

ED 365 099

FL 021 594

AUTHOR Marlett, Stephen A.
 TITLE Goals and Indirect Objects in Seri.
 PUB DATE 93
 NOTE 21p.; In: Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1993. University of North Dakota Session, Volume 37; see FL 021 593.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Language Research; Language Typology; *Linguistic Theory; Semantics; *Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Syntax; *Tenses (Grammar); Uncommonly Taught Languages; *Verbs
 IDENTIFIERS *Seri

ABSTRACT

A number of Seri verbs display a sensitivity to whether a goal, which is a term used for recipients, addressees, etc., is singular or plural. The data presented in this paper are of typological interest. It is argued that Seri has indirect objects, but that there is no one-to-one mapping between the semantic role goal and either the syntactic relation of indirect object or any oblique relation. Data and arguments are also presented that are of theoretical interest. First, it is argued that there are verbs that govern both 3-2 Advancement and 2-3 retreat, establishing the existence of the latter in human language. Second, it is proposed that a degree of simplification of the Seri grammar may be achieved by adopting a Minimality principle. This principle predicts that certain revaluations should not be expected in Seri, and permits simplification of the lexical entries of verbs. (JL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dooley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GOALS AND INDIRECT OBJECTS IN SERI¹

Stephen A. Marlett
Summer Institute of Linguistics, Mexico
University of North Dakota

ED 365 099

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Direct objects, indirect objects and obliques
 - 2.1 Agreement properties
 - 2.2 Transitive allomorphy
 - 2.3 Object marker
 - 2.4 Passivization
 - 2.5 Relational nouns
- 3 The Minimality Principle
- 4 The proposals
 - 4.1 Subcategorization for singular 3s
 - 4.2 3-2 Advancement
 - 4.3 2-3 Retreat
 - 4.4 Indirect object registration morphology
- 5 Alternative analyses
- 6 Conclusions

1 Introduction

A significant group of Seri verbs display a sensitivity to whether a Goal is singular or plural.² (I use the term 'Goal' as a cover term for 'Recipients', 'Addressees', etc.) A verb such as {æati} 'give', for example, has the subcategorization frame [1 3/Sg]; that is, it accepts only a subject and an indirect object, and the indirect object must be singular.³ With such verbs, if the Goal is plural, it *must* appear as a relational noun phrase (an Oblique).

The data which appear in this paper are of typological interest. I argue that Seri has Indirect Objects, but there is not a one-to-one mapping between the semantic role Goal and either the syntactic relation of Indirect Object or any oblique relation. Unlike in Southern Tiwa, where there is optionality in the mapping according to Rosen's 1990 analysis, the mapping in Seri is mediated by subcategorization frames which are sensitive to number.

This paper also presents data and arguments which are of theoretical interest. First, I argue that there are verbs which govern both 3-2 Advancement and 2-3 Retreat, establishing more firmly the existence of the latter in human language.⁴ One argument

¹I appreciate the discussions of these facts that I have had with David Perlmutter, Carol Rosen, and Chuck Speck.

²Some of the facts presented here are discussed in Marlett 1981, but the analyses differ in several points.

³I use the standard Relational Grammar notation, 1 (Subject), 2 (Direct Object), 3 (Indirect Object).

FL021594

for this analysis over a monostratal analysis is based on the fact that, with certain verbs, the presence (or absence) of an *initial* Indirect Object is registered on the verb. A second argument against a monostratal analysis is based on the fact that one loses the ability to posit a simple subcategorization frame for certain verbs.

Second, I propose that a degree of simplification of the Seri grammar may be achieved by adopting a Minimality Principle. This principle correctly predicts that certain reevaluations should not be expected in Seri. It also permits simplification of the lexical entries of verbs.

This paper is organized as follows: in section 2 I show a set of facts which are the basis for distinguishing between Obliques, Indirect Objects, and Direct Objects. In section 3, the Minimality Principle is introduced and its predictions explained. In section 4 I discuss verbs which show the need for other key proposals: (a) differential treatment of singular and plural Goals with respect to initial grammatical relations, (b) lexically-governed 3-2 Advancement, (c) lexically-governed 2-3 Retreat, and (d) morphology which is sensitive to initial 3hood. In section 5 I discuss alternative analyses of the verbs in question, including one in which there is simply a more complex skewing in the mapping of semantic roles to grammatical relations.

2 Direct objects, indirect objects, and obliques

It is important to be able to distinguish between Direct Objects, Indirect Objects, and Obliques in Seri. Each of these grammatical relations (or classes of grammatical relations, in the case of Obliques) has different properties. These properties are discussed below.

2.1 Agreement properties

Seri has three way person agreement on the verb: Subject, Direct Object, and Indirect Object agreement. The underlying forms of the agreement morphemes are given in Table 1. Number is not distinguished for Indirect Object Agreement.

Final Subjects determine Subject agreement, final Direct Objects determine Direct Object agreement, and final Indirect Objects determine Indirect Object agreement.⁵ Verb stems also reflect the number of the final Subject by changes in the root and/or suffixation (see Marlett 1990).

In nonpassive clauses, Goals determine Direct Object agreement in some clauses and Indirect Object agreement in others. In (1) the Goal is a final 2 and determines Direct Object agreement. In (2) the Goal is a final 3 and determines Indirect Object agreement.⁶ (These clauses are also discussed more below.)

