PASSIVES AND VERB AGREEMENT IN KIOWA-TANOAN[1]

Laurel J. Watkins
Colorado College

1. Passive constructions have been reported in three of the four subgroups of Kiowa-Tanoan: Tewa (Arizona Tewa only, Kroskrity 1979), Towa (Jemez, Hale 1972), and Tiwa (Isleta, Allen and Frantz 1978, Allen and Gardiner 1981; Picuris, Zaharlick 1980). These analyses are typically based on three diagnostic features: 1) intransitive or special passive verb agreement prefixes, 2) morphologically marked agent nominals, and 3) passive suffixes on the verb (Tiwa and Towa only). Moreover, passivization is said to operate under certain restrictions, namely that if a third person subject acts upon a first or second object, then passivization is obligatory. It is optional, however, for a third person acting on a third person. Examples of passive sentences from each of the Tanoan subgroups are illustrated in (1)-(3).

(1) nε ʔi ʔe:nu heʔi sen-dí ʔó:-kʷε di   (Arizona Tewa)
     (this boy that man-by 3/3:pass-hit)
     'This boy was hit by that man.'

(2) gɨwæyi-tǫ ɨ-zɨ:t'-æ   (Jemez)
     (horse-by 1sg/intr-throw-pass)
     'I was thrown by a horse.'

(3) ʔin-ʔuʔu-wia-če-ban sɨanide-ba   (Isleta)
     (1sg:3sg-child-give-pass-past man-by)
     'I was given the child by the man.'

Kiowa, the fourth subgroup of the Kiowa-Tanoan family, has no passives, nor does the main group of dialects comprising Rio Grande Tewa (Speirs, p.c.). Nevertheless, even a rather cursory examination of verb agreement prefixes in Kiowa-Tanoan reveals a number of correspondences, particularly in prefixes considered to be passive in one language but not in another. The focus of this paper, then, is on the verb agreement prefixes and secondarily on agent marking and passive verb suffixes. Its goal is an assessment of the likelihood that passives were a feature of Proto-Kiowa-Tanoan grammar. In brief, I will argue (a) that there are no special 'passive' verb agreement prefixes in any Kiowa-Tanoan language, (b) that agent marking, which occurs in all the Tanoan languages, serves broader functions than a strictly passive one, and (c) that passive verbal suffixes are likely derived from an earlier detransitive suffix. The conclusion is that although all three diagnostic features likely existed in the proto-language, we are not justified in reconstructing a passive in PKT. The question of areal and/or English influence in the passives of Tiwa is left open for further discussion.

A major continuing problem in the comparative reconstruction of the Kiowa-Tanoan verb agreement prefixes is the lack of complete data and where data are complete the absence of internal reconstructions. Although the Kiowa prefixes have been reconstructed in detail and the Tewa prefixes reliably recorded but not analyzed, data for Tiwa and Towa are incomplete. Lacking the necessary preliminary work, therefore, the correspondences presented in the next sections are suggestive of fruitful comparison but are no more than that. For the time being, we will have to proceed in a more fragmented way than we would like.

2. The internal reconstruction of the Kiowa prefixes is summarized in Figure 1 (see Watkins 1980 for a full discussion). The prefixes are best understood as polymorphemic complexes consisting of (a) an initial consonant indicating person and, in part, the semantic role of that person (agent or patient, but not both), (b) a following vowel, which further specifies the number and role of that person, (c) tone, indicating agent or patient agreement, (d) a second vowel, showing agreement with the number of a third person object, and (e) a final consonant d, indicating a non-singular object under certain conditions. Because rather elaborate allomorphy results from the operation of the phonological rules,[2] it is imperative to compare these underlying or reconstructed morphemes with the Tanoan prefixes.

