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1 Introduction

Choctaw verbs exhibit dative agreement:

(1) Alikchiyat anaako holisso apilatok.
   alikchi yat anaak o holisso a pila tok
   doctor NOM me FOC ACC letter 1 SG DAT send PST
   ‘The doctor sent ME a letter.’

→ I take this to mean: the agreed-with argument has dative case.

Sometimes, the dative argument functions as a subject:

(2) Akatosat itakoobih.
   a kat os at i takoo bi h
   1 SG POSS cat NOM DAT lazy TNS
   ‘My cat is lazy.’

Even transitive verbs can have dative subjects:

(3) Chishnakoosh ilipa chimihaksitok.
   chishnakoosh ilipa chim ihaksi tok
   you FOC NOM food 2 SG DAT forget PST
   ‘YOU forgot the food.’

Today’s goals:
- Build a typology of dative-subject transitives in Choctaw. Including
  - possessor raising (it will be necessary to distinguish two previously-conflated possessor-raising constructions)
  - ‘dative raising’
- Provide a unified syntax for dative-subject transitives.

Roadmap:
- Choctaw basics
- Dative-subject transitives #1: ‘subject possessor raising’
- Dative-subject transitives #2: ‘dative raising’
- Unifying subject possessor raising with dative raising
- Interaction with switch-reference: why SR treats subject possessor raising and dative raising differently

2 Choctaw basics

Choctaw is an agglutinating language:

(4) Issataalowaachaachiho?
   is sa taalowaa ch aachi h o
   2 SG ERG 1 SG ABS caus fut TNS Q
   ‘Are you going to make me sing?’

Argument-drop is pervasive:
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(5) *Michichih.*
  michi-chi-h
do-CAUS-TNS
‘She made him do it.’

Word order is fairly rigidly SOV:

(6) *Chalhakwayat hina awaanablih.*
  chalhakwa-yat hina awaanabli-h
copperhead-NOM road cross-TNS
‘A copperhead crossed the road.’

The grammatical and semantic functions of argumental NPs/DPs (henceforth DPs) are signalled by two pieces of information:

- Case
- Verbal agreement/elitics

2.1 Case

Overt DPs are marked in a nominative-accusative system:

(7) a. *Alikchiyat ofima¯ lhiyohlitok.*
alikchi-yat ofi-m-a lhiyohli-tok
doctor-NOM dog-DEM-ACC chased-PST
‘The doctor chased that dog.’

b. *Alikchiyat howi¯tah.*
alikchi-yat howi-ta-h
doctor-NOM vomit.N-TNS
‘The doctor is throwing up.’

Accusative DPs without determiners are generally not case-marked:

(8) *Alikchiyat ofi lhiyohlitok.*
alikchi-yat ofi-Ø lhiyohli-tok
doctor-NOM dog chased-PST
‘The doctor chased the dog.’

2.2 Verbal agreement

The verb agrees with its arguments:

(9) *Issashoolaachi¯ho?*
  is-sa-shool-aachi-h-o
  2SG.ERG-1SG.ABS-hug-FUT-TNS-Q
‘Are you going to hug me’

- 1st and 2nd-person arguments trigger agreement.
- 3rd-person arguments don’t trigger agreement (or it’s Ø, depending on your analysis).

See Nicklas (1974); Heath (1977); Ulrich (1986); Davies (1986); Broadwell and Martin (1993); Broadwell (2006); Woolford (2008); Tyler (2017; to appear.a,b) for extensive discussion of Choctaw agreement.

There is one other kind of agreement worth talking about...

2.3 Datives

Some arguments are cross-referenced by dative agreement:

(10) a. *Sanakfiyat chihoponaachih.*
sa-nakfi-yat chi-hopon-aachi-h
my-brother-NOM 2SG.DAT-cook-FUT-TNS
‘My brother will cook for you.’

b. *Alla ili¯hoponitok.*
alla il-i-hoponi-tok
child 1PL.ERG-DAT-cook-PST
‘We cooked for the kid.’

→ N.B. There is an agreement morpheme for 3rd-person dative arguments.

---

2I have referred to the traditional ‘Class I/II/III’ forms as erg, abs and dat respectively.

3See Ulrich (1986) for evidence that it is a ‘default’ form rather than an exponent of 3rd-person features. Its featural composition does not affect the analysis here, however.
DAT agreement can cross-reference both ACC objects (see 10a) and NOM subjects:

(11) a. *Katosat ĭtakoobih.*
   katos-at ĭ-takoobi-h
   cat-NOM DAT-lazy-TNS
   ‘The cat is lazy.’

b. *Anaakoosh aapisa amoppolotok.*
   anaakoo-sh aapisa am-oppolo-tok
   I-FOC-NOM window 1SG.DAT-break-PST
   ‘I’m the one who had his window broken.’

This final configuration—transitives with dative subjects—is the topic of this talk.

Summary:

- NOM-ACC case system
- Verb agreement
- Dative agreement happens with both objects and subjects

Next: the first case of a dative-subject transitive: external possession.

3 ‘Subject possessor raising’

Subject possessor raising is described as a process which turns the possessor of a subject into a ‘new’ subject (Nicklas 1974; Heath 1977; Munro and Gordon 1982; Broadwell 1990, 2006):

(12) Possessor remains inside subject DP
   Michelle imoofiyat abiikah.
   [Michelle im-ofi-yat] abiika-h
   ‘Michelle’s dog is sick.’

(13) Possessor becomes new subject (2 variants)
   a. *Michelle at ofi imabiikah.*
      Michelle-at ofi im-abiika-h
      Michelle-NOM dog DAT-sick-TNS
   b. *Michelle at imoofi abiikah.*
      Michelle-at im-ofi abiika-h
      Michelle-NOM 3.Poss-dog sick-TNS
      ‘Michelle’s dog is sick.’

→ The two variants:
   - DAT morphology on the verb, no marking on the possessee (13a)
   - No marking on the verb, POSS morphology on the possessee (13b)

- N.B ‘DAT’ and ‘POSS’ have identical paradigms and are probably the same morpheme; I label them differently for their different functions.

Claim: only the variant in (13a) (with dative agreement on the verb) is a true dative-subject transitive.

- The (13b) variant does not involve a dative subject, and has a different syntax.

Variation

There is a lot of variation in judgments of possessor raising, mainly with respect to the (13b) variant.

- Many speakers treat the two types of possessor raising differently—these are the judgments reported below.

4The third variant, in which both the possessive and the dative morphology show up, is sometimes uttered by speakers, although my consultants generally rejected it in elicitation contexts. See section 3.4.1.
3.1 A theoretical starting point: Broadwell (1990, 2006)

Broadwell’s (1990; 2006) analysis of all subject possessor raising (node labels changed, see also Baker 2015 for a similar analysis):

(14) TP
  DP
    Michelle-at
    DP
      vP
        D’
        im-abiika
  T

Some key tenets of Broadwell’s analysis:

• (13a) vs. (13b) is surface morphological variation.