The abbreviation 'F2' represents 'final direct object'.

⁴See the discussion in Perlmutter 1990.

⁵Direct Object chomeurs also determine Direct Object agreement. See the discussion of Seri impersonal passives in Marlett 1984.

I assume that those Obliques which determine Indirect Object Agreement are final Indirect Objects. This analysis is discussed in Marlett 1990 (p. 333), but in that article the terminology 'Oblique Agreement' was used nevertheless.

⁶The first line of the example is close to a phonemic transcription; the second line is essentially the

Table 1: Agreement morphemes			
	Subject	Direct Object	Indirect Object
1s	?-, ?p-	?im- (?po- in imperatives)	?a-
1p	?a-	?iši-	?a-
2s	m-	ma-	mæ-
2p	ma-	maši-	mæ-
3	(unmarked)	(unmarked, but see sec. 2.3)	ko-

(1) ?intmíiit
 ?im-t-míiit
 1sDO-R1-ask
 'did s/he ask me?'

(2) ?æ?áamX
 ?æ-?-aa-amX
 1IO-Im-Dat-say
 'say it to me!'

2.2 Transitive allomorphy

Various morphemes display suppletive allomorphy which is sensitive in whole or in part to the presence of a final Direct Object in the clause. These facts therefore provide a positive test for the Direct Object relation. For example, there are two suppletive allomorphs of the first person singular Subject prefix: {?} occurs if the clause is finally transitive, {?p} if it is finally intransitive. Another example of such allomorphy is found with the infinitive prefix: if the clause is finally intransitive, the prefix is {ika}; if the clause is finally transitive, the prefix is {i?a}.

(3) i?pyomáφp
 ?p-yo-m-aφp
 1sSI-Dt-N-arrive
 'I didn't arrive'

(4) i?yomá?o
 ?-yo-m-a?o
 1sST-Dt-N-see
 'I didn't see him/her/it'

underlying form. (Complete analyses of verb and noun stems are not presented due to complications discussed in Marlett 1990.) A couple of verbs use a capital C in their underlying form. This represents the empty consonant position discussed in Marlett and Stemberger 1981.

- (5) ikáφp
ika-aφp
Infl-arrive
'to arrive'
- (6) iʔáʔo
iʔa-aʔo
InfT-see
'to see (it)'

2.3 Object marker

When a clause has a third person final Subject and a third person final Direct Object, the prefix {i} occurs on a finite verb.⁷ The verb form for 's/he saw it/her/him' is iyóoʔo ({i-yo-aʔo} 'OM-Dt-see'). In (7) the Goal is a final 2; the Object Marker occurs.

- (7) ktám kix táitom kmáam kop itmíiit
ktam kix t-aitom kmaam kop i-t-míiit
man the RL-speak woman the OM-RL-ask
'the man spoke, he asked the woman...'

2.4 Passivization

Only Direct Objects can be passivized in Seri. If a nominal can be a passive Subject, it can also be a Direct Object in an active clause. In (8), a Goal has been passivized. This is possible since it can also surface as a Direct Object in Seri, as in (9).

- (8) šiXkám kiʔ ʔp+páæ
šiXkám kʔ ʔp-t-p<A>-æCæ
fish the lsSI-RL-Pv-give
'was I given fish?'
- (9) šiXkám kiʔ ʔimíyæ
šiXkám kʔ ʔim-mí-æCæ
fish the lsSI-Px-give
's/he gave me fish'

2.5 Relational nouns

Final Obliques surface as possessors of relational nouns. I restrict discussion here to the Oblique relations which I call Oblique_{IN} and Oblique_{ON}. A Locative Oblique_{IN} occurs as possessor of the relational noun {áno} 'in, to, from', as shown in (10).

⁷This prefix also occurs on Subject nominalized forms under slightly different conditions. It occurs on finite verbs under certain other conditions which are not relevant here. See the discussion in Marlett 1984. It should not be confused with epenthetic vowels which occur to prevent a syllable onset cluster from beginning with a sonorant.

- (10) ?áXš kop ?amáæn ak áno kápi?a
 ?a-aXš kop ?amáæn ak ano k-ap=?a
 Ab-pet the interior the 3P/in SN-stand-Dec
 'the dog is inside the house'

A Locative Oblique_{ON} occurs as possessor of the relational noun {ati} 'on', as shown in (11).

- (11) íti nskámom ?a?a
 i-ati m-sí-m-oom<SR> ?a=?a
 3P-on 2sS-Ir-N-lie Aux-Dec
 'you shouldn't lie down on it'

3 The Minimality Principle

In a theory in which nominals may revalue from one grammatical relation to another, numerous possibilities exist. Various of these are ruled out by the Oblique Law, namely Oblique to Oblique, 3 to Oblique, 2 to Oblique, and 1 to Oblique (Perlmutter and Postal 1983). Other possibilities remain, however, of which some are attested in Seri, but some are not.

- | | | |
|------|--------------|--------------|
| (12) | Oblique to 3 | Attested |
| | Oblique to 2 | Not Attested |
| | 3 to 2 | Attested |
| | 3 to 1 | Not Attested |
| | 2 to 3 | Attested |
| | 2 to 1 | Attested |
| | 1 to 2 | Not Attested |
| | 1 to 3 | Not Attested |

As Gerdts 1992 points out, such facts require explanation. I propose that much of the asymmetry shown above for Seri can be explained by the following principle:

- (13) Minimality Principle: Unless otherwise stipulated, revaluations are minimal.

