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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 {mati} '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

1 I appreciate the discussions of these facts that I have had with David Perlmutter, Carol Rosen, and Chuck Speck.
2 Some of the facts presented here are discussed in Marlett 1981, but the analyses differ in several points.
3 I use the standard Relational Grammar notation, 1 (Subject), 2 (Direct Object), 3 (Indirect Object).
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 revaluations 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. 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. (These clauses are also discussed more below.)
Table 1: Agreement morphemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Direct Object</th>
<th>Indirect Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s ?-</td>
<td>?im- ((?po- in imperatives)</td>
<td>?m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p ?a-</td>
<td>?iši-</td>
<td>?m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s m-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p ma-</td>
<td>maši-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (unmarked)</td>
<td>(unmarked, but see sec. 2.3)</td>
<td>ko-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) ?intmiit
    ?im-t-miiit
    1sDO-RL-ask
    'did s/he ask me?'

(2) ?a?áamX
    ?a-?-aa-amX
    liO-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 {i?a}; if the clause is finally transitive, the prefix is {i?o}.

(3) i?pyomáϕp
    ?p-yo-m-ϕϕ
    lsSI-Dt-N-arrive
    'I didn't arrive'

(4) i?yomáʔo
    ?-yo-m-ʔo
    lsST-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.
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 iyöö\(\text{o}\?) (\{i-yö-o\?\} 'OM-Dt-see'). In (7) the Goal is a final 2; the Object Marker occurs.

(7)  
ktám kix tátom  kmáam kóp itmíit  
man the R1-speak woman the OM-R1-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)  
šixkánm k?  ?p-t-\(\text{p\text{á}\text{á}}\)  
šixkám k?  ?p-t-\(\text{p}<\text{A}>\)-\(\text{m\text{á}}\)  
fish the 1sSI-R1-Pv-give  
'was I given fish?'

(9)  
šixkánm k?  ?im-\(\text{m\text{á}}\)  
šixkám k?  ?im-mi-\(\text{m\text{á}}\)  
fish the 1sSI-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\(\text{N}\) and Oblique\(\text{ON}\). A Locative Oblique\(\text{N}\) occurs as possessor of the relational noun \{ano\} 'in, to, from', as shown in (10).

\(^7\)This 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) ?áXǵ kop ?amáán ak ánō kápiʔa
    ?a-aXǵ kop ?amáán ak ánō k-ap=ʔa
Ab-pet the interior the 3P/in SN-stand-Dec
    'the dog is inside the house'

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

(11) íti nskaʔom
    i-ati m-si-m-oom<SR> ?a=ʔa
    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', but only if it is singular. If something like a plural Goal is to be expressed, it must be an Oblique and appear as a relational noun. The following pairs of examples illustrate this fact (certain final grammatical relations of the Seri are indicated in the free translation):

(15)  
\[ \text{tóotxʷk pak } ?\text{akámxk} \]
\[ \text{tootxʷk pak } ?\text{e-k-amxk} \]
\[ \text{cholla some 1I0-Im-deliver} \]
\[ '\text{bring some cholla cactus (F2) to me (F3)!}' \]

(16)  
\[ \text{tom k? } ?\text{íno kámxk} \]
\[ \text{tom k? } ?\text{i-ano k-amxk} \]
\[ \text{money the 1P-in Im-deliver} \]
\[ '\text{bring the money (F2) to us (F0b1)!}' \]

(17)  
\[ \text{mē?pyáeti} \]
\[ \text{mē-} ?\text{p-yo-áeti} \]
\[ 2I0-1sSI-Dt-give \]
\[ 'I gave to you (F3)' \]

(18)  
\[ \text{komkáak takoi áno } ?\text{pyáeti} \]
\[ \text{komkáak takoi ano } ?\text{p-yo-áeti} \]
\[ \text{people those 3P/in 1sSI-Dt-give} \]
\[ 'I gave to those people (F0b1)' \]

---

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)  
\[ \text{mikanóaa kom } ?\text{akóo?otim} \]
\[ \text{mi-kanóaa kom } ?\text{e-} ?\text{-akóo?otim} \]
\[ 2P-boat the 1I0-Im-show/M \]
\[ '\text{show us (F3) your boat (F2)!}' \]

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) ko?yamX
ko-?-yo-aa-amX
3I0-1sST-Dt-Dat-say
'I said it to him/her (F3)'