Person C_1

d	'1 agent or patient'
g	'2sg patient'
b	'2 agent'
	'2 or 3 non-sg patient'
Ø	'3 agent'
	'3sg patient'

Case role (on V_1)

| ˋ | 'agent' |
| ˊ | 'patient' |

Object V_2

Ø	'singular'
ę	'dual'
ia	'plural'
e	'inverse (agent)'
ɔ	'inverse (patient)'

Person V_1

N	'dual agent or patient'
e	'3 dual or inverse'
	'reflexive/reciprocal'
Ø	'3sg agent'
ia	'sg patient (singular agent implied)
	'all other agents (1sg, 2sg/ pl, 3pl)'
ɔ	'all other patients (2sg if non-sg agent implied, 2pl, 3pl)'

Object C_2

| d | non-singular' |

Figure 1: Internal reconstruction of Kiowa
verb agreement morphemes
$^*C_1V_1V_2C_2$

Functionally, the prefixes fall into five paradigms, illustrated
in sentences (4)-(8). The intransitive prefixes (4) indicate a single
participant and make use of agent, rather than patient, morphemes.

(4a) hɔ́ Carnegie-kù bà-bánmà?
      (Q Carnegie-to 2pl-go/imperf)
      'Are you-all going to Carnegie?'

(4b) á:-dɔ̀ è-tʰém-gyá
      (stick-inverse 3inv-break-detrans/perf)
      'The stick broke.'

The reflexive/reciprocal paradigm (5) is characterized throughout
by the vowel e, but otherwise agreement is with agent morphemes for
person; i.e., it is a transitive paradigm occurring only with transitive
verbs.

(5) dè-hâ: 'I got up.'
     (1sg/reflex-arise/perf)

The simple transitive paradigm (6) shows agreement with the agent
and a third person object and occurs only with transitive verbs.

(6a) cę̂: gyà-tʰɔ́n
      (horse 1sg/agt:sg/obj-find/perf)
      'I found the horse.'

(6b) yí: tʰàlí: nèn-bɔ̨́:
      (two boy 1sg/agt:du/obj-see/perf)
      'I saw two boys.'

In the dative/possessive paradigm (7), the initial consonant
shows agreement with the patient rather than the agent. There is also
obligatory agreement with a third person object. These prefixes imply
an agent (certain agents for certain patients in some cases, see Watkins
1980 for details) and thus occur with transitive verbs, as illustrated
in (7a) and (7c). They also occur with intransitive verbs for which the
only animate participant is a patient, e.g. a possessor or experiencer,
as in (7b) and (7d).

(7a) yí: cę̂: né- ʑ̨́:
      (two horse (2,3sg/agt):1sg/pat:du/obj-give/perf)
      'You/he gave me two horses.'

(7b) tá:dè né-kʰóp
      (eye (2,3sg/agt):1sg/pat:du-obj-hurt/stative)
      'My eyes hurt.'

(7c) hóldà bát- ꝝ:
      (clothes (agt):<u>2pl/pat</u>:pl/obj-give/perf)
      'I/he/they gave you-all some clothes.'

(7d) bát-gú:
      ((agt):<u>2pl/pat</u>:pl/obj-clever/stative)
      'You-all are clever, wise (to things).'

The only general exception to obligatory patient agreement is il-
lustrated in (8). If the agent is non-singular and the patient is
first or third singular (i.e. any non-singular acting on 1sg or 3sg),
then agreement is with the agent rather than the patient.[3] This dat-
ive/benefactive paradigm occurs only with transitive verbs.

(8) hꝝ cę̀:-gꝝ bꝝd ꝝ:- ꝝ: ?
     (Q horse-inv <u>2pl/agt</u>:(1,3sg/pat):inv/obj-give/perf)
     'Did you-all give me/him some horses?'

