This paper investigates the switch-reference and semantically-sensitive case systems of Kashaya, and focusses in particular on the interaction of the two in certain domains. The first section explains the basic rules of the switch-reference system; the second section discusses the influence of semantic factors on case-marking; and the third section investigates a problematic area in Kashaya grammar involving the interaction of the switch-reference marking with the case roles of the coded participants.

1. KASHAYA SWITCH REFERENCE

The description here is for the most part in line with that presented in Oswalt (1961, 1983), and is indebted to those works for insights into and clarification of the workings of the Kashaya switch-reference system.

When coordinating clauses or subordinating one to the other, Kashaya has a set of markers that carry various information, including the coreferentiality or disreferentiality of the agents [1] of the two clauses and the sequentiality or simultaneity of the actions represented in the clauses. Other information conveyed by at least some of the markers is the orientation of the events related in the clause with respect to speech time; the exceptions to this are the markers indicating simultaneity of actions, which are neutral with regard to the deictic category of orientation with respect to speech time. Thus, the system as a whole carries both deictic and non-deictic information.

The system of markers is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQUENTIAL</th>
<th>SIMULTANEOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAME/DIFF.AGENT</td>
<td>SAME/DIFF.AGENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba/-li</td>
<td>-n/-w(em)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>-phi/-phila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sentences illustrate their use:

(1) Gene mane ba cahnow
   G. dance-BA sing
   "G. danced then sang"

(2) Gene maneli cahnow
   G. dance-LL sing
   "Gene danced and then s.o. else sang"

(3) ?a manephi cahnokhe
    Ips dance-FHI sing-FUT
    "I'm gonna dance and then sing"

[1] Use of the term "agent" will be clarified below.
(4) ?a manepila cahnoke
1ps dance-PHILA sing-FUT
"I'm gonna dance and then someone else is gonna sing"

(5) mukin cahnon manew
3ps sing-N dance
"He danced and sang (at the same time)"

(6) mukin cahnon manekhe
3ps sing-N dance-FUT
"He's gonna dance and sing (at the same time)"

(7) mukin cahnowem Dave manew
3ps sing-WEM D. dance
"He sang and Dave danced (at the same time)"

(8) mukin cahnowem Dave manekhe
3ps sing-WEM D. dance-FUT
"He's gonna sing and Dave's gonna dance (at the same time)"

As may be seen in the examples, the deictic tense distinction is neutralized in the simultaneous markers, with the orientation relative to speech time being carried only on the main-clause verb. It should also be noted that the markers are used even when it is clear from the overt mention of agents in both clauses whether the two clause's agents are the same or different. This may be interpreted as a reflection either of the variety of information conveyed by the markers or of the degree of grammaticalization (loss of optionality) of the markers in the system.

In the English glosses of (1)-(8), the actions are represented with coordinated clauses which imply an equivalence in foregrounding of the actions represented in the clauses. The main reason for this is that these were the English sentences in response to which the consultant provided the Kashaya equivalents. However, an utterance like (1) would also be provided in response to, or conversely might elicit, the English "Gene sang after dancing." In the other examples, English glosses could also be provided indicating the backgrounded nature of the clause marked with one of the markers in the switch-reference system, e.g. "He danced while singing" for (5). Also, given the fact that the marker orients its verb's clause temporally with reference to the other clause, it is probably best to analyze the relationship between the two clauses in terms of subordination rather than coordination, with the clause featuring the marker from the switch-reference system being subordinated to the other clause.

Also, the clauses may be reversed with no change in the sequentiality of the events related—a standard indicator of backgrounding (Hopper & Thompson 1980):

(1') Gene cahno maneba
"Gene danced and then sang"
An additional formal indication of the accuracy of the analysis of these reference-markers as subordinators is that only the clause lacking the switch-reference marker bears a tense suffix. Generally, backgrounded clauses with defective tense-marking are considered subordinated. Another relevant fact in this connection is that when, in the English elicitation, the temporally following action is explicitly backgrounded, the Kashaya translation provided lacks a marker from the switch-reference system:

(9) Dave wayi ma?a bumucidu wayi
D. awoke food eat before
"Dave awoke before eating"

(10) baseckhe ma?a bumucidu wayi
wash-FUT food eat before
"(He) will wash before he eats"

In (9), the verb representing the temporally preceding action is tense-marked, with the temporally following action bearing no tense suffix and oriented with respect to the tense-marked clause by use of wayi "before." Use of the markers -ba or -phi would be impossible because of a conflict between grounding conveyed by those markers and the grounding indicated in the English glosses of (9) and (10).

It seems, however, that it might not be invariably correct to analyze the markers from the switch-reference system as subordinators. In Kashaya narrative, the markers often do not correlate with any kind of foreground-background distinction, but rather are used only to keep track of the agent in a sequence of foregrounded events:

(10) ?amhul a caruakhe Pt. Reyes mens'ephi ?a qo?o
tomorrow I carve-FUT P.R. thus-DO-PHI I dance

manekhe Santa Rosa
dance-FUT S.R.

"Tomorrow I’ll carve in P.R. & then I’ll dance in S.R."

(11) cibathin mukito dayicqackhe ?eemu
someone 3ps-OBJ love- INCEPTIVE-CAUS-RFLX-FUT EMPH

mens'ephilu mu cohtockhe ?e
thus-DO-PHILA 3ps leave-FUT EMPH

"Someone’s gonna fall in love with him and then he’s gonna leave"

These illustrate the use of mens'ephi-, which, although analyzable as a sequence of mens"e-"thus" and e-"do," is perhaps best considered to be a fairly grammaticalized ("bleached") vehicle
for the switch-reference marker. In extended narratives, mens'e—
plus a suffixed reference marker (usually -ba or -li, since
non-future events are typically narrated) is liberally used when
relating events that are narrated strictly in the sequence in
which they happened—in other words, all the events are
foregrounded. When used in this way, it could be argued that the
markers from the switch-reference system function more like
coodinators than subordinators (or, mens'e— plus the reference-
marker as a unit functions as a coordinator), at least with
respect to the grounding of the events related.