This principle would correctly allow for all of the attested revaluations and all of the unattested revaluations in Seri shown above, with the exception of 1 to 2 (Antipassive). The nonexistence of the latter, if true, must be stipulated.

In languages where Obliques advance to 2, the revaluation of Oblique to 2 is still in keeping with the Minimality Principle if one assumes the Landing Site Principle (Gerdts 1992), of which Part A interests us here:

- (14) Landing Site Principle (part A): Only morphosyntactically-licensed argument positions can be revaluation landing sites.

In some ways, the Minimality Principle is like the Universal Sonority Scale in phonology. It is not inviolable cross-linguistically, but the grammar of a language is less marked and more highly valued if it is consistent with the principle.

The grammar of Seri will also include other information. Passive, Unaccusative

Advancement, and Oblique to 3 Advancement are not lexically governed. But 2-3 Retreat and 3-2 Advancement are governed by particular predicates. Once this is known, the lexical entries for the verbs in question may simply specify [+Retreat] or [+Advance].

4 The proposals

In this section I motivate various simple proposals for the understanding of Seri grammar, and show how they interact to yield the superficially complicated situation that we find.

4.1 Subcategorization for singular 3s

I posit that several verbs in Seri subcategorize for an optional or obligatory *singular 3*. That is, they accept a 3 in their 'relational valence',⁸ but only if it is singular.⁹ If something like a plural Goal is to be expressed, it must be an Oblique and appear as a relational noun.¹⁰ The following pairs of examples illustrate this fact (certain final grammatical relations of the Seri are indicated in the free translation):

(15) tóotx^wk pak ?akámxk
 tootx^wk pak ?æ-k-amxk
 cholla some 1IO-Im-deliver
 'bring some cholla cactus (F2) to me (F3)!'

(16) tóm k? ?ino kámxk
 tom k? ?i-ano k-amxk
 money the 1P-in Im-deliver
 'bring the money (F2) to us (FObl)!'

(17) mæ?pyáæti
 mæ-?p-yo-æati
 2IO-1sSI-Dt-give
 'I gave to you (F3)'

(18) komkáak takoi áno ?pyáæti
 komkáak takoi ano ?p-yo-æati
 people those 3P/in 1sSI-Dt-give
 'I gave to those people (FObl)'

⁸This terminology is from Rosen 1981.

⁹I purposefully avoid examples with causativized verbs. A clause union analysis would lead one to expect the Subject of the inner verb to very possibly appear as an Indirect Object (Davies and Rosen 1988). This is what regularly happens with such verbs, as shown by the following example, where the verb glossed 'show' is a causative form of 'see'.

(i) mikanóaa kom ?æ?akóo?otim
 mi-kanóaa kom ?æ-?-akóo?otim
 2P-boat the 1IO-Im-show/M
 'show us (F3) your boat (F2)!'

But such verbs are therefore less interesting than simple verbs.

¹⁰Rosen 1990 makes a similar claim for Southern Tiwa. She claims that certain recipients may be realized as either Obliques or as Indirect Objects. This proposal requires a weakening of any claim of direct relation between semantic role and initial grammatical relation.

- (19) koʔyáamX
 ko-ʔ-yo-aa-amX
 3IO-1sST-Dt-Dat-say
 'I said it to him/her (F3)'
- (20) míno ʔyóomX
 mi-ano ʔ-yo-amX
 2P-in 1sST-say
 'I said it to you (pl.) (FObl)'
- (21) kíno kámX
 kí-ano k-amX
 3P-in 1m-say
 'say it to them (FObl)'

The subcategorization frame for two verbs of this group would be:

- (22) {amxk} 'deliver' [1 2 (3/Sg)]
- (23) {æati} 'give' [1 3/Sg]

These verbs contrast with a verb such as {kašit} 'take away forcefully', which allows for singular or plural Goals as Indirect Objects.

- (24) tom kʔ ʔæiyokášit
 tom kʔ ʔæ-i-yo-kašit
 money the 1IO-OM-Dt-take.forcefully
 's/he took the money away from me (F3)'
- (25) tom kʔ ʔæiyokášitim
 tom kʔ ʔæ-i-yo-kašitim
 money the 1IO-OM-Dt-take.forcefully/M
 's/he took the money away from us (F3)'
- (26) {kašit} 'take away forcefully' [1 2 3]

One verb commonly appears with Goals, and yet does not subcategorize for a 3 at all. It is therefore relationally a monotransitive verb. Singular and plural Goals both appear as relational nouns.

- (27) símæt kiʔ míti itáom
 símæt kʔ mi-ati i-t-aom
 bread the 2P-on OM-Rl-beg
 's/he was begging for bread (F2) from you (FObl) ...'
- (28) šiiX kXátʔk kʔ ʔín itáom
 šiiX k-Xatʔk kʔ ʔi-ano i-t-aom
 thing thin the 1P-in OM-Rl-beg
 's/he was begging for a tortilla (F2) from us (FObl) ...'