Summarizing the points which will be crucial to the discussion
that follows: 1) Semantic or case role provides the key to the morpho-
logical analysis of the Kiowa prefixes. 2) Three roles, agent, patient,
and (third person) object receive surface marking. Of the three, agent
and patient are necessarily animate; third person object is indeterminate
with respect to animacy. Patient is a cover term for all non-agentive
roles, i.e. possessor, recipient, beneficiary, experiencer. 3) If an
event/proposition involves both an agent and a patient, the Kiowa
speaker is not free to select a prefix showing agreement with agent <u>or</u>
patient. The presence of a patient ensures a prefix showing patient
agreement, except in the case of first and third patients with non-sin-
gular agents.

3. Turning to the Tanoan prefixes, examples (9)-(12) illustrate
some of the more common and obvious correspondences in initial conson-
ants. None of the sets reflects the established correspondences for
stem-initial consonants (Hale 1967, Watkins 1977). In (9), for example,
the <u>t:d:t:d</u> set contrasts with the stem-initial sets *<u>t</u> > <u>t</u> and *<u>n</u> > <u>n</u>
in all the subgroups and *<u>d</u> > <u>n</u> in Tanoan but remaining <u>d</u> in Kiowa.
In (11) and (12), there is evidence that nasalization is associated with
dual in Tewa, as it is in Kiowa. Most interesting are the parallels
between Rio Grande Tewa (RGT) and Kiowa in forms for patient agreement.
Although RGT agrees least often with otherwise regular correspondences
(e.g. in intransitive, reflexive/reciprocal, and simple transitive
sets), the regularities in patient agreement are striking.

(9)		<u>1sg/reflex</u>	<u>1sg/agt:sg/obj</u>	<u>1sg/patient</u>
	Tiwa	tǫ̀	tì	
	Tewa	dè:	dó	dín (2,3agt:obj)
	Towa	tɨ-1	ta	
	Kiowa	dè	gyà (*dià)	né (*dę̀, du:obj)

(10) 2sg/pat:sg/obj

Tiwa   kǫ́   (possessive)
Tewa   (ʔų̨́)
Towa   ko
Kiowa gɔ́   (sg/agt:inv/obj)

(11)   2du/intrans   2pl/intrans   2du/reflex

Tiwa   mòn   mò   môn
Tewa   (dà)[4]   (ʔí)   bá (imperative)
Towa   mǫ-l   ba   mǫ-l
Kiowa mà (*bą̀)   bà   mé (*bę́)

            2du/agt:sg/obj   2pl/agt:sg/obj

Tiwa   món   mó
Tewa   (dę́n)[4]   bîn
Towa   ma   ba
Kiowa má` (*bą́`)   bá`

            (agt):2du/pat:(obj)   (agt):2pl/pat:(obj)

Tiwa   mòpą́n   (1agt)   mòpí   (1agt)
Tewa   wòvæ̀n   (3agt)   wòvê: (3agt)
Towa   mǫ   (benef)   ba   (benef)
Kiowa mɔ (*bɔ̨́ sg/obj)   bɔ́   (sg/obj)

(12)   3sg/intrans   3du/reflex   (agt):3sg/pat:(obj)

Tiwa   ∅   òn   ó (possessive)
Tewa   (nà)   (dæ̀n)[4]   ó: (3agt)
Towa   ∅   į-l
Kiowa ∅   én   á (sg/agt:sg/obj)

Tewa prefixes showing correspondences with Kiowa in patient agree-
ment are more extensively illustrated in (13). Initial d 'first person',
w 'second person', and ∅ 'third person' are clearly cognate with the
Kiowa person morphemes. Moreover, final n on the dual forms (wæ̀n, wò-
væ̀n, òvæ̀n) correlates nicely with nasalization for dual in Kiowa.