• The possessor and possessee always form a constituent (at some point in the derivation).

In this section:

• The two kinds of possessor raising—henceforth external possession—have different morphology because they have different syntax.

• Athematic and thematic external possession will be distinguished.

  – The structure in (14) is a good fit for the external possession construction in (13b), i.e. athematic external possession.

3.2 Thematic and athematic external possession

I propose two different syntactic structures (based on work by Deal 2013). Each has their own morphological and semantic properties.

(15) Thematic external possession

a. Michelle-at
   Michelle Nom
   dog
   dat
   sick
   tns

b. TP
   DP
   VoiceP
   T
   -h
   ApplP
   Voice
   tDP
   VP
   Appl
   DP
   ofi
   im-abiika
   → The possessor is merged in an Appl(icative)P: it counts as an argument of the verb (or its extended projection), and receives a thematic role.\(^5\)


\(^5\)This is essentially a revival of Baker’s analysis, which Broadwell; Broadwell argues against. I believe, however, that it holds for thematic EP type, once the athematic type is separated out.
**Athematic external possession**

a. Michelle-at im-ofi abiika-h
   Michelle-NOM 3.POSS-dog sick-TNS

b. 

→ The possessor is **not** merged as an argument of the verb, and receives no additional thematic role.

### ‘Thematic’ and ‘athematic’

The terminology comes from Deal’s (2013) work on external possession in Nez Perce and cross-linguistically.

- In thematic EP, the possessor is akin to the subject of a **control** predicate—it receives an additional thematic role.
- In athematic EP, the possessor is akin to the subject of a **raising** predicate—it receives no additional thematic role.

The rest of this section: differences between the two constructions, and how they fall out of our syntactic structures.
• N.B. Left-branch extraction is possible in Choctaw, and crucially, it leaves behind a POSS morpheme:

(19) Katah-o chi-kana-yat [tį i-hina chanalli] oppani-tok?
who-ACC 2SG.POSS-friend-NOM 3.POSS-car break-PST
‘Whose car did your friend wreck?’

→ Broadwell’s account assumes that external possession always involves left-branch extraction. So why doesn’t it leave behind a POSS morpheme on the possessee?

3.4 Dative morphology on verb

(20) a. Thematic EP: DAT morpheme present
Michelle-at ofi im-abiika-h
Michelle-NOM dog DAT-sick-TNS

b. Athematic EP: no DAT morpheme
Michelle-at ofi __-abiika-h
Michelle-NOM 3.POSS-dog __-sick-TNS

• The analysis captures this:
  – In thematic EP, the possessor is an argument of the verb (or its extended projection). It triggers agreement.
  – In athematic EP, the possessor is not an argument of the verb. It does not trigger verbal agreement.

3.4.1 Aside: marking both possessive and dative

• Sentences like (21) are occasionally seen (though my consultants tended to reject them in elicitation contexts):

(21) a. Mary akoosh imooshiyat ikaniiyatok.
Mary-akoosh im-oshi-yat i-kaniiya-tok
Mary-FOC-NOM 3.POSS-uncle-NOM DAT-leave-PST
‘It was Mary whose uncle passed away.’ (Broadwell 2006:305)

b. John at imooi imillitokoosh, nokhakoosh binniilih.
John-at im-ofi im-ill-tok-oosh, nokhako-sh
John-NOM 3.POSS-dog DAT-die-PST-SS sad-SS

  binniili-h
  sit.GG-TNS

‘Because John’s dog died, he’s sad.’ (Broadwell 2006:309)

• Under the present account, these are thematic EP sentences (signalled by DAT agreement on verb) with redundant marking of the possessor.

→ So they aren’t ruled out in the syntax, but are maybe pragmatically marked, akin to:

(22) a. He punched me in the/#my face.

b. Les flics m’ont fouillé les/#mes poches.

  ‘The cops went through my pockets.’ (Diffloth 1974)

Nom-marking the old subject

Example (21a) exhibits NOM case-marking on the ‘old’ subject, as in:

(23) DP-NOM DP-NOM V

→ This is generally possible in both thematic and athematic EP!

• …but it is often suppressed. See section 5.2.

6An alternative possibility is that this sentence should be considered to have ‘dative-raising’, rather than EP (see section 4). In the dative-raising parse of this sentence, the DAT morpheme on the verb would indicate that the subject (Mary) is related to the event as an experiencer, and the POSS morpheme on imooshiyat ‘uncle’ would indicate possession. Marking possession in dative-raising clauses is not always redundant—see section 4.1 for evidence that in dative-raising sentences, the subject and object need not be in a possession relation.
3.5 Syntactic status of possessee

A prediction of my account:

- In thematic EP, the possessee should be an object
- In athematic EP, the possessee should be a subject (albeit one that sits below a higher argument, possibly also in a 'subject' position)

A subjecthood diagnostic that patterns as predicted:7

- The preverb okl(ah) indicates that the subject of a clause is plural (Broadwell 2006; Tyler to appear.a):

(24) a. Allaat akaka oklikpotok.
   alla-at akaka okl= ik-po-tok
   child-NOM chicken PL= NEG-eat.N-PST
   ‘The kids didn’t eat the chicken.’

b. Oklah hapinokshoopat tahah.
   oklah hupi-nokshoo-pa-t taha-h.
   PL 1PL.ABS-scared-PRT finish-TNS
   ‘We’re done being scared.’

- It’s for subjects only. Oklah can’t associate with most objects.8

(25) ohooyo-m-a (*oklah) pisa-li-tok
   woman-DEM-ACC (*PL) see.NG-1SG.ERG-PST
   ‘I saw that woman/*those women.’

- We can use (in)ability to associate with oklah to diagnose the status of the possessee in thematic and athematic EP.

(26) a. Thematic EP: oklah cannot associate with possessee
   Alikchiyat ofi oklimabiikah.
   alikchi-yat ofi okl= im-abiika-h
   doctor-NOM dog PL= DAT-sick-TNS
   ‘The doctors’ dog is sick’ (*‘The doctor’s dogs are sick’)

b. Athematic EP: oklah can associate with possessee (%)
   John at imoofi oklah abiikah.
   John-at im-ofi oklah abiika-h
   John-NOM 3.POSS-dog PL sick-TNS
   ‘John’s dogs are sick.’

- We can interpret these results to mean...
  - in thematic EP, the possessee is an object
  - in athematic EP, the possessee is a subject

3.6 Semantic restrictions on predicates

Thematic EP is restricted to a set of unaccusative predicates. They are compatible with athematic EP too:

(27) a. Thematic
   Mary at ofi imillitok.
   Mary-at ofi im-illi-tok
   Mary-NOM dog DAT-die-PST

b. Athematic
   Mary at imoofi illitok.
   Mary-at im-ofi illi-tok
   Mary-NOM 3.POSS-dog die-PST
   ‘Mary’s dog died.’