Another way of analyzing cases like (10) and (11), though,
would be to consider mens'e— to be not merely a bleached vehicle
for the reference markers but rather a pro-form for the preceding
narrated event, thus backgrounding it with respect to the
following event. Under this analysis, the reference markers are
invariably subordinators, attached always to a verbal element in
the subordinated clause. [1]

One reason the markers are characterized as indicating agent
coreference or disreference is because, with verbs that
subcategorize for agent-marked nominals, the switch-reference
markers are sensitive to the agent of the action represented by
the verb rather than, say, the highlighted or foregrounded
participant in the scene the clause represents. In Kashaya, there
is a great deal of freedom in the omission of arguments of the
verb. Thus, (12) expresses only the patient in the act of
hitting, because the identity of the agent is already known from
context or perhaps unknown or unimportant:

(12) to phanem

  1ps-PAT hit
  "I was hit"

Although there is no special marking to indicate deviation from the
active structure here, and although there does not seem to be any
morphosyntactic test by which the patient-marked nominal can be shown to
have been promoted to subjeethood, this kind of sentence is often best
translated with an English passive, since the function is similar.
In a sentence such as (13), in which such a clause is embedded by or
embeds another and a reference-marker is used, the foregrounded
participant in the subordinated clause and that in the matrix
clause are the same:

(13) to phanemli ?a phala phanem

  1ps-PAT hit-L1 1ps-AG also/back hit
  "I got hit and hit back"

However, in the subordinated clause the overtly-mentioned first-
person participant is coded with patient-marking as the endpoint
of the act of hitting, with the initiator or agent of the act
left unexpressed, while in the matrix clause the foregrounded
participant, although coreferential with that of the subordinated

[1] I am grateful to Leanne Hinton for suggesting this analysis.
clause, is coded with agent-marking as the initiator of a second act of hitting, with the endpoint of that act left unexpressed. The disreferential marker -li is used since the agents of the two clauses are disreferential—the coreference of the foregrounded participants is irrelevant. In general, regardless of what arguments are overtly expressed or left unexpressed, the reference-markers are sensitive to the agents of the clauses and nothing else. An investigation of exceptions to this generalization requires a discussion of verbs that lack an agentive-marked argument in their subcategorization frame, to which we now turn.

II. CASE MARKING IN KASHAYA

With a Kashaya verb that subcategorizes for two arguments, the two arguments will typically be coded by pronouns or suffixes drawn from two complementary lists. One list may be considered to include agent pronouns and suffixes, while the other may be regarded as including patient morphemes. These are the semantic cases they clearly encode in prototypical transitive situation-types:

(14) ?a mukito phanem
    1ps-AG 3ps-PAT hit
    "I hit him"

The "agent" and "patient" pronouns also encode other semantic roles besides those two, however, for example experiencer and stimulus:

(15) ?a mukito cadu
    1ps-AG 3ps-PAT see
    "I saw him"

Also, the 3p "agent" pronoun can apparently represent an instrument in the absence of an overtly expressed true agent (otherwise, an instrumental suffix -li is used). So far in this paper, the terms "agent" and "patient" have been used to represent the range of cases each of the two pronoun-types encodes; on the assumption that agents and patients are prototypical participants in a transitive situation-type, these are appropriate terms to represent the range of semantic roles covered by the two pronoun paradigms. However, given the range of cases covered by each paradigm, and given the fact that a two-valued system is clearly more appropriate here than a fine-grained one including two values among a host of others, I will henceforth use Foley and Van Valin's terms "actor" and "undergoer" rather than "agent" and "patient"; "briefly, actor and undergoer are the two arguments in a transitive predication, either one of which may be the single argument of an intransitive verb" (Foley and Van Valin 1984, 27). The pronoun paradigms are as follows:
Corresponding to the actor and undergoer pronouns are suffixes used on full NPs. The actor suffixes are 0, -xa2, and -2em, while the undergoer suffixes are -2el and -1o. (The last two might be analyzed as being present in whole or part in the object-pronoun paradigm.) The allomorphs are to some extent conditioned by lexical class: 0 and -1o occur suffixed to names, -xa2, -2em, and -2el to other full NPs:

(16) Gene Daveto phanem
    "Gene hit Dave"

(17) ?imatay? el phanem
    woman-YA? man-EL hit
    "The woman hit the man"

(18) s'ihta?em hopunel hanem
    bird-REM rat-EL Kick
    "The bird kicked the rat"

(The difference between -2em and -xa2 is difficult to determine.)

If a verb subcategorizes for just one argument, that argument may receive actor or undergoer coding, with the choice being largely semantically determined (this is another reason for using terms like "actor" and "undergoer" rather than "subject" and "object"). In general, the use of actor or undergoer forms for a one-place predicate's argument corresponds to the presence or absence of the control that argument exercises over the action represented by the verb. Thus, the following intransitive verbs all typically take undergoer-marked arguments:

(19) choyi "die"
    c'ezli "fall"
    silaya "skid"
    ha?tiw "sneeze"
    hit'a "fart"
    mocow "turn/become" [to k'iss mocow = "I turned red"]
    mukkhuna "feel embarrassed"
    woji "survive"
    s'u?tus'u?tu "shiver"
    mihecliw "stumble"
    low "fall (from a height)"
    sinam? "drown"

With most intransitive verbs that typically receive undergoer-marked arguments, undergoer marking seems to be the default or
semantically/pragmatically unmarked case, with actor marking being possible and indicating a greater degree of control of the argument over the action represented by the verb. For example, 2a ha2tiw has been translated as "I sneezed on purpose." Mu sinam? is translated as "He willingly gave his life" (i.e., he "drowned himself"). Actor or undergoer marking on the argument of choxi "die" may serve to distinguish between a death by illness or natural causes (actor marking) or a death by accident or murder (undergoer marking). Sometimes, it seems that a process/state distinction may be conveyed by case marking, so that mu choxi is sometimes translated as "He's dead" or "He died a long time ago," while mu! choxi is translated as "He's dying" or "He just died." Similarly, the consultant made a fairly firm distinction between 2a fεmaw "I'm tired" and 2a jemaw "I got tired."