(13)   2,3 agent: 1 patient   dí

       1 agent: 2 patient   2sg wí   wîn (with object)
                             du wæ̀n
                             pl wê:

(13)   3 agent: <u>2 patient</u>   2sg   wó: wôn   (with object)
                                du   wòv æ̂n
                                pl   wòvê:

        3 agent: <u>3 patient</u>   3sg   ó: ôn   (with object)
        2sg, 3   du   òv æ̂n
        2sg, 3   pl   òvê:

Formally, then, the prefix systems compare rather closely. The four subgroups share at least the intransitive, reflexive/reciprocal, and simple transitive paradigms. Benefactive/dative/possessive prefixes are still not entirely understood, especially in Tiwa, but can generally be seen to reflect patient agreement. There is a major difference involving object number categories, which vary from no number distinctions at all in Tewa to a four-way contrast maintained throughout the paradigms in Kiowa. Nonetheless, the usefulness of considering the prefixes to reflect case roles is indisputable. So-called passive prefixes are either simple intransitives or exhibit the same properties as benefactive/dative prefixes, i.e. with patient agreement.

In light of these conclusions, a reevaluation of the passive status of the Arizona Tewa examples in (14) (Kroskrity 1979) is in order. The verb in each case is an active transitive verb, with no passive morphology. As we have seen, the prefixes are those showing patient agreement (see (13) above) and do not constitute a separate passive paradigm.

(14a)   na: sen-en/ʔu̜-dí dí-k^{W}ɛ k^{W}ɛ di
         (I man-pl/you-by 1/2,3:pass-shoot)
         'I was shot by the men/you.'

(14b)   ʔu̜ k^{h}o:to heʔi sen-dí wó:-me:gi
         (you bracelet this man-by 2/3:pass-give)
         'You were given a bracelet by this man.'

(14c)   n ɛʔi ʔe:nu heʔi sen-dí ʔó:-k^{W}ɛ di
         (this boy that man-by 3/3:pass-hit)
         'This boy was hit by that man.'

Kiowa equivalents of (14a) and (14b) are shown for comparison in (15a) and (15b). Each has a patient agreement prefix (dative/possessive) and an active transitive verb. There is one caution however: English translations of these sentences could be passive in one context, active in another, depending on the translator's sensitivity to the discourse strategies of Kiowa (e.g. topic selection as indicated by word order, switch-reference, etc.): 'I got hit by the man' or 'the man hit me'. Given an event in which x hits y, the prefix obligatorily agrees with y, the patient, but such a construction does not automatically indicate that the patient is the topic of that stretch of discourse. Ex-

ample (15c) illustrates how an impersonal passive would appear in Kiowa, with an active transitive verb and third plural agent. This prefix could also refer to some identifiable third plural agent, e.g. those Kiowa men over there.

(15a)   (n ɔ́:)⁵ k'yá̰:hḭ̂:/(ám)⁵ ḛ-góp
        ((I)   man/(you) (2,3sg/agt):<u>1sg/pat</u>:∅-obj-hit/perf)
        'You/the man hit me.' or 'I was hit by the man/you.'

(15b)   ḛ:dè k'yá̰:hḭ̂: (ám)⁵ mɔ́nsó:dóp m ɔ́- ɔ̰́:
        (this man   you (agt):<u>2du/pat</u>:inv/obj-give/perf)
        'This man gave you a bracelet.' or 'You were given a
        bracelet by this man.'

(15c)   â:-gòp
        (<u>3pl/agt</u>:(1,3sg/pat):∅-obj-hit/perf)
        'Somebody/they hit me.' or 'I got hit.'

The evidence from Tewa, which does not support an interpretation of such sentences as passive, suggests that the agentive suffix, -ři (RGT)/-dí (AT), serves the more general function of explicitly marking the agent nominal when there are two <u>animate</u> participants, i.e. agent and patient.⁶ The examples in (16), drawn from a RGT text (Speirs and Martinez 1980-81), illustrate the role -ři plays in making clear who sees whom. In (16a), the little rabbit, who has come out across the river to eat cactus fruit, sees Old Man Coyote first; the prefix is ó:- '3 agent:3sg patient'. In (16b), the same prefix occurs, but in this case Old Man Coyote is the agent and carries the suffix -ři.