The subcategorization frame for this verb would be:

- (29) {aom} 'beg' [1 2]

4.2 3-2 Advancement

A number of clauses have Goals as final Direct Objects. In such clauses, the Goal determines Direct Object agreement, and the clauses are finally transitive by all available tests. The proposal I make is the standard one within Relational Grammar analyses: these verbs require 3-2 Advancement.¹¹

The following verbs have simple subcategorization frames, yet require 3-2 Advancement.¹¹

- (30) {ai} 'tell' [1 3] [+Advance]
 (31) {æ<SR>} 'give' [1 2 3] [+Advance] (2 is specific)
 (32) {æCæ} 'give' [1 2 3] [+Advance] (2 is generic)
 (33) {aipot} 'pay' [1 (2) (3)] [+Advance]

The 3 in clauses with these verbs always advances to 2. It determines the presence of the Object Marker (if Subject and Direct Object are third person) in the following examples.

- (34) óX imíi
 oX i-mi-ai
 thus OM-Px-tell
 'thus s/he told him/her/them (F2)'
 (35) óX iyóaam
 oX i-yo-aaam
 thus OM-Dt-tell/Pl
 'thus they told him/her/them (F2)'

It also determines Direct Object agreement in sentences such as those which follow.

- (36) óX ?išimíi
 oX ?iši-mi-ai
 thus lpDO-Px-tell
 'thus s/he told us (F2)'
 (37) tóm ki? ma?ítæ
 tom k? ma-?-t-æ<SR>
 money the 2sDO-1sST-Rl-give
 'did I give you (F2) the money?'
 (38) šixkám ki? matáæ
 šixkám k? ma-t-æCæ
 fish the 2sDO-Rl-give
 'did s/he give you (F2) fish?'

¹¹The initial 2 (Theme) is a 2-chomeur in the final stratum. Some of these verbs enter into arguments for the analysis of passive clauses in Seri in Marlett 1984, which also provides additional evidence

- (39) mašitkmáipotim
 maši-t-m-aipotim
 2pDO-R1-N-pay/M
 'didn't s/he pay you (pl.) (it)?'

As a 2, the initial 3 may also passivize and be the final Subject, and as such be an Equi victim.

- (40) tóm ki? ?pyopá?æ
 tom k? ?p-yo-p<A>-ææ<SR>
 money the lsSI-Dt-Pv-give
 'I was given the money'
- (41) šixkám k? ikapá?æ ?mímšo
 šixkám k? ika-p<A>-ææ<SR> ?-mi-amšo
 fish the InfI-Pv-give lsST-Px-want
 'I want to be given the fish'
- (42) šixkám k? ikapáæ ?mímšo
 šixkám k? ika-p<A>-æCæ ?-mi-amšo
 fish the InfI-Pv-give lsST-Px-want
 'I want to be given fish'

4.3 2-3 Retreat

Some clauses have Themes as final Indirect Objects. In such clauses, the Theme determines Indirect Object agreement, and the clauses are finally intransitive if there is no other nominal as Direct Object. I claim that the verbs in question require 2-3 Retreat. The subcategorization frames for these verbs are:¹²

- (43) {aasot} 'end' [1 2 (3/Sg)] [+Advance] [+Retreat]
- (44) {itaɬ?áa} 'sell' [1 2 (3/Sg)] [+Advance] [+Retreat]

These verbs may both occur without a Goal as 3, either because the Goal/3 is optional, or because any Goal/3 must be singular. In the following examples, note that

for the 3-2 Advancement analysis.

¹²The root {itaɬ?áa} may mean either 'buy' or 'sell', depending on the frame in which it occurs. Our interest here lies with the use as 'sell'. The following examples with the frame for 'buy' show that it is a typical transitive verb (no Source allowed).

- (ii) šixkám ki? kátXo pak isitaɬ?áa ?aya
 šixkám k? k-atXo pak i-si-itaɬ?áa ?a=ya
 fish the SN-be.much some OM-Ir-buy/sell Aux-Int
 'will s/he buy a lot of fish (F2)?'
- (iii) ?ásax kap i?ataɬ?áa ?mímšo
 ?asax kap i?a<A>-itaɬ?áa ?-mi-amšo
 basket the InfT-buy/sell lsST-Px-want
 'I want to buy the basket (F2)'
- (iv) tróoki ?ataɬ?áa ki?
 trooki ?a-aa?-itaɬ?áa k?
 car SN-Pv-buy/sell the
 'the car (F1) that was bought'

the Theme is determining Indirect Object agreement, that there is no Object Marker on the verb, and that the intransitive allomorph of the first person Subject agreement appears.

- (45) kmáɛX ánim i?yáa šo ko?pskmáasot ?a?i
 kmaaX ánim ?i-Ø-yaa šo ko-?p-si-m-aasot ?a=?i
 now knife 1P-OM-own a 3IO-lsSI-Ir-N-lend Aux-Dec
 'now I won't lend my knife (F3)'
- (46) ánim šo ?ino k^wyáasotim
 ánim šo ?i-ano ko-yo-aasotim
 knife a 1P-in 3IO-Dt-lend/M
 's/he lent a knife (F3) to us (FObl)'
- (47) k^wtmitaɬ?áa?o
 ko-t-m-itaɬ?áa=?o
 3IO-Rl-N-buy/sell-Dec
 's/he didn't sell it (F3)'
- (48) šixkám ?ípkom ko?ptkmitaɬ?áa?o
 šixkám ?ípkom ko-?p-t-m-itaɬ?áa=?o
 fish this 3IO-lsSI-Rl-N-buy/sell-Dec
 'I didn't sell this fish (F3)'

The *intransitive* allomorph of the infinitive prefix is required in the following sentences.