→ The set includes ili ‘die’, abika ‘be sick/get sick’, oppolo ‘be broken/break’, kantiya ‘be lost/go away’

7The interaction of athematic EP and switch-reference is discussed in Appendix A.4.
8See Tyler (to appear.a) for evidence that oklah can associate with clitic-doubled objects (i.e. 1st and 2nd-person objects).
9Some speakers do not allow oklah to appear before a verb in an athematic EP sentence, under any reading.
Thematic EP is incompatible with all individual-level predicates and all unergative predicates. Athematic EP is fine:  

(28) Individual-level predicates

a. *hattak-m-at lokka lobo i-chito-h  (*Thematic)
   man-DEM-NOM shirt DAT-big-TNS
   (‘That man’s shirt is big.’)

b. Hattakmat ilokka lobo chitoh.
   hattak-m-at i-lokka lobo chito-h  (√ Athematic)
   man-DEM-NOM 3.POSS-shirt big-TNS
   ‘That man’s shirt is big.’

(29) Unergative predicates

a. #alikchi-yat ofi i-baliili-tok
   doctor-NOM dog DAT-run-PST
   (‘The doctor’s dog ran.’)

b. Alikchiyat imoofi baliilitok.
   alikchi-yat im-ofi baliili-tok  (√ Athematic)
   doctor-NOM 3.POSS-dog run-PST
   ‘The doctor’s dog ran.’

• There is a lot of dialectal/idiolectal variation w.r.t. which stage-level predicates are available for thematic EP:
  
  – E.g. %hokchafo ‘be hungry/get hungry’, %showa ‘stink’
  
  → Aaron Broadwell, p.c.: a speaker accepted homma ‘be red’ with thematic EP, but it meant that the possessee was becoming redder. i.e. only a stage-level interpretation was available.

These restrictions can be captured by the analysis:

- **Ban on unergatives:**
  
  - In thematic EP, the possessor is introduced in an ApplP below VoiceP. If the possessee was merged in Spec-VoiceP, the possessor could not raise over it to subject position.  

(30) Ruled-out thematic EP with unergative predicate

- **Ban on individual-level predicates:**
  
  - The ban can be stated as a selectional restriction between Appl0 and V0.  
  
  - In athematic EP, the possessor is not an argument of the verb, so it can’t impose selectional restrictions.

---

10 Interestingly, even in Chickasaw, where the thematic-type EP is available for a much larger set of verbs, including all unergative verbs, the only verbs to resist it are those denoting color states (e.g. lakna ‘be yellow’) (Munro and Willmond 1994). As in Choctaw, these verbs are only available with the athematic-type EP.

12 (29a) does in fact have an available meaning: ‘the doctor ran away from the dog’. Here, the nmr-referenced argument is the dog, rather than the doctor, and the doctor is interpreted as the agent of the predicate.

13 There may also be selectional issues: possessor-introducing Appl0 may need to merge with a VP that takes a complement, in order to ensure that the possessor has a possessee to associate with. This restriction may be encoded syntactically, as described here, or semantically.
How universal is the ban on unergatives?

Broadwell (2006:307) provides this example:

(31) *Pam at katosat i-balilih.
Pam-at katos-at i-balili-h
Pam-NOM cat-NOM DAT-run-TNS
‘Pam’s cat is running.’

And in Chickasaw, Munro (1999) provides a number of examples like this:

(32) Jan-at *foshi’at in-taloowa.
Jan-NOM bird-NOM DAT-sing
‘Jan’s bird is singing.’ (Chickasaw, Munro 1999:254)


3.7 Semantic restrictions on possessors

Thematic EP is incompatible with inanimate possessors, athematic EP is fine:

(33) a. Thematic
    *chokka-m-at okkissa im-oppolo-h
    house-DEM-NOM door DAT-broken-TNS
b. Athematic
    Chokkamat imokkissa oppoloh.
    chokka-m-at im-okkissa oppolo-h
    house-DEM-NOM 3.POSS-door broken-TNS
    ‘The house’s door is broken.’

This distinction can be captured, again, by selectional restrictions:

• In thematic EP, the possessor is an argument of the verb, so the verb (or its functional structure) can impose selectional restrictions on it.
• In athematic EP, the possessor is not an argument of the verb, so the verb cannot impose selectional restrictions on it.

This leads to the question: what is the thematic role imposed in thematic EP?

• EP cross-linguistically tends to impose a ‘(mental) affectedness’ interpretation on the possessor (e.g. Lee-Schoenfeld 2006 on German, Guéron 1985 on French, Kempchinsky 1992 on Spanish, see Haspelmath 1999 for an overview).
  – This captures the Choctaw restriction: inanimate things can’t have mental states.

Dead possessors

• Dead possessors should be incompatible with thematic EP (König and Haspelmath 1998; Deal 2013).

→ This may be borne out...but I need to ask more speakers.

(34) Jimmy at katos imillitok.
Jimmy-at katos im-ill-tok
Jimmy-NOM cat DAT-die-PST
‘Jimmy’s cat died.’
(# if Jimmy, the cat’s original owner, is deceased)
3.8 Summary

Some distinctions between thematic and athematic EP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thematic</th>
<th>Athematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSS on possessee?</td>
<td>N, (?Y)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT on verb?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of possessee</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricts predicate?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricts possessor?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These distinctions reflect different syntactic structures:

(35) a. **Thematic**

(36) $\text{DP}_{\text{[DAT,NOM]}}$ VoiceP T
    $\text{ApplP}$ Voice
    $t_{\text{DP}}$
    VP Appl
    $\text{DP}_{\text{[NOM]}}$ V

New proposal: this same structure, with the same case specifications, surfaces elsewhere: the ‘dative-raising’ construction.\(^\text{14}\)

- Looking ahead, we’ll see that thematic EP and dative-raising form a family of constructions.

4 ‘Dative raising’

I’ve proposed that thematic EP has the structure in (36).

→ DPs are marked with their [CASE] specifications (recall that the object is NOM, but it rarely surfaces).

• For further issues in external possession (and they are many), see Appendix A.

Up next: the other dative-subject construction in Choctaw.

4.1 Functions of dative-raising

The template in (37) covers a range of related meanings, outside of thematic EP:

(37) $\text{DP-NOM}$ $\text{DP-NOM}$ DAT-V

4.1.1 Predicative possession

(38) a. \textit{Chikiyat hina chanalli losa i-hikiyaho?}
    chiy-i-yat hina chanalli losa i-hikiyah-o $\text{DAT-stand.NG-TNS-Q}$
    ‘Does your father have a black car?’

\(^{14}\text{A.k.a. III-subjectivalization (Munro and Gordon 1982), or the oblique subject rule (Munro 1999).}\)
b. Mary at ofi ikawah.
   Mary-at ofi ɪ-lawa-h
   Mary-NOM dog DAT-many-TNS
   ‘Mary has a lot of dogs.’

