentless construction, viz, passive
    (b) (*Hliawra-de- ba*) *in/a-* *'u'-* *wia- che- ban*
        woman- BAS-by :1S/3S:3S-child.DIM-give-PASS-PST
        'I/(s)he was given the baby (by the woman)'

(18) Missing piece: non-phi selection
    (a) Nothing bleeds selection of a first or second person agent. So, there must be some further feature at play. This could be used to permit 3:3:3 in those Tanoan languages that permit it.
    (b) *'au-* *ną́t'awi-'am-bá– k*
        3S:3S:3P-gun- do- PNCT–SUB
        '[Then, where he was overtaking the other Navajo,] he fired his gun at him [and he dropped the little girl]'
    (c) *Ną́łe* Ø- *ną́t'awi-'ábé- ban T'ełíep-'ide– va*
        Nale 3S-gun- do.PASS-PNCT Navajo-BAS–by
        '[Just as he got there,] Nale was shot by a Navajo [with a little round pebble in the middle of his forehead]'
    (d) *Huva* *'u-* *nąt'awi-'am-ban*
        then 3S:3P-gun- do- PNCT
        '[When he went up to the top of the cliff, he saw them running.] He shot. [One of them cried out as he was running.]'