- (49) ?ásax kap k^wikitaɬ?áa ?mímšo
 ?asax kap ko-ika-itaɬ?áa ?-mi-amšo
 basket the 3IO-InfI-buy/sell lsST-Px-want
 'I want to sell the basket (F3)'
- (50) míno k^wikitaɬ?áa ?mímšo
 mí-ano ko-ika-itaɬ?áa ?-mi-amšo
 2P-in 3IO-InfI-buy/sell lsST-Px-want
 'I want to sell it (F3) to you (pl.) (FObl)'

A clause containing these verbs without an initial 3 cannot be passive; instead, as with intransitive verbs, the Unspecified Subject prefix occurs on the verb if the initial Subject is unspecified.

- (51) ánm ?áakšox ki? kookx k? ?ino komkáasot
 ánm ?aakšox ki? k-ookx k? ?i-no ko-mi-ka-aasot
 metal bows the SN-two the 1P-in 3IO-Px-US-lend
 'one (unspecified) lent two rifles (F3) to us (FObl)'

The fact that the Theme is a final 3 is clear. I claim that the initial 2 retreats to 3. However, when there is an initial 3 present, that 3 is a final 2 in active clauses, by 3-2 Advancement, contrary to the Chomeur Law.¹³

¹³An analysis with simultaneous 2-3 Retreat and 3-2 Advancement was posited by Perlmutter and Postal (1983) for Kinyarwanda, although Gerdts and Whaley 1991 propose another analysis of the Kinyarwanda facts which avoids the problematic co-occurrence.

- (52) P 1 2 3 (initial stratum)
P 1 3 2 (final stratum)

This analysis is not immediately obvious, however. If Direct and Indirect Object Agreement are both called for, as in these cases, a kind of (independently attested) Object Camouflage occurs, as discussed in Marlett 1990 (p. 526).¹⁴ Specifically, only one object prefix occurs, and it has the *form* of Indirect Object Agreement but the *person* required by the Direct Object. This Camouflage appears in some examples which follow.

In the example immediately below, the Imperative allomorph which appears here is possible only if the clause is finally *transitive*.¹⁵ The Goal is a final 2.

- (53) ?æ?áasot
?æ-?-aasot
3IO/1sDO-Im-lend
'lend me (F2) it (F3)!'

The transitive allomorph of the first person Subject prefix and of the infinitive prefix occur in examples with Goals as final 2s.

- (54) ko?yita?áa
ko-?-yo-ita?áa
3IO-1sST-Dt-buy/sell
'I sold it (F3) to him/her (F2)'

- (55) tíiX mæi?ata?áa imáa?a
tíiX mæ-i?a<A>-ita?áa i-i-m-aCa=?a
that.one 3IO/20-InfT-buy/sell SN-OM-N-know-Dec
's/he can't sell it (F3) to you (sg.) (F2)'

A 'sell'/'lend' clause with an initial 3 may be passive.¹⁶

¹⁴For example, compare the following examples. In the first one, the Direct Object determines Direct Object Agreement. In the second one, an Instrumental occurs as Indirect Object (the only way it can occur) and Object Camouflage occurs.

- (v) ma?sníp ?a?a
ma-?-si-níp ?a=?a
2sDO-1sST-Ir-hit Aux-Decl
'I will hit you (with a closed fist)'
- (vi) ?æ?æ tikom mæ?sníp ?a?a
?æ?æ tikom mæ-?-si-níp ?a=?a
stick that 3IO/2sDO-1sST-Ir-hit Aux-Decl
'I will hit you (F2) with that stick (F3)'

¹⁵See Marlett 1981 for a discussion of imperative prefix allomorphy.

¹⁶An impersonal passive is required here. Impersonal passives occur if there is a plural 2 or if there is a 3 in the clause with which the verb must agree, and the other conditions for passive are met. Additional details are given in Marlett 1984 (where some nominals that I now call final 3s are referred to as Obliques).

- (56) ánm ?aakni šo mætompáasot
 ánm ?aakni šo mæ-t-m-p<A>-áasot
 metal bow a 3IO/2DO-R1-N-Pv-lend
 'you (sg.) weren't lent a rifle (F3)'

The verb {šax^w} 'discuss' is slightly different from the verbs discussed above. First, it allows for singular and plural initial 3s. In the following examples, the Goal is a final 2 or 1.

- (57) ma?nšáX^w
 ma-?-mi-šax^w
 2sDO-1sST-Px-discuss
 'I am discussing with you (sg.) (F2)'
- (58) mai?ašáX^w i,Xóomšo
 ma-i?a<A>-šax^w ?-Xo-amšo
 2sDO-InfT-discuss 1sST-Em-want
 'I want to discuss with you (sg.) (F2)!'
- (59) maši?nšáX^w
 maši-?-mi-šax^w
 2pDO-1sST-Px-discuss
 'I am discussing with you (pl.) (F2)'
- (60) iyošáX^w
 i-yo-šax^w
 OM-Dt-discuss
 's/he discussed with him/her (F2)'
- (61) i?pya?šáX^w
 ?p-yo-aa?-šax^w
 1sSI-Dt-Pv-discuss
 'I (F1) was discussed with'

Second, when there is no Goal, the Theme is a final 2.