In other instances, case marking serves to distinguish different senses of a polysemous verb in a way that seems idiosyncratic. Verbs featuring the -laya root behave this way:

(20) to malaya "I slipped"
    2a malaya "I missed the target (with my foot)"
    to silaya "I skidded"
    2a silaya "I missed (the ice cream, trying to lick it)"
    to dulaya "My hand slipped, trying to pick something up"
    2a dulaya "I missed an object, trying to pick it up with my hand"
    to dalaya "My hand slipped (I was propping myself up with it)"
    2a dalaya "I missed hitting (someone's bottom, e.g.) with my hand"

Here, the "control" parameter does not seem to very straightforwardly distinguish the pairs, in that both "slipping" and "missing" are non-deliberate actions. However, it is the case that "missing" is predicated of an individual who is acting purposefully, while "slipping" may be indifferent to purposefulness in this respect, so that it may be possible to bring these apparently idiosyncratic cases in line with the rest of the analysis.

Finally, there are a number of verbs that only accept undergoer marking on their arguments:

(21) daw "want, like" (TR)
    dawam "want (food)" (TR)
    piseq, baseq "dislike" (TR)
    t'αdu "feel (good, etc.)" (INTR)
    qa?adidu "dream" (TR)
    duyaqadu "remember" (TR)

All of these have corresponding causative-marked counterparts which only accept actor-marked arguments:

(22) daq?a "want, like" (TR)
    dawaqaw "want (food)" (TR)
    piseq?, baseq? "dislike" (TR)
    t'anqaw "feel (good, etc.)" (INTR)
Gswalt (1983) points out that some of these may be analyzed as bearing a causative-plus-reflexive sequence, as what might be an allomorph of the reflexive suffix (-'e) appears when the phonological environment permits:

(23) daqac'/khe "like FUT"
  qa?adinqac'/khe "dream FUT"
  piseqac'/khe "hate FUT"

The others show no evidence of a reflexive morpheme. In most cases, I can find no semantic difference between pairs like those in (21) and (22). D'aw seems to predicate a stronger emotion of its argument than does daq'a2, but no other pairs exhibit a similar distinction as far as I can tell:

(24) qa hanem daq'a
    "I want to kick"

(25) hanem d'aw
    "I really want to kick"

(26) qa t'o tho?o daq'a
    lps-ACT CONTRASTIVE acorn=mush like
    "I like acorn mush"

(27) to t'o tho?o d'aw
    lps-UND CONTR acorn=mush like
    "I really like acorn mush"

In general, we can say that the causative suffix requires an actor-marked argument, whether that argument is expressed overtly or not. This may seem obvious, since it may appear that a causative must have an agentive "causer" almost by definition, but many of the verbs that appear to bear a causative suffix are not so clearly causative semantically. In cases where the reflexive morpheme could be argued to be affixed to the causative morpheme, then we can imagine the argument of which the verb is predicated "causing him/herself" to like, dream, or hate. However, willful, agential causation is never apparent in the translations or accepted by the consultant. The causative semantics in duyaqangaw "remember" and laqangw "feel" is absolutely opaque, at least from an English-speaker's perspective.

As is clear from the translations, most of the verbs under (21) are two-place predicates. Given the fact that the usual device in Kashaya for determining "who" does "what" in the coding of a transitive situation is not word order but case marking, we would expect the following sentences to be ambiguous:

(28) to mukito d'aw
    lps-UND 3ps-UND like
(29) modal to duyaga:du
   3ps-UND 1ps-UND remember

However, (28) can only mean "I like her," not "She likes me," and (29) can only mean "I remember her," not "She remembers me." It turns out that daw and duyaga:du (as well as dawono, pisew, and basew) may be predicated only of first- and second-person singular and plural arguments. The verb root da- subcategorizes not just for direct objects, but also for embedded clauses; in neither case may it be predicated of a third-person argument:

(30) ?imata?el hanem daw
    woman-UND kick like
    "(I, we, you) like to kick the woman" / "The woman likes to kick"

(31) ?imata?em hanem daw
    woman-ACT kick like

Thus, the only ambiguity of participant-roles that could arise in the use of these two-place double-undergoer predicates would be when both arguments are coded by first- or second-person pronouns, which would rarely in fact lead to ambiguity due to the deictically-grounded nature of these pronouns. The sole exception to this among the verbs listed under (21) seems to be qa?adidu "dream," which, like daw, subcategorizes for both embedded clauses and direct objects, but, unlike daw, may be predicated of third-person as well as second- and first-person arguments:

(32) mukito to qa?adidu
    3ps-UND 1ps-UND dream
    "I dreamed about it/him" OR "He dreamed about me"

(33) mukito qa?adidu malayacphi mubickhe
    3ps-UND dream slip-FHI run-away-FUT
    "He dreamed he would slip and run away"

Further Comments on the Causative

The causative suffix -la:la may be productively attached to intransitive and transitive verbs to indicate that some agent caused the erstwhile actor to perform or undergo the action denoted by the verb; the erstwhile actor is then demoted to undergoer in the morphological marking:

(34) ?a hanem?
    1ps-ACT kick
    "I kicked"

(35) mukin hanemqa? to
    3ps-ACT kick-CAUS 1ps-UND
    "He made me kick"
The causative suffix may also be attached to verbs that include no actor in their subcategorization frame, in which case there is no demotion indicated by the case marking:

(36) Daveto choyi?
    D-UND die
    "Dave died"

(37) mukin Daveto choyicqaw
    3ps-ACT D-UND die-CAUS
    "He Killed Dave"

Causative marking is a standard way of deriving transitive from intransitive verbs:

(38) phus'a "snap (INTR)"
    phus'a:iqaw "snap (TR)"
    ba "grow (INTR)"
    bacqaw "grow (TR)"
    mukhu "burn (INTR)"
    mukhuqaw "burn (TR)"

In addition to these uses, the causative is also used to mark embedded clauses with some verbs:

(39) madal e ?a hanemqa? da:qa?
    3ps-UND BE 1ps-AG kick-CAUS like
    "I want her to kick"

(40) Daveto tubicqati? diyadu
    D-UND get=up-CAUS-INTENTIVE(?) tell
    "(I) told Dave to get up"

(41) Bun Daveto cohtocqa? medu
    B. D-UND leave-CAUS tell
    "Bun told Dave to leave"

The causative is only used on the verb of the embedded clause when the higher-clause actor is disreferential with the lower-clause actor. Otherwise, an "equi-deletion"-type structure is used with no causative marking on the verb, contrasting with the "raising"-type structure with lower-clause causative marking in (39)-(41):