4.1.2 Introducing indirect causers as subjects

(39) a. Mary at ihina chanalli imaayiskatok.
   Mary-at ɪ-hina chanalli im-aayiska-tok
   Mary-NOM -3.POSS-car DAT-fixed-PST
   ‘Mary got her car fixed.’

b. Bill at chokka mat Ḩobatok.
   Bill-at chokka-m-at ɪ-toba-tok
   Bill-NOM house-DEM-NOM DAT-built-PST
   ‘Bill got that house built.’

c. Hoponiyat akakoshi imalwashatok.
   hoponi-yat akakoshi im-alwasha-tok
   ‘The chef had the egg fried.’

4.1.3 Introducing experiencers as subjects

(40) a. Michelle at imaapisa imoppolotok.
   Michelle-at im-aapisa im-oppolo-tok
   Michelle-NOM 3.POSS-window DAT-broken-PST
   ‘Michelle had her windows broken.’

b. John at holisso aka pilat iliitiihatok.
   John-at holisso aka pila-t ɪ-litiíha-tok
   John-NOM paper down throw-PRT DAT-dirty-PST
   ‘John got the book dirty, by dropping it.’

c. Piţikba Abraham at ... Chihoowa holittopayat at Ḩayaakatok.
   pi-tikba Abraham-at ... Chihoowa holittopay-yat
   1PL.POSS-front Abraham-NOM God holy-NOM
   at ɪ-hayaaka-tok
   come.and DAT-appear-NOM
   ‘Holy God appeared to our forefather Abraham.’
   (Acts 7:2, in Broadwell 2006:310)

d. John at balokka imossih.
   John-at balokka im-ossi-h
   John-NOM pants 3.POSS-small-TNS
   ‘The pants are too small for John.’

Some verbs have special, lexicalized meanings when they take dative subjects:

(41) a. Katahoosh imalla imihaksitok?
   katahoo-sh im-alla im-ihaksi-tok
   who-NOM 3.POSS-child DAT-forget-PST
   ‘Who forgot their child?’

b. John at amofošik imittolatok.15
   John-at am-ofošik im-ittola-tok
   John-NOM 1SG.POSS-puppy DAT-fall-PST
   ‘John dropped my puppy.’

c. Towwayat ikaniiyah, sattiyaapishiyat.
   towwa-yat ɪ-kaniiya-h, sa-ttiyaapishi-yat
   ball-NOM DAT-go.away-TNS 1SG.POSS-sibling-NOM
   ‘She lost the ball, my sister did.’

→ N.B. These dative subjects still have a ‘experiencer’-like thematic role.16

15 Cf. Spanish se me cayó ‘I dropped it’, literally ‘it fell to me’.
16 ‘Experiencer’ is likely the wrong term here, since an event of forgetting, by definition, involves no subjective experience on the part of the forgetter.
4.1.4 Aside: the spooky aptness of ‘have’

So dative-raising covers:

- Predicative possession
- Indirect causer subjects
- Experiencer subjects

...a bit like a certain familiar English word:

(42) a. Suzie had a car.
    b. Suzie had her car fixed.  
    c. Suzie had her car break down.

The overlap isn’t perfect:

- *Have* can introduce indirect causers and experiencers of agentive predicates, Choctaw dative-raising cannot:

(43) a. Suzie had everyone sing at the top of their voice.
    b. Suzie had a cyclist crash into her.

- Assuming that thematic EP is a subtype of dative-raising, dative-raising can introduce *possessors* of some subjects. *Have* cannot do this:

(44) Suzie had a/the dog die (≠ ‘Suzie’s dog died’)

But the overlap is still striking! See Kim (2012); Myler (2014, 2016); Tyler and Wood (to appear), a.o. for discussion of the multifaceted use of *have*.

- Looking within Muskogean, Munro (1999) discusses the aptness of *have* as a translation for the output of the Chickasaw dative-raising.

---

17Myler (2014, 2016) refers to this as the ‘engineer’ reading of *have*, in the sense that the subject is ‘engineering’ a situation so that the complement clause of *have* comes about.

18Although sentences like *Suzie had a tooth come loose* may come close to this meaning.

---

Summary

Dative-raising clauses come in the same form as thematic EP sentences:

(45) \( \text{DP-NOM} \text{DP-NOM DAT-V} \)

The dative subject is linked to the verb in one of these roles:

- Possessor (in a predicate possession clause)
- Indirect causer (or Myler’s ‘engineer’)
- Experiencer

5 Unifying thematic EP with dative-raising

I’ve proposed that thematic EP and dative-raising have the same syntax:

(46)\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{[DAT,NOM]}} \downarrow \text{VoiceP} \downarrow \text{T} \\
\text{ApplP} \downarrow \text{Voice} \\
\text{tDP} \downarrow \text{Appl} \\
\text{VP} \downarrow \text{Appl} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{[NOM]}} \downarrow V
\end{array}
\]
In this section: 4 empirical reasons to unify the two constructions.

- They are only compatible with unaccusatives
- The theme is nominative in both
- The theme is an object in both
- The dative subject is optional in both

5.1 Restriction to unaccusatives
We saw that thematic EP is incompatible with unergative verbs.

- Dative-raising also applies only to unaccusatives:

\[(47) \text{Dative-raising impossible with unergatives} \]
\[a.\] Shayla-at 3.FOSS-child 1sg.dat-cook-PST
Shayla-NOM 3.FOSS-child DAT-cook-PST
‘Shayla cooked for her kid.’
(*’Shayla had her kid cook.’)
\[b.\] Bill-at 3.FOSS-dog DAT-run-TNS
Bill-NOM 3.FOSS-dog DAT-run-TNS
‘Bill ran away from his dog.’
(*’Bill had his dog run.’)

→ This is expected if thematic EP and dative-raising have the same syntax—see section 3.6.20

19To convey the indirect causer interpretation, speakers would tend to use a different construction such as (48).

\[(48) \text{Thematic EP} \]
Michelle-at window 1sg.dat-break-juss think-TNS
Michelle-NOM window someone-NOM 1SG.DAT-break-juss think-TNS
‘Michelle got someone to break her windows.’ (deliberately, e.g. to commit insurance fraud)

This construction has some mysterious properties, (e.g. is the embedded clause quoted or syntactically embedded?), which are beyond the scope of this talk.

20A complication: all of the verbs used to express predicative possession agree with their subject using ergative agreement. Broadwell (1988) argues that this property diagnoses the verb as unergative, rather than unaccusative. If Broadwell is correct, then dative-raising cannot be restricted to unaccusatives.

However, I believe that the verbs involved in predicative possession are underlingly unaccusative, but their internal argument undergoes an obligatory process of raising to ergative such that they agree with their subject using the erg morphemes. See Tyler (2017, to appear.b) for further discussion of raising-to-ergative in Choctaw.