- (62) ?æ kmáaX mos ikáitom i?máa šo
 ?æ kmáaX mos i-Ø-ka-aitom i?máæ šo
 1Pro now also 3P-AN-US-talk other a
 ?æ ššáX^w ka?a
 ?æ si-šáX^w ka=?a
 1Pro Ir-discuss Aux-Dec
 'I will now discuss another topic (F2)'

Third, when both a Goal and a Theme occur, the Goal advances to 2 but the Theme retreats to 3. The combination results in Object Camouflage.

- (63) šíiX šo mæ?nšáX^w
 šiiX šo mæ-?-mi-šax^w
 thing a 3IO/2DO-1sST-Px-discuss
 'I am discussing something (F3) with you (sg./pl.) (F2)'

- (64) šiiX šo k^wiyošáX^w
 šiiX šo ko-i-yo-šaX^w
 thing a 3IO-OM-Dt-discuss
 's/he discussed something (F3) with him/her/them (F2)'
- (65) táaX mæ?nšáX^w
 taaX mæ-?-mi-šaX^w
 that 3IO/2DO-1sST-Px-discuss
 'I am discussing that (F3) with you (sg./pl.) (F2)'

Such examples are opaque; one might propose that they do not have any syntactic rearrangement of the Objects. But we suspect from the simpler examples that the Goal may be a 2 hidden by Object Camouflage. Clearer evidence of the syntactic rearrangement is possible by passivizing the Goal and making it an Equi victim. The following example shows that the Theme is indeed a final 3 since it determines Indirect Object Agreement and the (complement) clause is finally intransitive.

- (66) táaX k^wika?šáX^w i?mímšo
 taaX ko-ika-aa?-šaX^w ?-mi-amšo
 that 3IO-InfI-Pv-discuss 1sST-Px-want
 'I want that to be discussed with me'
 (More literally, I want to be discussed that (F3)')

Therefore the lexical entry for {šaX^w} 'discuss' must include a condition on 2-3 Retreat. 2-3 Retreat occurs with this verb if and only if the initial 3 (Goal) advances to 2.¹⁷

- (67) {šaX^w} 'discuss' [1 (2) (3)] [+Advance], conditional [+Retreat]

4.4 Indirect object registration morphology

Three verbs are sensitive to the presence of an initial 3. The presence or absence of an initial 3 is indicated morphologically by adding the 'Dative' prefix.¹⁸ The point of this section is that such a generalization is possible under the analyses proposed. The notion 'initial 3' cannot be replaced by any one superficial or non-initial grammatical relation, nor by any one semantic role. The nominals in question are not always final 3s, or final 2s; and some Goals are not 3s, but rather Obliques.

The lexical entries for the two verbs that are sensitive to the positive presence of

¹⁷An alternative analysis for this verb would be to claim that the final 3 is not really a Theme or an initial 2, but an initial Oblique that advances to 3. The Goal (initial 3) always advances to 2, and the Oblique (topic discussed) always advances to 3, but in addition advances to 2 if and only if there is no Goal that is a 2.

¹⁸The Dative prefix is an ablauting process (<A>) with the verb 'hide' and the 'augment' prefix {aa} with the verb 'say'. The augment prefix is most commonly used as a causative prefix in Seri.

an initial 3 are:¹⁹

- (68) {isX^w} 'hide' [1 (2) (3)] [+Advance if no 2]
Morphology: Dative prefix <A> if initial 3
- (69) {amX} 'say' [1 2 (3/Sg)]
Morphology: Dative prefix {aa} if initial 3

First, consider examples of these verbs in clauses without an initial 3, either because there is no Goal or the Goal is plural (and hence an Oblique). Note that the verbs appear with simple stems.

- (70) mos kámXo
mos k-amX-o
again Im-say-AdvS
'say it (F2) again!'
- (71) itámX
i-t-amX
OM-Rl-say
'did s/he say it (F2) ?'
- (72) i?yóomX
?-yo-amX
1sST-Dt-say
'I said it (F2)'
- (73) kíno kámX
ki-ano k-amX
3P-in Im-say
'say it (F2) to them (FObl)'
- (74) míno ?yóomX
mi-ano ?-yo-amX
2P-in 1sST-Dt-say
'I said it (F2) to you (pl.) (FObl)'
- (75) ?ísX^w
?-isX^w
Im-hide
'hide it (F2)!'

¹⁹Alternatively, one could view the so-called Dative prefix as a derivational affix that derives ditransitive verbs from monotransitive verbs. Under such an analysis, each verb root has two lexical entries:

- | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| (vii) | {isX ^w } | 'hide' | [1 (2)] |
| (viii) | {<A>-isX ^w } | 'hide from' | [1 (2) 3] [+Advance if no 2] |
| (ix) | {amX} | 'say' | [1 2] |
| (x) | {aa-amX} | 'say to' | [1 2 3/Sg] |

- (76) ?æ ?sísX^w ?aya
 ?æ ?-si-isX^w ?a=ya
 1Pro 1sST-Ir-hide Aux-Int
 'shall I hide it (F2)?'

In the following examples, an initial 3 occurs. Its presence is reflected not only by Indirect Object Agreement, but also by the Dative prefix.