(42) ?a duc? da:qa?
    1ps-ACT know want
    "I want to know"

(43) ?a cohto? da:qa?
    1ps-ACT leave want
    "I want to leave"
The parallelism between causative marking on the embedded verb and the subordinators -li, -phila, and -\(\omega\)em has led Oswalt to analyze -\(\omega\)a as a marker of switch-reference in cases like (39)-(41) (Oswalt 1977). It is possible to get roughly synonymous versions of sentences like (40) and (41) with markers from the switch-reference system:

\[
\begin{align*}
(44) & \text{ diядulи } \ ?а & \text{ туби?} \\
& \text{tell-LI } & \text{1ps-ACT get-up} \\
& \text{ "He told me to get up"} \\
(45) & \text{ Dave cohtо Bun diядulи} \\
& \text{ D. left B. tell-LI} \\
& \text{ "D. left because Bun told him to"}
\end{align*}
\]

Causative marking seems to differ from the use of the other switch-reference markers in that it is apparently infelicitous in cases where the embedded verb subcategorizes for an undergoer coreferential with a matrix-clause actor:

\[
\begin{align*}
(46) & \text{ ?а } \text{ ha?thiqa? } \text{ da:qa?} \\
& \text{ 1ps sneeze-CAUSE want} \\
& \text{ "*I want to sneeze"}
\end{align*}
\]

As we will see in the next section, the markers li, philа, and \(\omega\)em are routinely used when two clauses are linked but at least one of them has a verb that subcategorizes only for an undergoer—even though the participant in the subordinated clause is coreferential with the participant in the matrix clause. The difference between the causative morpheme and the reference markers in this respect, however, may well be predictable by the semantics of embedding under the verb "want," and thus in fact be perfectly consistent with the other switch-reference markers; we will return to this point in the next section.

Only some verbs that subcategorize for an embedded clause permit raising and -\(\omega\)a-marking on the lower-clause verb in cases of disreference; others lack any kind of marker of embedding:

\[
\begin{align*}
(47) & \text{ duсi? } ?а & \text{ da:qa} \\
& \text{ know 1ps-ACT like} \\
& \text{ "I know I like something"} \\
(48) & \text{ duсi? } ?а & \text{ mu } \text{ da:qa} \\
& \text{ know 1ps-ACT 3ps-ACT like} \\
& \text{ "I know he likes something"} \\
(49) & \text{ ?а } \text{ qa?adiqa? } \text{ mu cohtоckhe?} \\
& \text{ 1ps-ACT dream 3ps-ACT leave-FUT} \\
& \text{ "I dreamed he will leave"}
\end{align*}
\]
Causative marking and raising correlate fairly straightforwardly, in other words, with the matrix-clause actor's degree of control over the lower-clause actor implied by the semantics of the higher-clause verb.

III. THE INTERACTION OF SWITCH-REFERENCE AND "UNDERGOER" VERBS

In section I, it was argued that the markers in the switch-reference system are sensitive to the reference only of the actors in the two clauses linked by the reference markers. One kind of evidence on which this argument is based is represented by sentences of the following kind:

\[(50) \text{?a qa?ading}a? \text{?a cohtockhe?} \]
\["I dreamed I will leave" \]

Although the foregrounded, topicalized or focussed participant doesn't change from one clause to the next, the actor does, so -li is used rather than -ba. The fact that the actor in the second clause is left off-scene (receives no overt coding) is irrelevant to the choice of reference marker.

In all the examples discussed so far, the linked clauses have featured verbs that subcategorize for an actor-marked argument. The question that raises itself is what marker is used when one or more of the clauses features a verb that subcategorizes only for one or more undergoer-marked argument. If it is indeed accurate to characterize the reference markers as keeping track only of whether the actor changes or remains the same from one clause to the next, then we would probably expect the DS [I] marker to be used if one of the clauses contains an undergoer verb. Another possibility is that the SS marker might be used in such a situation, since in some switch-reference systems described in the literature the SS marker serves to indicate not that the subject or actor remains the same, but rather that it doesn't change (Munro 1983). Assuming that undergoer verbs have no actor, a clause featuring such a verb would be linked to another clause by the SS marker, since absence of an actor in one or more of the clauses constitutes lack of change of the actor. A priori, it also seems reasonable that the SS marker might be used if the argument of the undergoer verb (or, perhaps, the argument higher in the case role hierarchy -- or, perhaps, the human participant -- in cases where the verb subcategorizes for two undergoer arguments) is coreferential with the actor of the other

[11] I use DS in its conventional use as a term referring to the "different referent" marker, and SS as a term referring to the "same referent" marker. Use of these standard terms is not meant to imply sensitivity to the category "subject."
clause's verb.

Interestingly, however, none of these hypotheses makes the right prediction. It turns out that, when linking two clauses at least one of which features an undergoer verb, either a SS or a DS marker is acceptable:

(52) bahcuba malaya
    jump-BA slip
    "I jumped and slipped"

(53) Gene bahcubili malaya
    6. jump-up-L1 slip
    "Gene jumped and slipped"

(54) c'elic'ba muhkuna:
    trip-BA feel=embarrassed
    "I tripped and felt embarrassed"

(55) c'elili muhkuna:
    "I tripped and felt embarrassed"

In (52) and (53), a clause with an actor verb ("jump") is linked to a clause with an undergoer verb ("slip") and either the SS or the DS marker may be used. In (54) and (55), two clauses with undergoer verbs ("trip" and "feel embarrassed") are linked and, again, either marker is acceptable. It might be objected that, given the flexibility of case marking discussed in section II, it is possible that in (52) and (55) the arguments of the verbs identified here as taking undergoer arguments are "really" taking (covert) actor arguments, thus accounting for the use of the SS marker. However, an immediate problem with this solution is that malaya with an actor argument doesn't mean "slip" at all, but rather means "miss," as mentioned above. Also, conclusive counterevidence is provided by the following, in which the same variation is exhibited with the undergoer overtly coded:

(56) ?a wayicqali to muhkuna
    1ps-ACT wake=up-CAUS-L1 1ps-UND feel=embarrassed
    "I woke someone up and then I felt embarrassed"

(57) ?a wayicqala to muhkuna
    "I woke someone up and then I felt embarrassed"

(58) to malayali munthi ?a bahcubi
    ps-UND slip-L1 but 1ps-ACT jump-up
    "I slipped but then I jumped up"

(59) to malayacBA munthi ?a bahcubi
    "I slipped but then I jumped up"

It should be pointed out that the Kashaya sentences in (56)–(59) were presented to the consultant for his grammaticality judgments,
rather than being elicited in response to the English glosses. The reason for this is that, given the flexibility of case marking, I wanted to be sure whether one or both of the clauses did indeed include an undergoer argument. The primary way in which (56)–(59) deviate from a typical unprompted or spontaneous Kashaya utterance is that in each case both clauses feature an overt pronoun, whereas normally two pronouns or full NPs would be explicitly mentioned only if they were not coreferential. Thus, the objection could be raised that data like these are useless for insights into the grammar since they are to some extent unnatural.