(16a)   ...i pu'e:-<u>ři</u> pá:řébo ó:-mû' i P'óséxwâ: Se'dó...
        (the rabbit-<u>agt</u> first 3agt:3sg/pat-saw the Coyote Old Man)
        'the (little) rabbit saw Old Man Coyote first...'

(16b)   i P'óséxwâ: Sedó-<u>ři</u> ó:-mû'-ři ó:-tų'an...
        (the Coyote Old Man-<u>agt</u> 3agt:3sg/pat-saw-when 3agt:3sg/
        pat-said)
        'Old Man Coyote saw him (rabbit) and said...'

Even where the identity of the agent is clear from the prefix, as in (17a), -ři marks an agent pronominal, which contrasts with (17b), where <u>na:</u> 'I' is the patient and is thus without -ři. Interestingly, switch-reference clitics fulfill a similar function in Kiowa, which lacks any agent nominal suffix.

(17a)   n æ: na: dí-k'o:-řá
        (now I 2/agt:1/pat-eat-if)
        'now if you eat me'

(17b)   na:-r̃i wí píví wîn-hó:-we:n-i
           (I-<u>agt</u> some meat 1/agt:2sg/pat:obj-get-go-potential)
           'I'll go get some meat for you.'

The interesting question of the optional application of passivization if a clause involves a third person subject (agent) acting on a third person object (but obligatory passive for third on first or second) receives a plausible explanation when viewed from a non-passive perspective. The Arizona Tewa sentences in (18) illustrate the two possible constructions, (18a) with the patient agreement prefix <u>ó:-</u> (third on third) and (18b) with the active transitive prefix <u>mán-</u>.

(18a)   n ɛ ʔi ʔe:nu heʔi sen-dí ʔó:-k^{W}ɛ di   (= 14c)
           (this boy that man-by 3/3:pass-hit)
           'This boy was hit by that man.'

(18b)   heʔi sen n ɛ ʔi ʔe:nu mán-k^{W}ɛ di
           (that man this boy 3:sg/3:act-hit)
           'That man hit this boy.'

However, there is no corresponding pair of sentences if the object is inanimate. (19b) with <u>ó:-</u> (patient agreement) is ill-formed; only (19a) with <u>mán-</u> is possible. Note also that the agentive suffix <u>-dí</u> does not occur with sentences (18b) and (19a).

(19a)   ʔe:nu n ɛ ʔi ka̧:la mán-keʔ
           (boy this leaf 3/3:act-pick up)
           'The boy picked up this leaf.'

(19b)   *n ɛ ʔi ka̧:la ʔe:nu-dí ʔó:-keʔ
           (this leaf boy-by 3/3:pass-pick up)
           'This leaf was picked up by the boy.'

The simple explanation is that patient is an animate category, whereas third object is indeterminate, allowing both animate and inanimate arguments. It follows that a third person animate participant can be coded as a patient or as an object (hence the optionality of the passive), whereas an inanimate third person can only be coded as an object. In the preceding examples (18)-(19), <u>mán-</u> is thus the simple transitive prefix (agent:object) and is equally appropriate for 'he hit <u>him</u>' and 'he picked <u>it</u> up'. As it happens, the third patient category in Kiowa requires an object, so the possibility of showing agreement either as third object or as third patient with no object does not exist.

4.   Finally, we turn briefly to the Tiwa languages, on which little attention has been focussed to this point. Based on the available but incomplete data, the Tiwa languages exhibit verb agreement prefixes analyzable according to semantic roles, as discussed in section 3.

Passive constructions are characterized by agent nominals marked with -pa
(Picuris)/-ba (Isleta) and by passive suffixes on the verb. These verbal
suffixes are expecially interesting in that (a) the grammatically condi-
tioned allomorphs correspond in (Southern) Isleta -Ce and (Northern)
Picuris -Cia, (b) they appear to be susceptible to analysis as stem
consonant plus vocalic suffix, and following from that (c) they may be
cognate with a general detransitivizing suffix in Kiowa.