5.2 The theme is nominative
In both thematic EP and dative-raising sentences, the theme (below the dative argument) can bear nominative case:

\[(49) a. \text{Thematic EP} \]
katos-at 1sg.dat-die-PST
katos-NOM 1sg.dat-die-PST
‘My cat died.’

\[b. \text{Dative raising} \]
katos-at 1sg.dat-many-TNS
katos-NOM 1sg.dat-many-TNS
‘I have a lot of cats.’

- If it’s not the subject, why is it nominative?
  → This requires a more complete theory of Choctaw case-assignment, e.g. Baker (2015).
  − The important thing for now is the similarity between thematic EP and dative raising.

The double -at constraint
Strings of clausemate DPs bearing NOM marker -at are * for most speakers (though one consultant consistently uttered and permitted them):

\[(50) ??John-at 1sg.dat-die-TNS
John-NOM dog-NOM DAT-die-TNS
(‘John’s dog died.’) \] (Broadwell 2006:310)
The usual way of dealing with this is to suppress case-marking on the **NOM** object.

→ Hence **NOM** objects are typically only detectable when there's a **pro** subject (e.g. (49)).

N.B. There is a comparable prohibition against strings of **ACC**-marked DPs:

(51) *Bill-\textit{a} ofi-\textit{ya} im-aa-li-tok
    Bill-\textit{ACC} dog-\textit{ACC} DAT-give-1SG.\textit{ERG-PST}
    ('I gave Bill a dog.')

N.B. Broadwell (2006:310): double -\textit{at} constraint does not hold for dative-raising. Compare (50) with (52):

(52) John-\textit{at} iskali-\textit{yat} im-asha-h
    John-\textit{NOM} money-\textit{NOM} DAT-be-TNS
    'John has money.'
    \hspace{1cm} (Broadwell 2006:310)

My consultants were not sensitive to this distinction.\textsuperscript{21}

5.3 The theme is an object

- In section 3.5, I argued that the possessee in thematic EP is a true object, using the **\textit{oklah-association test}.** We can apply the same test to the theme in dative-raising:

(53) a. katos alhiia-t (*\textit{okl=}*) im-ittola-tok
    cat PL-\textit{NOM} (*\textit{PL}) DAT-fall-PST
    'She dropped the cats.'

b. ofi-yat (*\textit{okl=}*) am-asha-h
    dog-\textit{NOM} (*\textit{PL}) 1SG.DAT-be-TNS
    'I have a lot of dogs.'

- **\textit{Oklah}** cannot associate with the theme in dative-raising constructions.

→ In both thematic EP and dative-raising, the theme is an **object**, not a subject.

A further argument for the objecthood of the theme:\textsuperscript{22}

- **\textit{NOM}** case on the theme is optional

(54) a. Thematic EP
    katos(-\textit{at}) am-illi-tok
    cat(-\textit{NOM}) 1SG.DAT-die-PST
    'My cat died.'

b. Dative raising
    katos(-\textit{at}) a-lawa-h
    cat(-\textit{NOM}) 1SG.DAT-many-TNS
    'I have a lot of cats.'

- **\textit{NOM}** subjects must obligatorily realize **\textit{NOM}** case.\textsuperscript{23} Optional case-realization is usually a property of **in-situ objects**:

(55) John im-alla*(-\textit{t}) nipi(-\textit{ya}) nonaachi-tok
    John 3.Poss-child-\textit{NOM} meat(-\textit{ACC}) cook-PST
    'John's kid cooked the meat.'

- I propose that the optionality of **\textit{NOM}** in (54) and **\textit{ACC}** in (55) is a consequence of them both being **in-situ objects**.

\textsuperscript{22}See Appendix B for another argument for the objecthood of the theme in thematic EP and dative raising sentences, this one from the placement of participial phrases.

\textsuperscript{23}The picture is slightly more complicated: Gordon and Munro (2017:3) state that nominative case markers may sometimes be omitted in main clauses, and Broadwell (1990:186) notes that subjects of locative clauses may also fail to be marked as nominative. From preliminary investigation, it seems that the presence of more than one argument generally forces nominative case-marking to appear, although the example provided by Gordon and Munro is transitive. More research is required.
5.4 The dative argument is optional

In thematic EP and dative-raising, the predicate can usually survive in the absence of the dative argument:

(56) Thematic EP
   a. *Mary at katos imillitok.*
      Mary-at katos im-illi-tok
      Mary-NOM cat DAT-die-PST
      ‘Mary’s cat died.’
   b. *Katosat illitok.*
      katos-at illi-tok
      cat-NOM die-PST
      ‘The cat died.’

(57) Dative raising
   a. *Katosat alawah.*
      katos-at a-lawa-h
      cat-NOM 1SG.DAT-many-TNS
      ‘I have a lot of cats.’
   b. *Katosat lawah.*
      katos-at lawa-h
      cat-NOM many-TNS
      ‘There are a lot of cats.’

There are a couple of exceptions: *im-ihaksi* ‘forget’, *im-illi* ‘lose (a game)’ require a DAT subject.

→ *But*, the theme is never optional.

• The analysis captures this: the verb selects its theme, but the argument introduced in ApplP is optional.

---

### Summary

Reasons to believe that thematic EP and dative-raising have the same syntax:

- Both constructions are only compatible with unaccusative verbs.
- In both constructions, the theme is nominative.
- In both constructions, the theme is an object. As diagnosed by
  - The oklah-association test
  - Optional case-realization
- In both constructions, the dative argument is optional.

Reminder of what the structure looks like:

(58)

```
TP
   DP[DAT,NOM]
      VoiceP T
         ApplP Voice
            tDP VP Appl
               DP[NOM] V
```

Open question: how do the DPs get those case features?

• I’m not answering that question (see Baker 2015), but I will briefly put this structure in a cross-linguistic perspective.
5.5 Aside: dative subjects, nominative objects

The ‘dative-subject, nominative-object, unaccusative-verb’ configuration is used to convey a similar set of meanings cross-linguistically:

(59) DAT as experiencer, NOM as source of experience

a. Henni leiddust stráknarí. [her.DAT bored.3PL the.boys.NOM]
   ‘She found the boys boring.’ (Icelandic, Sigurðsson 1996:1)

b. A Ana se le olvidaron las llaves de Pedro. [Ana.DAT 3REF.CL DAT.CL forgot.3PL they keys of Pedro]
   ‘Ana forgot Pedro’s keys.’ (Spanish, Rivero 2004:496)

(60) DAT as indirect causer, NOM as theme²⁴

a. Benit i-u thye dritarja. [Ben.DAT 3SG.DAT.CL-NACT broke.AOR.3SG window.NOM]
   ‘Ben unintentionally broke the window’ (Albanian, Kallulli 2006:274)

b. Dem Ben ist das fenster zerbrochen. [the.DAT Ben is the.NOM window broken]
   ‘Ben unintentionally broke the window.’ (German, Kallulli 2006:274)

(61) Predicative possession

a. Cheli-eykey ton-i iss-ta [Cheli-DAT money-NOM exist-DECL]
   ‘Cheli has money.’ (Korean, Yoon 2004:1)

²⁴Kallulli (2006) states that the dative arguments in these examples are involuntary causers, which is not the case for the Choctaw examples. Nonetheless, in both Choctaw and the languages shown here, the dative argument is interpreted as a causer of the event.