- (77) ko?yáamX
 ko-?-yo-aa-amX
 3IO-1sST-Dt-Dat-say
 'I said it (F2) to him/her (F3)'
- (78) šíiX šo mæspáamX
 šíiX šo mæ-si-p<A>-aa-amX
 thing a 2IO-Ir-Pv-Dat-say
 'something will be said to you (F3)'
- (79) ?æ?æsX^w
 ?æ-?-<A>-isX^w
 1IO-Im-Dat-hide
 'hide it (F2) from me/us (F3)!'
- (80) ikáaspox ki? mæskmásX^w ?a?a
 i-Ø-ka-aaspox k? mæ-i-si-m-<A>-isX^w ?a=?
 3P-AN-US-draw the 2IO-OM-Ir-N-Dat-hide Aux-Dec
 's/he will not hide the pencil (F2) from you (sg./pl.) (F3)'
- (81) ikáaspox ki? ?æpásX^w i?mímšo
 i-Ø-ka-aaspox k? ?æ-i-Ø-p-<A>-isX^w ?-mi-amšo
 3P-AN-US-draw the 1IO-3P-AN-Pv-Dat-hide 1sST-Px-want
 'I want the pencil to be hidden from me'
 (More literally, 'I want that the pencil (F1) be hidden from me (F3)')

The verb {isX^w} 'hide' may also omit the Theme if the verb is understood reflexively (in which case the word {?akX} 'somewhere' is also used with it).²⁰ If there is no Theme, the Goal (initial 3) advances to 2. In the examples that follow, the Goal is clearly a 2. The clauses are all finally transitive by the known tests.

- (82) ?ákX ?æsX^w
 ?akX ?-<A>-isX^w
 somewhere Im-Dat-hide
 'hide (yourself) from him/her (F2)!'
- (83) ?ákX i?æsX^w intámšo
 ?akX i?a<A>-<A>-isX^w m-t-amšo
 somewhere InfT-Dat-hide 2sS-R1-want
 'do you want to hide (yourself) from him/her (F2)?'

²⁰Reflexive clauses in Seri typically are transitive clauses with a reflexive noun phrase such as ?ísox 'myself' or mísóx 'yourself.'

- (84) ?ákX i?pásX^w
 ?akX ?po-Ø-<A>-isX^w
 somewhere 1sDO-Im-Dat-hide
 'hide (yourself) from me!'

With the verb {miiit} 'ask (about)', the prefix {aa} behaves somewhat differently. This verb takes the prefix {aa} only if there is *no* initial 3.²¹

- (85) {miiit} 'ask (about)' [1 (2) (3/Sg)]²² [+Advance] [+Retreat]
 Morphology: Antidative prefix {aa} if no initial 3

First, consider examples in which an initial 3 is *not* present. The Theme (what is asked about) is a final 3, by 2-3 Retreat. Since there is no initial 3, the Antidative prefix occurs. If there is no initial 3, there is no final 2 and the clause is superficially intransitive.

- (86) ?ætamiit
 ?æ-t-aa-miiit
 1IO-R1-ADat-ask
 'did s/he ask about me (F3)?'
- (87) k^wtamiit
 ko-t-aa-miiit
 3IO-R1-ADat-ask
 'did s/he ask about him/her/it (F3)?'
- (88) šiiX šo míno k^wtamiit
 šiiX šo mí-ano ko-t-aa-miiit
 thing a 2P-in 3IO-R1-ADat-ask
 'did s/he ask about something (F3) of you (pl.) (FObl)?',
 i.e., 'did s/he ask you (pl.) something?'
- (89) šiiX š ano k^wtamiit
 šiiX šo ano ko-t-aa-miiit
 thing a 3P/in 3IO-R1-ADat-ask
 'did s/he ask about something (F3) of them (FObl)?',
 i.e. 'did s/he ask them something?'

In the following examples, an initial 3 is present, and hence the Antidative prefix does *not* occur. The initial 3 advances to 2 and determines Direct Object agreement or the Object Marker, as appropriate.²³

²¹If the prefix is a derivational prefix, it must be viewed as one which derives a monotransitive verb from a ditransitive. The lexical entries would be:

- (xi) {miiit} 'ask to' [1 (2) (3/Sg)] [+Advance] [+Retreat]
 (xii) {aa-miiit} 'ask' [1 (2)] [+Retreat]

²²So far as I know, a 2 or 3 is always present. An alternative for this verb would be to claim that the final 3 is not really a Theme or an initial 2, but an initial Oblique that advances to 3. I do not have any way of arguing for one of these analyses over the other.

²³Example (93) is an impersonal passive (see Marlett 1984).

- (90) ?intmíiit
 ?im-t-míiit
 1sDO-Rl-ask
 'did s/he ask me (F2)?'
- (91) ktám kix táitom kmáam kop itmíiit
 ktam kix t-aitom kmaam kop i-t-míiit
 man the Rl-speak woman the OM-Rl-ask
 'the man spoke, he asked the woman (F2)...'
- (92) šiiX šo ?ætmiíit
 šiiX šo ?æ-t-míiit
 thing a 3IO/1sDO-Rl-ask
 'did s/he ask me (F2) about something (F3)?'
- (93) šiiX šo ?æya?míiit
 šiiX šo ?æ-yo-aa?-míiit
 thing a 3IO/1sDO-Dt-Pv ask
 'I was asked about something (F3)'

5 Alternative analyses

The presentation of the facts that I have made utilizes a multistratal view of syntactic structure. In the initial stratum, Themes are Direct Objects, which is not unusual. Goals may be Indirect Objects or Goals in the initial stratum, however, depending on the verb's subcategorization frame. In this section I consider two alternative analyses.