Examples in (20) illustrate likely cognates involving stem-final
or internal consonants. Of particular interest here are the Tewa ac-
tive transitive verbs whose medial stop g corresponds to the Isleta
passive stem with k (put in, bite).

(20)	Isleta		Tewa		Kiowa	
	(active)	(passive)	(active)			
	k'ɨapi	k'ɨape		'trip'	k'ó:bé-	'fell, tip'
	c'ɨati	c'ɨate	c'ude	'bring in'	cát	'entrance'
	tay	take	tógi	'put in'		
	kʰoay	kʰoake	xu:gi	'bite'		
	miki	mike	mægi	'give'	*má:gè-	'feed'

Still more intriguing are the cognate stems shown in (21). The
underscored consonants in Kiowa have a variety of functions, including
the irregular perfective suffixes (name, find, kill, sit down), the im-
perfective stem suffix (see, ask), the derived stative suffix (lay plu-
ral object), or simply the root-final consonant (bring). The cognate
status of the Kiowa and Tiwa consonants seems promising but remains
undemonstrated.

(21)	Passives			Kiowa	
	Isleta	Picuris			
	mu-če		'see'	bǫ́:-n-	
	tʰa-če		'find'	tʰ ʑ́:-n	
	k'oa-če	k'u-čia	'lay'	k'ú-1	
	hu-te		'kill'	hó-1	
	kɨ-re	ka-lia	'bring, carry'	k ʄn	
	xǫy-be	xǫy-mia	'name'	kʰ ʄ-m	
	se-ke		'set'	s ɔ́:-gyá:	(Tewa: soge)
		ci-lia	'ask'	cá:-1-	
	y-be	om-mia	'tell to'		
	masu-we	mačo-wia	'leave be-hind'		

In addition, Zaharlick (p.c.) reports that several irregular allo-
morphs of the past suffix in Picuris correspond to the passive allo-
morphs for the same verbs, e.g. -te 'past'/-tia 'passive' (-we/-wia,
-me/-mia, etc.). If the initial consonant of the suffix belonged his-

torically to the stem, the agreement in allomorphs is nicely explained.

That Taos (N. Tiwa) has a passive suffix -ya provides further sup-
port for a reconstruction of the suffix as a vowel or diphthong which
has attracted the stem-final consonant. The function of -ya is not yet
clearly understood, but like the other Tiwa passive suffixes, it appar-
ently occurs on the verb when an indefinite third person acts on first,
second, or third animate. The most likely candidate for a Kiowa cog-
nate is the general detransitive suffix *-ia, perfective with high tone,
imperfective with low tone, as in è-kʰú:l-yà (3inv/intr-yank off-detr/
imperf) 'it got yanked off; it popped off'.

The hypothesis presented here, based on admittedly sketchy evi-
dence, is the existence of a vocalic suffix, tentatively identified as
*-ia , whose function was generally detransitive, rather than strictly
passive. Text examples in Picuris (recorded by Harrington and repro-
duced and analyzed in Zaharlick 1977) indicate that agentless passives
(22) are more common than the elicited passives with marked nominal
agents reported in Isleta. The parallel between constructions like (22)
and Kiowa detransitives (23) is clear.

(22)   ʔiʔine...ʔa̧-xa̧-čia-hen...
        (corn...3sg/agt:3sg/pat:sg/obj-take away-pass-dur)
        'the (ear of) corn is taken away...'

(23)   è-tʰém-gyá
        (3inv/intr-break-detr/perf)
        'it broke; it was/got broken'

5. Two goals have guided this comparative treatment of passives
and verb agreement prefixes in Kiowa-Tanoan. The first is to illustrate
the importance of considering semantic role in the analysis of the pre-
fixes. The answer to Frantz's (1979) question concerning the Isleta
sentences in (24), 'why do they all share the prefix in-?', is a simple
one, provided in- is analyzed as showing agreement with a first person
singular patient (I, me) and a third singular object (child). The cog-
nate Kiowa prefix, ȩ́- '(2,3sg/agt):1sg/pat:sg/obj', occurs in just
these contexts.