Note also that it is not clear that the dative arguments here are subjects of their clauses. The parallelism between these languages and Choctaw still holds, however, if we focus on the case of the arguments (NOM, DAT) and their semantic roles (theme, causer).

b. eni-kkə valiya viiə unə I-DAT big house be.PRES
   ‘I have a big house.’ (Malayalam, Nizar 2010:11)

(62) External possession

a. Benit i něčvto-hej një shtěpi. [Ben.DAT 3SG.DAT.CL build-NACT.IMPF.3SG a house.NOM]
   ‘Ben’s house was being built.’ (Albanian, Kallulli 2006:278)

b. Masha-qə emiske massyna-ta adjanna. [Masha-DAT suddenly car-3SG.PASS broke]
   ‘Masha’s car suddenly broke down.’ (Sakha, Baker and Vinokurova 2010:621)

I proposed that the subject of these constructions has both DAT and NOM Case features. There is a clear parallel with focused nominals in Korean:

(63) a. Cheli-hanthey-ka ton-i isse [Cheli-DAT-NOM money-NOM exist]
   ‘Cheli has money.’ (Korean, Levin 2017:448)

   ‘Cheli is afraid of Yenghi.’ (Korean, Yoon 2004:4)

→ N.B. the object in these constructions is nominative too!


- Here, dative-raising and thematic EP diverge.
6 Switch-reference and case

Switch-reference refers to the phenomenon in which a clause-edge morpheme identifies an embedded clause as having either:

- the same subject (SS) as the matrix clause
- a different subject (DS) from the matrix clause

For discussion of switch-reference in Choctaw, see Nicklas (1974); Linker (1987); Broadwell (1990, 1997, 2006); Gordon and Munro (2017), a.m.o.

Some wholesome uncomplicated examples:

(64) a. Chinaalhatokakooosh chiyokchayaahaatoosh chimachokmahii ahoobah. 25
   chim-achokm-ahii ahooba-h 2SG.DAT-happy-EXH be.like-TNS
   ‘You got shot but you’re still alive so act like you’re grateful.’

b. Onnahiliya hashok amo ikbannotok lachaatoko.
   onnahili-ya hashok amo ik-banno-tok [lach-aatok-o ] morning-ACC grass cut IRR-WANT.NEG-PST wet-because-DS
   ‘He didn’t want to cut the grass in the morning because it was wet.’

Examples like this leave undetermined what switch-reference might be sensitive to:

- Syntactic subjecthood?
- Nominative case?
- ...Something else?

Whatever the nature of SR, if thematic EP and dative-raising have the same syntax, we would expect switch-reference to treat them in the same way.

25 This speaker has reduced the complementizers -ookakoo- ‘although’ and -aatokoo- ‘because’ to -akoo- and -aatoo- respectively. This seems common in fast speech.

→ However, thematic EP and dative-raising are treated differently by switch-reference.

The status of switch-reference in Mississippi Choctaw

In short: I think it’s on the way out.

- The examples and categorical judgments here come from older speakers, and two very committed mid-30s speakers
- Younger speakers overgeneralize the different-subject forms. E.g.:

(65) Taloowalaachika ikkanali.
   [taloowa-l-aachi-k-a ] ikkana-li-h
   sing-1SG.ERG-FUT-C-DS know-1SG.ERG-PST
   ‘I know that I’m going to sing.’

- Although, interestingly, judgments remain strong for the -cha/-na switch-reference forms.
- One younger male speaker never volunteered a same-subject form.
6.1 Switch-reference with thematic EP

- When the **theme** is co-referential with the subject of the other clause: both SS and DS marking tend to be acceptable

(66) Theme co-referential with subject of matrix clause

a. *Mary at ofi imillicha showa hikiit iyatok.*
   Mary-NOM dog DAT-die-and.SS smell up.to go-PST
   ‘Mary’s dog died and began to smell.’

b. *John at ofi imillihma¯ ittolatok.*
   John-NOM car DAT-standNG-when-DS break-PST
   ‘When John’s dog died, it fell over.’

- When the **dative possessor** is co-referential with the subject of the other clause: SS marking is %, DS marking is always OK.

(67) Dative possessor co-referential with subject of matrix clause

a. *John at ofi imilli-cha yayyah.*
   John-NOM dog DAT-die-and.SS cry-TNS
   ‘John’s dog died and he cried.’

b. *John at ofi imilla-cha yayyah.*
   John-NOM dog DAT-die-and.SS cry-TNS
   ‘John’s dog died and he cried.’

- This is evidence against a ‘subject-oriented’ view of switch-reference
  - The DP that is (I think) the syntactic subject has a harder time controlling switch-reference than the syntactic object!

6.2 Switch-reference with dative-raising

- When the **theme** is co-referential with the subject of the other clause: both DS and SS acceptable, with a possible preference for DS.

(68) Theme co-referential with subject of matrix clause

a. *katos-at im-ittola-{na/ɔ}  iyyi o-hikiya-tok*
   cat-NOM DAT-fall-when-DS/as break-PST
   ‘When he dropped the cat it landed on its feet.’

b. *Mary-at car i-hikiya-h-{a/ɔ} okpollo*
   Mary-NOM car DAT-standNG-when-DS break
   ‘When Mary had a car, it was always breaking.’
   ((✓)SS, ✓DS)

- When the **dative argument** is co-referential with the subject of the other clause, SS is always acceptable. DS is degraded.

(69) Dative argument co-referential with subject of matrix clause

a. *Michelle-at car im-aayiska-t taha-hm-{a/ɔ}*
   Michelle-NOM car DAT-fixed-PRT finish-when-DS
   3.POSS-house go-PST
   ‘When Michelle finished getting her car fixed, she went home.’

b. *naa balili i-hikiya-h-aatok-{oosh/o} tamaasha naksika*
   she car DAT-stand-tNS-because-DS town another
   3.POSS-work-loc-when-DS
   ‘She has a car so she can work in another town.’
   (✓SS, ✓DS)

- Here, switch-reference seems more ‘subject-oriented’: the dative subject controls switch-reference
  - Although it’s still not wholly subject-oriented: the nominative object can control switch-reference too.
Summary

Switch-reference marking on an embedded clause, where the matrix subject is coreferential with the embedded...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canonical transitive</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic EP</td>
<td>DS/SS</td>
<td>DS/SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative-raising</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>DS/SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generalizations:
- The nominative objects of thematic EP and dative-raising can control switch-reference (at least, more easily than an accusative object)
- In thematic EP, a dative subject is more likely to fail to control switch-reference than to control it.