Baker 1988 suggests that perhaps 2-3 Retreat should be viewed as quirky case, "in which the argument is a true object of the verb, but the verb assigns it some exceptional Case as a lexical property, rather than the usual accusative Case (p. 489n)." To make such a claim explicit for Seri, consider again an example discussed above:

- (94) míno k^wikitaɬ?áa ?míimšo
 mi-ano ko-ika-itaɬ?áa ?-mi-amšo
 2P-in 3IO-InfI-buy/sell 1sST-Px-want
 'I want to sell it (F3) to you (pl.) (FObl)'

I claimed that the verb {itaɬ?áa} 'sell' requires 2-3 Retreat. If we were to adopt the quirky case marking solution for this verb, we would expect the subordinate clause above to be *transitive*, despite the fact that the Theme determines indirect object agreement. However, every test indicates that these clauses are unequivocally intransitive. For example, in the Seri sentence above, the intransitive allomorph of the infinitive prefix occurs. A quirky case solution is therefore not adequate to describe the observed facts.

In a second alternative analysis, the facts might be accommodated by a lexicalized mapping between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations that varies from verb to verb. The subcategorization frames for select verbs would be:

- (95) {amxk} 'deliver' [Ag Th (Go/Sg)]
 [1 2 3]

6 Conclusions

This paper contributes to several areas of our knowledge of human language. First, it shows that the notion of Indirect Object is clearly relevant in the Seri language, and that it is distinct both from Direct Object and from semantically similar Oblique relations. This presents a challenge to theories of syntax which have attempted to avoid this grammatical relation.

Second, it shows that Seri represents another case where there is a more complicated mapping between the semantic role of Goal and initial grammatical relations. Goals are sometimes Indirect Objects and sometimes Obliques; verb subcategorization is significant. The Universal Alignment Hypothesis, or its analog in other theories, must be weakened (again).

Third, the analysis provides additional arguments against the Chomeur Law. Some verbs display Object Reversal, with the initial Indirect Object becoming a Direct Object, and the initial Direct Object becoming an Indirect Object.

Fourth, the Seri facts show that morphological registration may be sensitive to the presence of a nominal which bears a particular initial grammatical relation.

Fifth, I have shown how the adoption of the Minimality Principle permits a significant restriction on the grammar of Seri. It correctly predicts that certain revaluations are not attested, and that certain others are.

ABBREVIATIONS

<A>	the morpheme potentially ablauts vowel of following morpheme
Ab	Absolutive
AdS	Adverbial Suffix
Ag	Agent
AN	Action/oblique Nominalizer
Aux	Auxiliary
Dec	Declarative
Dt	Distal
Em	Emphatic
Go	Goal
Im	Imperative
InfI	Infinitive, Intransitive allomorph
InfT	Infinitive, Transitive allomorph
Int	Interrogative
Ir	Irrealis
M	Multiple action
N	Negative
OM	Object Marker
Pl	Plural
Pv	Passive
Px	Proximal
Rl	Realis
Sg	Singular

SN	Subject Nominalizer
<SR>	Stress Retracting morpheme
Th	Theme
US	Unspecified Subject or possessor
1IO, 2IO, 3IO	First, Second, Third person Indirect Object
1sDO	First person singular Direct Object
1pDO	First person plural Direct Object
1sSI	First person singular subject, Intransitive allomorph
1sST	First person singular subject, Transitive allomorph
1P, 2P, 3P	First, Second, Third person possessor
1Pro	First person Pronoun

REFERENCES

- Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davies, William and Carol G. Rosen. 1988. Unions as Multi-Predicate Clauses, *Language* 64:52-88.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1992. Morphologically-Mediated Relational Profiles. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 18.
- Gerds, Donna B. and Lindsay Whaley. 1991. Two types of Oblique Applicatives in Kinyarwanda. *Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics 1991*.
- Marlett, Stephen A. and Joseph P. Stemberger. 1981. Empty Consonant Positions in Seri, *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:617-639.
- Marlett, Stephen A. 1981. *The Structure of Seri*. Dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- Marlett, Stephen A. 1984. Personal and Impersonal Passives in Seri, *Studies in Relational Grammar* 2, ed. by David M. Perlmutter and Carol G. Rosen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marlett, Stephen A. 1990. Seri Person and Number Inflection. *IJAL* 56:503-41.
- Perlmutter, David M., ed. 1983. *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1990. Demotions to Object, the Successor Demotion Ban, and the Class of Careers. Manuscript.
- Perlmutter, David M. and Paul M. Postal. 1983. Some Proposed Laws of Basic Clause Structure. In Perlmutter (ed.) 1983, 81-128.
- Perlmutter, David M. and Paul M. Postal. 1984. The 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law. *Studies in Relational Grammar* 2, ed. by David M. Perlmutter and Carol G. Rosen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosen, Carol G. 1981. *The Relational Structure of Reflexive Clauses: Evidence from Italian*. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Rosen, Carol G. 1984. The Interface Between Grammatical Relations and Semantic Roles, *Studies in Relational Grammar* 2, ed. by David M. Perlmutter and Carol G. Rosen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosen, Carol G. 1990. Rethinking Southern Tiwa: The Geometry of a Triple-Agreement Language, *Language* 66:669-713.