However, as mentioned in section II, there are verbs that invariably take undergoer arguments, and are patently ungrammatical with an explicitly-mentioned actor pronoun or full NP:

(21) da*w "want, like" (TR)
    dawa:n "want (food)" (TR)
    pisew, basew "dislike" (TR)
    t\'a:idu, t\'a:law "feel (good, etc.)" (INTR)
    qa?adi:du "dream" (TR)
    duyaga:du "remember" (TR)

These correspond to apparently causative-marked verbs that obligatorily take an actor argument:

(22) da*ga? "want, like" (TR)
    dawanqaw "want (food)" (TR)
    piseqa?, baseqa? "dislike" (TR)
    t\'anqaw, t\'alahaqaw "feel (good, etc.)" (INTR)
    qa?adingqa? "dream" (TR)
    duyagaqanqaw "remember" (TR)

Since these verbs absolutely resist semantically-controlled manipulation of the case of their arguments, we can be sure whether their arguments are actors or undergoers, even when those arguments are covert.

(60) qa?adingacphi qo:di t\'ankhe
    lps-ACT dream-SS good feel-FUT
    "I'm gonna dream and then feel good"

(61) qa?adingacphila qo:di t\'ankhe
    lps-ACT dream-DS good feel-FUT
    "I'm gonna dream and then feel good"

(62) to qa?adinphi qo:di t\'ankhe
    lps-UND dream-SS good feel-FUT
    "I'm gonna dream and then feel good"
(63) to qa?adinphila qo:di t'ankhe
    1ps-UND dream-DS good feel-FUT
    "I'm gonna dream and then feel good"

In (60) and (61), the subordinated clause's verb obligatorily takes an actor argument, and the matrix clause's verb obligatorily takes an undergoer argument; both the DS and the SS marker are acceptable. In (62) and (63), both clauses' verbs require undergoer arguments; again, either marker is acceptable. Thus, the overlap of the two markers' domains can't be ascribed in these cases to "mistakes" due to the unnaturalness of the sentences. In general, the phenomenon seems to be so robust that it would be highly undesirable to attempt to explain it away as due to some kind of error; the following is a partial list of minimal pairs from my elicitations:

(64) wayili choyi?
    wayiba choyi?
    "He woke up and died"

(65) bahculi malaya?
    bahcuba malaya?
    "He jumped and slipped"

(66) bahculi to malaya?
    bahcuba to malaya?
    "I jumped and slipped"

(67) Gene bahcubili malaya?
    Gene bahcubicba malaya?
    "Gene jumped up and slipped"

(68) bahculi c'eli?
    bahcuba c'eli?
    "I jumped and tripped"

(69) bahculi qo:di t'a:law
    bahcuba qo:di t'a:law
    "I jumped and felt better"

(70) to malayali munthi ?a bahcubi?
    to malayacba munthi ?a bahcubi?
    "I slipped but then I jumped up"

(71) to c'elili munthi ?a bahcubi?
    to c'elica munthi ?a bahcubi?
    "I tripped but then I jumped up"

(72) to ha?tili ?a bahcu
    to ha?tiba ?a bahcu
    "I sneezed and I jumped"
(73) to sighthali nati ?a bahcu
to sighthaya nati ?a bahcu
"I sneezed but then I jumped"

(74) ?a bahculi to malaya?
?a bahcuba to malaya?
"I jumped and I slipped"

(Of course, in cases such as (64) and (66) where one or both of
the arguments is omitted and DS marking is used, a possible
interpretation is that two different participants are involved.
This use is unproblematic and irrelevant to our concern, which is
the use of either marker when only one participant is involved
in the two actions.) The cases under discussion, then, represent a
problem for our characterization of the switch-reference
morphemes as indicating a switch or preservation of the reference
of the actor, since the SS marker may be used when the reference
of the actor is different in the two clauses. It doesn't help to
argue that the SS marker might in that case indicate that the
actor doesn't change, so that if one of the clauses features an
actorless verb the SS marker is used by default, since that would
still leave us unable to account for the possibility of using the
DS marker with no necessary difference in the reference of the
verbs' arguments.

It must be acknowledged at this point that it is not true
that either the DS or the SS marker always may be used to link
clauses when at least one of the clauses features an undergoer
verb and that verb's argument is coreferential with the other
clause's actor (or undergoer, in the case of two undergoer-verb
clauses). There are numerous such sentences that have been
rejected by the consultant:

(75) *?a cohtocba to ha?tiw
1ps-ACT leave-SS 1ps-UND sneeze

(76) *to bacubicba to malaya
1ps-UND jump-up-SS 1ps-UND slip

(77) *to ha?tiba ?a malaya
1ps-UND sneeze-SS 1ps-ACT miss

(78) *to c'elili to muhkunadu
1ps-UND trip-DS 1ps-UND feel=embarrassed

In many of these cases, though, the rejection of the sentence may
be plausibly attributed to independent factors. (76), for example,
might have been rejected because of the superfluous repetition of
?a. In some other cases, the reason for rejection may have had
something to do with the absolute ungrammaticality of the sentence
but rather with its inappropriateness to express a certain meaning
or nuance of meaning, a possibility to which we will return later.

Pairs like (64)-(74) indicate that, if we are not to throw up
our hands and claim free variation, we might have to consider the
choice of DS and SS to be determined in certain cases by something
other than the reference of the verbs' agents. Thus, we might
envision an analysis in which in "core" situations of a sequence of
two actor-taking verbs the markers signal same reference or switch
reference of the actors of the verbs, while in cases of a sequence
of an actor-taking and an undergoer-taking verb or of two
undergoer-taking verbs, the markers are not used to signal
reference, but rather have some other, perhaps more subtle, use or
uses not revealed in the translations.