(24)   in-ʔu-wia-če-ban sianide-ba
        (-child-give-pass-past man-by)
        'the man gave me the child'

        in-ʔu-wam-ban
        (-child-come-past)
        'the child came to me'

(24) in-ʔu-chiapiaw-m
    (-child-sleep-pres)
    'my child is sleeping'

    in-ʔu-we-m
    (-child-be-pres)
    'I have a child'

The second goal is to stimulate others to examine passives in Tanoan from a different perspective and to fill in the gaps in the data. What I have suggested is that the Tiwa languages have reanalyzed several features reconstructible to Proto-Kiowa-Tanoan, including patient agreement and intransitive prefixes, detransitive or other derivational morphology, and agent marking, in the direction of an English-type passive. Whether all of this proves in the end to be correct will require a much better comparative understanding of the Kiowa-Tanoan family than we now have.

NOTES

1 A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C. (1980).

2 Phonological rules which apply in the prefixes are the following: 1) truncation of the first of two adjacent vowels (unless the first vowel is e); 2) the shift of d → g/___i and of g → d/___e; 3) glide formation (i → y/___V) and subsequent loss of the glide following labials or word-initially; 4) nasalization of voiced obstruents adjacent to a nasal vowel; and 5) devoicing of final obstruents.

3 This paradigm exhibits both agent agreement and patient agreement morphemes: person morphemes for agent but object morphemes for patient, and in the falling tone, both high (patient) and low (agent).

4 The second dual intransitive, reflexive, reflexive/benefactive, and possessive prefixes in Tewa have collapsed with third dual.

5 These independent pronouns would normally occur in the Kiowa clause only if they were the focus of contrast, if they carried locative postpositions, or if context did not make it clear which person should be interpreted as agent.

6 More precisely, according to examples from the Speirs, -x̸i marks the agent whenever 6̣:- '3 on 3' is used, which includes third inanimate on third animate ('the rock hit the man') and third inanimate on third inanimate ('the rock hit the house').

REFERENCES

Allen, B. and D. Frantz. 1978. Verb Agreement in Southern Tiwa. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, ed. Kenneth Whistler et al.

Allen, B. and D. Gardiner. 1981. Passive in Southern Tiwa. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Southwestern Areal Language and Linguistics Workshop, ed. C. Eleric.

Frantz, Donald G. 1979. RG to the Rescue. Paper presented to the Canadian Linguistics Association, Saskatoon.

Hale, Kenneth. 1967. Toward a Reconstruction of Kiowa-Tanoan Phonology. IJAL 33:112-120.

_____. 1972. A New Perspective on American Indian Linguistics. New Perspectives on the Pueblos, ed. Alfonso Ortiz. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1979. A 'Sympathetic' Consideration of the Tewa Passive. Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Cincinnati.

Speirs, A. and E. Martinez. 1980-81. Mimeographed handouts. Second and Third Kiowa-Tanoan Working Conferences, Albuquerque.

Speirs, R. and A. Speirs. 1980-81. Mimeographed handouts. Second and Third Kiowa-Tanoan Working Conferences, Albuquerque.

Watkins, Laurel J. 1977. Kiowa-Tanoan Internal Relationships. Proceedings of the 1977 Mid-America Linguistics Conference, ed. Donald M. Lance and Daniel E. Gulstad.

_____. 1980. A Grammar of Kiowa. Ph.D. dissertation. Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Zaharlick, Amy. 1977. Picuris Syntax. Ph.D. dissertation. Washington, D.C.: The American University.

_____. 1980. Passives in Picuris (Tiwa). Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.