(20) mino ?yomX
mi-ano ?-yo-amX
2P-in 1sST-say
'I said it to you (pl.) (FObl)'

(21) kíno kámX
ki-ano k-amX
3P-in I-m-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) \{amX\} '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 k? ?amiyokášit
    tom k? ?e-i-yo-kašit
money the 1I0-OM-Dt-take.forcefully
's/he took the money away from me (F3)'

(25) tom k? ?amiyokášitim
    tom k? ?e-i-yo-kašitim
money the 1I0-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) simet k? míti itáom
    simet k? mi-ati i-t-aom
bread the 2P-on OM-R1-beg
's/he was begging for bread (F2) from you (FObl) ...'

(28) šiiX kXátik k? ?ín itáom
    šiiX k-Xatik k? ?i-ano i-t-aom
thing thin the 1P-in OM-R1-beg
's/he was begging for a tortilla (F2) from us (FObl) ...'

The subcategorization frame for this verb would be:

(29) \{am\} '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.

The following verbs have simple subcategorization frames, yet require 3-2 Advancement.\(^{11}\)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
(30) & \{ai\} & \text{'tell'} \ [1 \ 3 ] \\
(31) & \{\text{za}<\text{SR}>\} & \text{'give'} \ [1 \ 2 \ 3 ] \\
(32) & \{\text{C}\} & \text{'give'} \ [1 \ 2 \ 3 ] \\
(33) & \{\text{aipot}\} & \text{'pay'} \ [1 \ (2) \ (3) ]
\end{array}
\]

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.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
(34) \ \text{oX} \ \text{i-mi-ai} \\
\text{thus OM-Px-tell} \\
\text{'thus s/he told him/her/them (F2)'}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
(35) \ \text{oX} \ \text{i-yo-aaam} \\
\text{thus OM-Dt-tell/P1} \\
\text{'thus they told him/her/them (F2)'}
\end{array}
\]

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

\[
\begin{array}{l}
(36) \ \text{oX} \ \text{i-shimii} \\
\text{thus 1pDO-Px-tell} \\
\text{'thus s/he told us (F2)'}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
(37) \ \text{tóm} \ \text{ki? ma?ita} \\
\text{tom k? ma?-t-za<SR>} \\
\text{money the 2sDO-1sST-Rl-give} \\
\text{'did I give you (F2) the money?'}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
(38) \ \text{šiXkám} \ \text{ki? matáž} \\
\text{šiXkám k? ma-t-za\text{C}} \\
\text{fish the 2sDO-Rl-give} \\
\text{'did s/he give you (F2) fish?'}
\end{array}
\]

\(^{11}\)The 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
Goals and Indirect Objects in Seri

(39) mašitkmáipotim
   maši-t-m-aipotim
   2pDO-RI-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?m
    tom k? ?p-yo-p<A>-æ<SR>
    money the 1sSI-Dt-Pv-give
    'I was given the money'

(41) šiXkám k? ikapá?m
    šiXkám k? ika-p<A>-æ<SR> ?-mi-amšo
    fish the InfI-Pv-give 1sST-Px-want
    'I want to be given the fish'

(42) šiXkám k? ikapáæ
    šiXkám k? ika-p<A>-æa ?-mi-amšo
    fish the InfI-Pv-give 1sST-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:

(43) { aasot } 'lend' [ 1 2 (3/Sg) ] [+Advance] [+Retreat]
(44) { itaš?aa } '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

(43) (ii) šiXkám k? kátXo pak isitaš?aa ?aya
        šiXkám k? k-atXo pak i-si-itaš?aa ?a=ya
        fish the SN-be.much some OM-Ir-buy/sell Aux-Int
        'will s/he buy a lot of fish (F2)'

(43) (iii) ?ásax kap i?ataš?aa ?míimšo
        ?ásax kap i?a<A>-itaš?aa ?-mi-amšo
        basket the InfT-buy/sell 1sST-Px-want
        'I want to buy the basket (F2)'

(43) (iv) trooki ?ataš?aa kì?
        trooki ?a-aa?-itaš?aa k?
        car SN-Pv-buy/sell the
        'the car (F1) that was bought'

---

12The root { itaš?aa } 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).
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)  kmá-X únim i-yáa šo ko?pskmáasot ?a?i
      kmaaX únim ?i-0-yáa šo ko-?p-si-m-aasot ?a?i
      now knife 1P-OM-own a 3IO-1sSI-1r-N-lend Aux-Dec
      'now I won’t lend my knife (F3)'