6.3 Switch-reference tracks nominative case

Previous approaches to Choctaw switch-reference:
- Broadwell (1990, 2006): SR tracks subjecthood
  - Munro (1999, 2016): In Chickasaw, subjecthood is more clearly the relevant consideration for SR.

I follow Camacho (2010): if SR cared solely about subjecthood, thematic EP and dative-raising wouldn’t complicate the calculation of SR.

- The SS/DS marker is a determiner sitting atop the embedded clause.
- SS-marking is case concord between the determiner and two coreferential NOM arguments.\(^{26}\)
  - SR markers may in fact be case morphemes—they are homophonous (see Appendix C). See Jelinek (1989); Schütze (1994, 1995); Camacho (2010) for various proposals for unifying case and SR morphemes.

\[^{26}\]A precise implementation of this idea, using the machinery of minimalist Agree, may require Agreement in index features (Arregi and Hanink 2017).

Even more variation

We may see more variation if we look at the impact of:
- Complement vs adjoined clauses
- Extrapoosed vs. non-extraposed clauses
- Clauses with overt vs. covert arguments
- Clauses with vs. without case-marked objects
- Clauses with 1st/2nd-person vs 3rd-person subjects
- Putting the thematic EP/dative-raising verb in the matrix vs. embedded clause.

But setting that aside for now...
When there are two nominative arguments in the embedded clause, as in thematic EP and dative-raising, either can agree with D:

(71)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{CP}
\end{array}
\]

This optionality may be key to understanding the difference in how thematic EP and dative-raising are treated.

- The syntax allows either the subject or object to Agree with clausal D.
- Then, which argument actually agrees with clausal D is subject to discourse and pragmatic factors.\(^{27}\)
  - Dative-raising: more likely that dative subject agrees with D.
  - Thematic EP: more likely that nominative object agrees with D (such that SS-marking with a coreferential dative subject is actually blocked).
- Why this preference in particular? I have no clue.
  
\(\rightarrow\) But see Broadwell (2006:266) for more evidence that SR isn’t entirely syntactic.

7 Conclusions

- ‘Possessor raising’ is not uniform!
  
  - Athematic external possession involves left-branch extraction from a possessed DP (i.e. actual ‘raising’)
  
  - Thematic external possession involves two independent DPs being related at semantic interpretation
- Thematic EP is significantly more restricted than athematic EP. This reflects their different syntax.
- Thematic EP shares a syntactic structure with dative-raising. Evidence:
  
  - They are both compatible only with unaccusatives
  
  - In both constructions, the theme is a nominative object
- Switch-reference does not really look for coreferential subjects, but coreferential nominative DPs.
  
  - Given that thematic EP and dative-raising constructions involve multiple nominatives, this allows for a degree of optionality (and messiness) when interacting with switch-reference.
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### Appendix A: Further issues in external possession

#### A.1 Stacking athematic EP on thematic EP

It’s possible!

\[(72)\] a. *Katahoo*š *imallo*š *chokfi* *imabiikah.*

\[katahoo\-sh \quad t_i \quad im-alla-yat \quad | \quad chokfi \quad im-abiika-h\]

who-NOM 3.POSS-child-NOM rabbit DAT-sick-TNS

‘Whose kid’s rabbit got sick?’

b. *Mary* *at* *imalla* *ofi* *imillih.*

\[Mary-at \quad t_i \quad im-alla \quad | \quad ofi \quad im-illi-h\]

Mary-NOM 3.POSS-child dog DAT-die-TNS

‘Mary’s kid’s dog died.’

\[(73)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{t}_{\text{DP}} \\
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{katahoo-sh} \\
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{X} \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Applic} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{h} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{t}_{\text{DP}} \\
\text{im-alla-yat} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{h} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{chokfi} \\
\text{im-abiika} \\
\end{array}
\]
A.2 The athematic possessor: specifier or adjunct?
I have proposed that the possessor in athematic EP raises to Spec-XP, a placeholder projection (potentially e.g. Spec-TopP, Spec-FinP).

→ But why not an adjunct to TP, as in Broadwell’s analysis?
  
  - Tentative answer: athematic EP is not iterable. The structure in (75c) is *

(74)

a. Athematic EP on thematic EP
   Katahoosh imallayat chokfi imabiikah.
   katalboo-shi [t_i] im-alla-yat | chokfi im-abiika-h
   who-NOM 3.POSS-child-NOM rabbit DAT-sick-TNS
   ‘Whose kid’s rabbit got sick?’

b. Athematic EP with ‘deep’ LBE\(^{28}\)
   Alikchiyat imalla i-choha-k.  
   alikchi-yat [t_i] im-alla-yat | i-chokfi | abiika-h
   doctor-NOM 3.POSS-child 3.POSS-rabbit sick-TNS
   ‘The doctor’s kid’s rabbit got sick.’

c. Double athematic EP
   *Kata-shi [t_i] im-alla-yat | [t_k] i-chokfi | abiika-h
   who-NOM 3.POSS-child-NOM 3.POSS-rabbit sick-TNS
   ‘Whose kid’s rabbit got sick?’

(76) Jan at inka-nat im-o-fi’at iti iyyaat hishi-at ibiito-pat lowa-tok.
        Jan-at in-kan-aat im-ofi’-at iyy-yaat hishi’-at Jan-NOM DAT-friend-NOM DAT-dog-NOM leg-NOM hair-NOM
        ibiito-pat lowa-tok
        end-NOM burn-PERF
        ‘The ends of the hair on Jan’s friend’s dog’s legs are burnt.’
          (Chickasaw, Munro 1999:268)

→ Munro (1999:286): “Elaborated examples like (76) are rare. But almost all speakers freely volunteer sentences containing at least one instance of multiple [possessor raising...]”

A.3 The intransitivity condition
Both thematic and athematic EP can only apply to intransitive predicates:

(77) Thematic EP of a transitive
a. *Mary-akoosh im-oshi-yat ofi’ i-chopa-tok
   Mary-foc.nom 3.POSS-uncle-NOM dog DAT-buy-PST
   (‘It was Mary whose uncle bought the dog.’)  
   (Broadwell 2006:307)

b. *Bill-at alla im-a-noktalha-h
   Bill-NOM child DAT-1SG.DAT-jealous-TNS
   (‘Bill’s kid is jealous of me.’)

(78) Athematic EP of a transitive
a. *Mary-at im-o-fi sa-kopoooli-tok
   Mary-nom 3.POSS-dog 1SG.ABS-bite-PST
   (‘Mary’s dog bit me.’)