First, though, there is a more straightforward possibility
that should be investigated, suggested by the following pair:

(79) a. c'elic'ba choyi?
b. c'elicili choyi?
    both "he fell down and died"

Again, as with (64)-(74), we have a case where either marker may be
used in two apparently synonymous sentences. However, a more
detailed explanation of the contexts in which the sentences would
be used illuminates a difference in meaning between the two. (79a)
might be uttered as an explanation of how someone died (i.e., the
act of falling results directly in the death, by the person hitting
his/her head on the ground or what have you). (79b), on the other
hand, would be more appropriate if someone, while running away from
an enemy, fell down and was caught and killed by the enemy. Thus,
we could say that in the (a) sentence the (unspoken) agent of the
two clauses does indeed remain the same, in that whatever causes
the falling causes the death, while in the (b) sentence there is a
an agent of death distinct from the agent of the fall. A slightly
different way of putting this would be to say that the SS marker
implies a causal relationship between the two clauses. It should
be stressed that this would only be possible when at least one of
the two clauses takes an undergoer argument and the undergoer of
the undergoer-taking verb is coreferential with the undergoer or
actor of the other verb. Thus, the following would still be ruled
out:

(80) *?a phanemBA mul choyi
    "I hit him and he died"

(81) *?a q'ac'amaBA mu mobi?
    "I shouted and he ran away"

In other words, (79) suggests that a minor extension of the "core"
analysis presented in Section 1 might be able to account for the
choice of the DS or the SS marker in cases like (64)-(74) as well.
Also, cases like (78) that were rejected by the consultant might be
explained as being bad because the DS marker implies that there was
no direct connection between the fall and the embarrassment, which
would be highly implausible.

If this analysis is correct, then certain predictions follow.
First, the consultant should consistently choose the SS-marked version over the DS-marked version when asked to choose the sentence describing a situation in which the action represented by the subordinated verb causes the action represented by the matrix verb. Thus, for example, in the (67) pair:

(67) Gene bahcubili malaya?
     Gene bahcubicba malaya?
     "Gene jumped up and fell"

the consultant should firmly choose the second sentence when asked which one means that the act of jumping caused the slip. Second, the consultant should consistently use the SS marker when asked to provide Kashaya equivalents of sentences like the following:

(82) The ice melted (=undergoer-taking) because it was hot

Third, we would predict that sentences like the following would be pretty much ruled out:

(83) to ha?tiBA ?a bahcubi?
     [would mean] "I jumped b.c. I sneezed"

since the second clause overtly expresses an agent that must be different from whatever unexpressed agent is involved in causing the sneeze.

Unfortunately, however, we can see right off the bat that (70)-(73) run counter to this last prediction. Also, it seems that it is possible to get sentences like the following:

(84) bahcucBA to ha?tiw
     "I jumped and sneezed"

even though it is hard to imagine how a jump could cause a sneeze.

With regard to the second prediction, the following is as expected:

(85) ana; oho mu:t’ABA ihyu soh sihso
     "the ice melted b.c. it was very hot"

Usually, in response to an English sentence with a "because"-clause, the consultant provided a Kashaya sentence with the SS- or DS-marked verb in final position. The ungrammaticality of the second sentence of the following pair would be explained by the hypothesis that SS-marking indicates a causal relationship:

(86) a. to t’o qo?di t’a?lauw bahcubA
     "I felt better because I jumped"
     b. *to t’o qo?di t’a?lauw bahcull
     (could only mean "I felt better b.c. someone jumped")

In final position, the SS marker is consistently provided when the reference of the participant remains the same, regardless of the
presence of one or more undergoer-taking verbs in the sequence:

(86') muhkuna;du c'elic'BA
 "I felt embarrassed because I fell down"

(86'') ha?tiu to pimiyenta miscalqaba
 "I sneezed when I smelled the pepper"

However, in non-final position, there are cases where the SS marker is not used to express a causal relationship:

(87) c'elic'ba to ipe hit'a mens'ili to ana muhkuna;
 fall-SS 1ps-UND fart fart MENS'I-DS 1ps-UND very embarrassed
 "I fell down and farted and then I felt very embarrassed"

Here, our analysis entails that we assume the speaker to be imagining the fart to be caused by the fall, but the embarrassment to be unrelated to the fart—a highly implausible interpretation. Finally, it turns out that the consultant fails consistently to choose the SS sentences when asked which one of a pair means that the action in the subordinated clause resulted in the action in the higher clause. Considering all this, we have to reject the analysis that the SS marker consistently indicates some kind of retention of agency or causal relationship between the two clauses.

The following items of data, however, prompt a second hypothesis closely related to the one just rejected:

(88) a. bahcuBA go?di t'ai;law
 "I jumped knowing I would feel good"
 b. bahcuLI go?di t'ai;law
 "I jumped and then felt good (I didn't know I would feel good)"

(89) a. bahcuBA c'eli?
 "he jumped in order to fall"
 b. bahcuLI c'eli?
 "he jumped and fell"

(90) a. ha?tiBA ?a choko?
 "I sneezed and left (I planned the whole thing)"
 b. ha?tiLI ?a choko?
 "I sneezed (and felt embarrassed) and walked out"

(91) a. ?a bahcubicBA to malaya?
 "I jumped up and slipped (I planned the whole thing)"
 b. ?a bahcuLI to malaya?
 "I jumped and slipped"

(92) a. ?a t'o bahcuBA qaso
 "I got well by jumping"
 b. bahcuLI qaso
 "s.o. jumped and is out of trouble"
(93) a. qa?adinqacPHI qo?di t'ankhe  
"I'm gonna try and dream and feel good"
   b. qa?adinqacPHILA qo?di t'ankhe  
"only after I dream I'll feel good"

(94) a. to qa?adinPHI qo?di tankhe  
"I'll feel good when I dream (I'm sure of it)"
   b. to qa?adinPHILLA qo?di tankhe  
"I'll feel good when I dream (but I'm not sure of it)"

(95) a. ?a t'o bahcuPHI sikhayakhe  
"I'm gonna jump and fall (I'm sure)"
   b. ?a t'o bahcuPHILA sikhayakhe  
"I'm gonna jump and fall (I'm not sure)"

In these pairs, SS marking consistently indicates that the person of whom the sequence of actions is predicated plans or intends the entire sequence, or, in the last examples, is confident that the sequence of events will come to pass as predicted. Thus, one could say that the agentivity of a single participant has scope over the entire sequence of clauses. In the above cases, the SS marker is used with this meaning when the verb in one of the clauses obligatorily takes an argument coded as undergoer; one might assume that in a case like (90) the verb ha?ti- "sneeze" would take an actor argument if the argument were explicitly coded. However, the consultant readily accepted the following sentence with the meaning glossed in (90a):

(96) a. to ha?tiba ?a chohto?