(46)  únim šo ?íno kʷyáasotim
      aúnim šo ?i-ano ko-?y-o-aasotim
      knife a 1P-in 3IO-Dt-lend/M
      's/he lent a knife (F3) to us (FObl)'

(47)  kʷmitaʔ?áa?o
      ko-t-m-itaʔ?áa=?o
      3IO-Rl-N-buy/sell-Dec
      's/he didn’t sell it (F3)'

(48)  šiXkám ?ípkom koʔptkmitaʔ?áa?o
      šiXkám ?ípkom ko-ʔp-t-m-itaʔ?áa=?o
      fish this 3IO-1sSI-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 kʷikitaʔ?áa ?míimšo
      ?ásax kap ko-ika-itaʔ?áa ?-mi-amšo
      basket the 3IO-InfI-buy/sell 1sST-Px-want
      'I want to sell the basket (F3)'

(50)  míno kʷikitaʔ?áa ?míimšo
      mi-ano ko-ika-itaʔ?áa ?-mi-amšo
      2P-in 3IO-InfI-buy/sell 1sST-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)  únim ?áakšox ki? kookx k? ?íno komkáasot
      únim ?áakšox 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

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

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

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

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.

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).
The verb {šaXw} '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.

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

(57) ma?nšáXw
    ma-?-mi-šaXw
    2sDO-1sST-Px-discuss
    'I am discussing with you (sg.) (F2)'

(58) mai?ašáXw i:Xómšo
    ma-i?a<š>-šaXw ?-Xo-amšo
    2sDO-InfT-discuss 1sST-Em-want
    'I want to discuss with you (sg.) (F2)'

(59) maši?nšáXw
    maši-?-mi-šaXw
    2pDO-1sST-Px-discuss
    'I am discussing with you (pl.) (F2)'

(60) iyošáXw
    i-yo-šaXw
    OM-Dt-discuss
    'she discussed with him/her (F2)'

(61) i?pya?šáXw
    ?p-yo-aa?-šaXw
    1sSI-Dt-Pv-discuss
    'I (F1) was discussed with'

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

(62) ?a kmáaX mos ikáitom i?máa šo
    ?a kmáaX mos i-Ø-ka-aitom i?más šo
    1Pro now also 3P-AN-US-talk other a

    ?a ššáXw kaʔa
    ?a si-šáXw ka=ʔa
    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) šiiX šo ma?nšáXw
    šiiX šo ma-?-mi-šaXw
    thing a 3IO/2DO-1sST-Px-discuss
    'I am discussing something (F3) with you (sg./pl.) (F2)'
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(64) šiiX šo k"iyošáXw
šiiX šo ko-i-yo-šaXw
thing a 3I0-OM-Dt-discuss
's/he discussed something (F3) with him/her/them (F2)'

(65) taaX ma?nšáXw
aaX ma-?mi-šaXw
that 3I0/2D0-1sST-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 taa 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) taaX k"ika?šáXw i?mímso
aaX ko-ika-aa?-šaXw ?-mi-amso
that 3I0-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 šaxw '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) šaxw '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\} 'hide' [1 (2) (3)] [+Advance if no 2]
Morphology: Dative prefix <A> if initial 3

(69) \{amX\} 'say' [1 2 (3/5g)]
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 (F0b1)!'

(74) míno ?yóomX
mi-ano ?yo-smX
2P-in 1sST-Dt-say
'I said it (F2) to you (pl.) (F0b1)'

(75) ?ísXw
?ísXw
Im-hide
'hide it (F2)!'

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

(vii) \{isX\} 'hide' [1 (2)]
(viii) \{<A>-isX\} 'hide from' [1 (2) 3] [+Advance if no 2]
(ix) \{amX\} 'say' [1 2]
(x) \{aa-amX\} 'say to' [1 2 3/5g]
Goals and Indirect Objects in Seri

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

(76) ?a \( ?s\)ísX'w ?aya
?a \( ?-si-is\)X'w ?a=ya
1Pro 1sST-Ir-hide Aux-Int
'shall I hide it (F2)?'

(77) ko?yáamX
ko-?-yo-aa-amX
3IO-1sST-Dt-Dat-say
'I said it (F2) to him/her (F3)'

(78) šiiX šo mëspáamX
šiiX šo ma-si-p<\( A\)>-aa-amX
thing a 2IO-Ir-Pv-Dat-say
'something will be said to you (F3)'

(79) ?a?âsX'w
?a-?-<\( A\)>-isX'w
1IO-Im-Dat-hide
'hide it (F2) from me/us (F3)'

(80) ikáaspx̌ ̌ ki? mëskmâsX'w ?a?a
i-Ø-ka-aaspx̌ k? ma-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) ikáaspx̌ ̌ ki? ?apâsX'w i?mimšo
i-Ø-ka-aaspx̌ k? ?a-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'\} '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 ?âsX'w
?akX ?-<\( A\)>-isX'w
somewhere Im-Dat-hide
'hide (yourself) from him/her (F2)'

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

\(^{20}\)Reflexive clauses in Seri typically are transitive clauses with a reflexive noun phrase such as ?isox 'myself' or mësox 'yourself.'
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

\[\text{(85)} \quad \{miiit\} 'ask (about)' \quad [1\ (2)\ (3/Sg)]^{22} \quad [+\text{Advance}] \quad [+\text{Retreat}]\]

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.

\[\text{(86)} \quad \?akX\ \text{?pêsXw} \quad \?akX\ ?po-\text{Ø-<A>-isXw} \quad \text{somewhere l} \text{DO-Im-Dat-hide} \quad \text{'hide (yourself) from me!'}\]

\[\text{(87)} \quad \text{?atamiiit} \quad \text{?a-t-aa-miiit} \quad \text{1I0-R1-ADat-ask} \quad \text{'did s/he ask about me (F3)?'}\]

\[\text{(88)} \quad \text{?iiX} \ \text{?iiX} \ \text{míno} \ \text{kwa-tamiiit} \quad \text{2P-in 3I0-R1-ADat-ask} \quad \text{'did s/he ask about something (F3) of you (pl.) (FObl)?',}\]
\[\text{ i.e., 'did s/he ask you (pl.) something?'}\]

\[\text{(89)} \quad \text{?iiX} \ \text{?iiX} \ \text{án}\text{o} \ \text{kwa-tamiiit} \quad \text{3P/in 3I0-R1-ADat-ask} \quad \text{'did s/he ask about something (F3) of them (FObl)?',}\]
\[\text{ i.e., 'did s/he ask them something?'}\]

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:

\[\text{(xi)} \quad \{miiit\} \quad \text{'ask to'} \quad [1\ (2)\ (3/Sg)] \quad [+\text{Advance}] \quad [+\text{Retreat}]\]

\[\text{(xii)} \quad \{aa-miiit\} \quad \text{‘ask’} \quad [1\ (2)] \quad [+\text{Retreat}]\]

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).
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)  
mino  k\^{w}ikita\^{?}\^{a}  ?\text{m}i\text{m}\^{a}o  
m\text{i}-\text{ano}  ko-ika-it\^{a}\text{?}\^{a}  \text{?}-\text{mi-}\text{am}\^{a}o  
2P-in  3I0-Infi-buy/sell  1sST-Px-want  
'I want to sell it (F3) to you (pl.) (FObl)'

I claimed that the verb \(\text{i}ta\^{?}\text{?}aa\) '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 \textit{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 allomorphic 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)  
\{am\text{x}k\} 'deliver'  
\(\text{[Ag Th (Go/Sg)]}\)  
\(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{array}\)
For the verbs shown above, there is perhaps no great problem (although for verbs such as \{æCa\} 'give' it may be unclear what grammatical relation would be posited for the Theme that would be comparable to Chomeur). Nevertheless, for the verb \{sàX\} 'discuss', the matter is more complicated. Two frames are needed: one for when a Goal is present, and one for when one is not. This represents a complication not present in the bistratal analysis.

Now consider the verbs which are sensitive to the presence or absence of initial 3s (under the multistratal analysis).

As pointed out earlier, the Goals in question are not always Indirect Objects, and not always Direct Objects (superficially). A monostratal analysis cannot successfully link the Dative registration morphology and grammatical relations. But an attempt to link it with semantic roles, as shown above, is also deficient, because it duplicates the subcategorization restriction on singular Goals. The bistratal analysis is successful, however, because it makes reference to initial Indirect Objects.
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 Chomerc 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

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