Thus, the agentivity indicated by the SS-marking seems to be independent of the agentivity indicated by the coding of the argument.

At this point, we can reconcile the behavior of the causative morpheme -tihqa, discussed in the previous section as a DS marker, with the other DS markers -li, -phila, and -liwa'm. Recall that, while the causative -tihqa seems parallel in function to the DS markers in many respects, it differs in that it can't be used in cases where the embedded verb subcategorizes for an undergoer coreferential with a matrix-clause actor:

1ps-ACT sneeze-CAUS want  
"*I want to sneeze"

The DS markers, on the other hand, can be used in a parallel sequence:

(72) to ha?tilli ?a bahcu  
1ps-UND sneeze-DS 1ps-ACT jump  
"I sneezed and I jumped"
However, if we consider that embedding under a matrix clause with "want" entails a predication of agentivity over the entire sequence, we can make sense of the impossibility of using the causative marker on the embedded verb in a case such as (46).

It should be noted that (91a) was at one point rejected by the consultant, and during a second elicitation-session accepted. When I pointed out to him that he had earlier rejected it, he replied that (91b) was the 'better' or 'more normal' way of saying it, and that (91a) would only be acceptable under the interpretation that "you planned the whole thing." This raises the possibility, mentioned earlier, that many of the sentences judged at one point or another to be ungrammatical, such as (75)-(78), are ungrammatical under a certain (perhaps "more normal") interpretation only. Indeed, during the same session in which (77) was rejected

(77) *to ha?tiba ?a malaya.

the consultant accepted the following:

(97) to malayacba munthi ?a bahcubi
   "I slipped but then I jumped up"

A second point that should be mentioned here is that the consultant does not consistently make a distinction, even when prompted, between SS/DS minimal pairs along the lines of the distinctions given for (88)-(93). Indeed, with some of the pairs, such as (64) and (79)

(64) a. wayili choyi?
    b. wayiba choyi?
       "he woke up and died"

(79) a. c'elic'ba choyi?
    b. c'ellili choyi?
       "he fell down and died"

the interpretation of the SS-marked sentence representing a planned sequence of events would be pragmatically improbable—and yet both (64b) and (79a) were judged as acceptable. The semantic distinction already discussed provided between (79a) and (79b) is different from the ones provided for the (88)-(93) pairs, and yet is equally reasonable given the use of the SS and DS markers in the unproblematic "core" cases discussed in Section I. It seems inevitable, given everything discussed so far in this section, that in cases involving two clauses at least one of which takes an undergoer argument, DS and SS marking may convey any of a cluster of semantic nuances, rather than having a single monolithic use. The particular nuance conveyed may depend on a variety of factors, such as the reasonableness of considering the participant in the events represented by the linked clauses to have intended or planned the entire sequence (which could also conceivably influence the grammaticality judgment). In the case of (79), the particular
contrast provided by the DS and SS markers may depend crucially on the possibility of an easily-identified agent of the verb choyi distinct from the undergoer—even though that agent can’t be explicitly coded as an argument of the verb (in this sense, "die" is different from, say, "sneeze" or "fart"). In many cases, the consultant can articulate no difference between DS/SS minimal pairs, indicating that, in those cases, any semantic nuance conveyed by the markers must be extremely subtle.

Another problem that needs to be addressed is the behavior of the "simultaneous" DS and SS markers -h-un and -n. It seems that the SS-simultaneous marker is largely incompatible with overt undergoer-marking:

(98) a. Geneto bahcudem ha?tiw
   G-UND jump-DS sneeze
   "Gene jumped and sneezed"
   b. *Geneto bahcun hit’a
      G-UND jump-SS fart

(99) a. Gene ha?tin bahcudu
   G. sneeze-SS jump
   "Gene sneezed and jumped"
   b. *Geneto ha?tin bahcudu
      G.-UND sneeze-SS jump

(100) a. ?a bahcunwadem to ha?timedu
      1ps-ACT jump-DISTRIB-DS 1ps-UND sneeze-DUR
      "I was jumping around sneezing"
   b. *?a bahunwadun to ha?timedu
      SS

This generalization is not exceptionless, since the consultant did accept the following:

(101) a. to qa?adidun qo?di t’ala:medu
      1ps-UND dream-SS good feel-DUR
      "I always dream to feel good"
   b. to qa?adidun ?a qo?di t’ala:qamedu
      1ps-UND dream-SS 1ps-ACT good feel-CAUS-DUR
      "I always dream to feel good"

as well as DS-marked counterparts:

(102) a. to qa?adidem qo?di t’ala:medu
      "when I dream I feel good"
   b. to qa?adidem ?a qo?di t’ala:qamedu
      "same"

I have no explanation for this special behavior of the simultaneous markers.
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Two final strange cases

In all the cases discussed so far in which both DS and SS marking have been possible with no apparent difference in the reference of the participant, the overt or covert argument of the undergoer-taking verb has been coreferential with the actor of the linked clause's verb or, in the case of two undergoer-taking verbs, with the undergoer of the other verb. Thus, the only way to say "My bones ached because it rained" or "I slept because it rained" would be with DS marking, given the fact that in Kashaya "it rained" is expressed by a verb "rain" predicated of a noun "rain":

(103) a. ?ihya duhtal iihche dibuli
   bones ache rain rain-DS
   "my bones ached b.c. it rained"
   b. *?ihya duhtal iihche dibucaBA

(104) a. ?ihche dibucali to sima:
   rain rain-DS 1ps-UND sleep
   "I slept b.c. it rained"
   b. *?ihche dibucaBA to sima:

However, a few DS-SS minimal pairs have come up and been confirmed to have involved noncoreferential undergoers:

(105) airplane. banala:ba ʔaca cho?do?
   a.   come=down-SS people die-EVID
   "the people all died when the airplane came down"

(The same sentence, with the same given meaning, is also possible with -Ji.) In this case, with no overt marking on "airplane," it is not clear whether "come down" takes an actor or undergoer argument, but in either case the SS marking is unexpected since the argument of the following undergoer-taking verb, cho-, is clearly noncoreferential with "airplane." Naturally, the question arises whether "airplane" is the covert actor of cho-, but cho- unequivocally subcategorizes for only one argument:

(106) a. *ma mukito cho?do?
   2ps-ACT 3ps-UND die-EVID
   b. *mul ma?cal cho?do?
   3ps-UND 3pp-UND die-EVID

If the airplane were to be expressed as the killer of 2aca "people" in (105), then the causative suffix -bqa would be used to transitivize "die" to "kill," but there is obviously no transitive suffix on cho- in (105). One way we could bring this closer to being in line with the rest of our analysis would be to consider a kind of part-whole relationship to hold between the passengers (the people, 2aca) and the airplane, thus making them non-distinct referentially. Note that in English we say "When
the airplane went down all the passengers died"; the definite article indicates reference to something already brought up in the discourse, which could only be "the airplane." [1]

However, the following are also problematic:

<107> ?ihche dibucba ?ihyu sit’e
rain rain-SS snow snow
"it rained and then it snowed"

rain rain-SS wind ? blow
"it rained and then the wind blew"

(Both are also acceptable with -li, again with no clear meaning difference.) The obvious response to these items of data is that the "weather" nouns are referentially empty, in which case the SS marker would indicate lack of change of agent (although, again, the acceptability of the DS marker in the same sentences would still pose a problem).

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Oswalt has characterized the Kashaya switch-reference system as involving sensitivity to the identity of the agents of the linked clauses; if the agents are coreferential, a SS marker is used, while if they are disreferential, a DS marker is used (Oswalt 1961, 1983). His characterization admirably handles sequences of clauses featuring verbs that subcategorize for agentive arguments. In this paper, I have focussed on cases that deviate from this unproblematic class in certain respects. In each of the sentences discussed in detail in the preceding section, at least one of the clauses in the linked sequence contains a verb that includes no agent (i.e., actor) in its subcategorization frame. This class of sentences routinely accepts either the DS or the SS marker. While the semantic differentiation between the DS and SS versions is subtle and in many cases seems to be inaccessible to conscious direct analysis by the consultant, in at least some cases there is a clear differentiation that is intuitively plausible in view of the function of the switch-reference markers in the unproblematic cases involving two agent-taking clauses. In one such set of cases (exemplified above by <80>-<92>) SS marking indicates that the individual of whom the sequence of actions is predicated deliberately plans the entire sequence; thus, a kind of agentivity is involved even though the participant may be coded with undergoer marking in one or both clauses. In a closely related set of cases (involving future events), the participant does not necessarily plan the sequence, but is confident that the events will transpire as predicted.

[1] This possibility was suggested to me in conversation by Toshio Ohori.
In a recent study of switch reference in Central Pomo, Marianne Mithun argues that in this member of the Pomo family a set of markers largely cognate with the Kashaya markers discussed in this paper have a primary function of "specifying relations between actions or events, not participants" (Mithun ms., 14). She presents evidence that the SS markers actually indicate that the events represented by the two clauses are conceptualized as a single event, rather than as a sequence of two different events. By her analysis, "the frequent cooccurrence of bi, io, and ba [cognate with the Kashaya SS markers phi, a, and ba] with coreferent subjects or agents, and of bila, da, and li [corresponding to Kashaya DS markers phi, a, and la] with different ones, are simply secondary effects of this distinction" (Mithun ms., 14). While her analysis has tantalizing implications for a coherent deciphering of the nuances of the DS/SS distinction in Kashaya, it is nevertheless clear that the Kashaya switch reference system is different from the superficially similar Central Pomo clause linking system she discusses. In particular, with the exception of the small class of problematic cases discussed at the end of section III, it does not seem to be possible in Kashaya to use a SS marker when the linked clauses feature disreferential agents/actors (or disreferential patients/undergoers when "undergoer" verbs are involved). This restriction even applies to certain sequences involving "weather" predicates:

(103) a. ?ihya duhtal ?ihche dibuli
    bones ache rain rain-DS
    "my bones ached b.c. it rained"
    b. *?ihya duhtal ?ihche dibucaBA

(104) a. ?ihche dibucal to sima:
    rain rain-DS 1ps-UND sleep
    "I slept b.c. it rained"
    b. *?ihche dibucaBA to sima:

Here, the consultant consistently rejected SS marking since the argument of dibu(rah) "rain" is disreferential with the argument of "ache" in (103) and 'sleep' in (104)—even though it is easy to imagine that the sequences related in (103) and (104) could be conceptualized as single events. Similarly, the following could only mean that the agent of the first clause died:

(109) phanemba choyi
    hit-SS die
    "I (you, he, etc.) hit (s.o.) and died"
    "*I (etc.) hit him and he died"

In this last case, the switch-reference marking is sensitive to the first argument in the subcategorization frame of each clause's verb. Thus, even if the undergoer of the action of hitting is of central importance in the discourse, the SS marker
can't be used to indicate the identity of that undergoer with the argument of *choz* 'die,' since the SS marker would necessarily indicate that the first argument—the actor—of *phanem* 'hit' is identical with the argument of *choz*. According to Mithun's analysis, Central Pomo would permit SS marking if the sequence were conceptualized as a single event; in Kashaya, on the other hand, the switch-reference marking is indeed sensitive primarily, not just incidentally, to the identity of the first argument in the subcategorization frame. As already discussed in sections I and III, Kashaya exhibits clear restrictions of this sort on the use of the DS and SS markers. It is only in a special class of cases involving clauses at least one of which takes an undergoer as its first (or only) argument, and the first arguments of both clauses' verbs are coreferential, that the DS and SS markers may serve to convey information other than the switch or preservation of reference of the verbs' arguments.
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James E. Redden

Carbondale, December 1990
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