• For thematic EP, the intransitivity condition is easy to explain:
  
  - Transitives that involve external arguments (e.g. (77a)) are incompatible with thematic EP (see section 3.6).
  
  - Transitives that involve dative arguments (e.g. (77b)) are ruled out by a general prohibition against a sequences of dative clitics:
(79) *imaabaachi chim-im-anopol-aachi-h
   teacher 2SG.DAT-DAT-talk-FUT-TNS
   (‘I’ll talk to the teacher for you.’)

- But for athematic EP, the intransitivity condition is hard to explain
  - Nothing clearly rules it out in the syntax
    → And if thematic EP sentences count as a transitive, then it is
      possible to do athematic EP on some transitives (Appendix
      A.1).
  - My best explanation: speakers really want to treat a NOM-marked
    DP as a subject (rather than a raised possessor), even where it is
    pragmatically weird (80a) or even syntactically ill-formed (80b).

(80) a. Mary at imalla hoponi-h.
    Mary-at im-alla hoponi-h
    Mary-NOM 3.PASS-child cook-TNS
    *‘Mary’s kid is doing the cooking.’ (EP)
    ‘Mary is cooking her kid.’ (!!)

  b. ?Bill-at im-alla nokshoopa-h
    Bill-NOM 3.PASS-kid scared-TNS
    *‘Bill’s son is afraid.’ (EP)
    ‘Bill is scared of his son.’ (syntactically ill-formed; missing a
     DAT morpheme on verb)

- Your mileage may vary on how satisfying you find this...

A.4 Athematic EP and switch-reference

N.B. This is based on data from a single speaker in a single session, so
     treat with caution!

When the embedded clause contains an athematic EP construction, the
possessor may not control SR:

(81) Athematic possessor co-referential with subject of matrix clause
    John-at im-afi baliili-{na/*cha} j-takpala-tok
    John-NOM 3.PASS-dog run-{and.DS/*and.DS} DAT-call-PST
    ‘John’s dog ran and he called to it.’ (*SS, ✓ DS)

The possessee can and must control SR:

(82) Athematic possessee co-referential with subject of matrix clause
    a. John-at im-afi baliili-{cha/*na} wochi-tok
       John-NOM 3.PASS-dog run-{and.DS/*and.DS} bark-PST
       ‘John’s dog ran and barked.’

    b. John-at im-afi abiika-{cha/?na} illy-1
       John-NOM 3.PASS-dog sick-{and.DS/and.DS} die-TNS
       ‘John’s dog got sick and died.’ (✓ SS, *DS)

Ultimately, I don’t have enough data to draw conclusions at this point.

- It’s also possible that -cha/-na switch-reference markers work differ-
  ently from the others (see Linker 1987).

Appendix B: An argument for the objecthood
of the theme in thematic EP and dative raising,
from the placement of participial phrases

Speakers allow preposing of participial phrases marginally, with a separating
pause:

25
(83) a. Allamat washoohat a¯ttat i¯kana hablitok.
   alla-m-at [wasoo ha-t atta-t ] i¯-kana habli-tok
   child-DEM-NOM play-PRT be-PRT 3.Poss-friend kick-PST
   ‘The kid was playing and kicked his friend.’

b. ?[ wasoo ha-t atta-t ], alla-m-at i¯-kana
   play-PRT be-PRT child-DEM-NOM 3.Poss-friend
   habli-tok
   kick-PST
   ‘While playing, the child kicked his friend.’

However, in thematic EP and dative-raising sentences, the theme happily sits to the right of a participial phrase:

(84) a. Thematic EP
   Suzie at hokchafoochit ofi imillitok.
   Suzie-at [hokchafo-chi-t ] ofi im-illi-tok
   Suzie-NOM hungry-CAUS-PRT dog DAT-die-PST
   ‘Suzie starved her dog and it died.’

b. Dative raising
   Katie at chiloofat chokka i¯tobatok.
   Katie-at chiloofa-t chokka i-toba-tok
   Katie-NOM pay-PRT house DAT-built-PST
   ‘Katie paid to have a house built.’

Takeaway: the theme is not in a subject position.29

29There is an alternative take on this test: participial phrases cannot easily be preposed before the DP that controls their subject. In (83b), the participle is controlled by allamat ‘the child’ and moves in front of it. In (84), however, the participial phrase is controlled by the dative subject, and remains to the left of it. More work is required on this.

Appendix C: case and switch-reference paradigms

The presentation here is taken from Camacho (2010) and extended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR forms</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>case forms</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-k-at</td>
<td>-k-a</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-hm-at</td>
<td>-hm-a</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-km-at</td>
<td>-km-a</td>
<td>DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-oosh</td>
<td>-o¯</td>
<td>-oosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-aatok-oosh</td>
<td>-aatok-o¯</td>
<td>wh-DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ookak-oosh</td>
<td>-ookak-o¯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-cha</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D: ‘object possessor raising’

Choctaw also allows external possession of objects.

- It looks more like what we would expect from European languages: the dative possessor is treated as an object.

(85) a. John at holisso chito a¯hoklih.
   John-at holisso chito a-hokli-h
   John-NOM paper big 1SG.DAT-hold.NG-TNS
   ‘John is holding my book.’

b. Jimmy ishitwashooha imoppaanilitok.
   Jimmy ishitwashooha im-oppani-li-tok
   Jimmy toy DAT-break-1SG.ERG-PST
   ‘I broke Jimmy’s toy.’

We can re-use the same Appl⁰ that we find in thematic EP of subjects.

- The only difference is that here, there is an external argument added on top:
This predicts that EP of objects should have the same kind of restrictions as thematic EP of subjects:

- **Semantic restrictions on predicates?**
  - Many predicates are incompatible with EP of objects. A totally random sample:
    - * Perception verbs (e.g. *pisa* ‘see’, *haklo* ‘hear’)
    - * Motion verbs (e.g. *iya/ilhkooli* ‘go to’, *foloota* ‘visit’)
    - * Transaction verbs (e.g. *chopa* ‘buy’, *ka chi* ‘sell’)
    - * Others: *ahoochi* ‘find’
  - However, given that all of these are eventive (‘stage-level’ w.r.t. the theme), and apply to a [V+theme] (‘unaccusative’) constituent, I think it’s more likely that they violate the semantic restrictions on the interpretation of the possessor...

- **Semantic restrictions on the possessor.**
  - Just as in thematic EP of subjects, EP of objects requires that the possessor be **mentally affected**.

\[ (87) \]

\[ a. \] **Tasibomat hina chanalli amoppanitok.**
\[ tasibo-m-at \quad hina \quad chanalli \quad am-oppani-tok \]
\[ crazy-DEM-NOM \quad car \quad 1SG.DAT-break-PST \]
\[ ‘The crazy fool crashed my car.‘ \]

\[ b. \] **Ili pa ofi chimipitalaachi³.**
\[ ili-pa \quad ofi \quad chim-ipiita-l-aachi-h \]
\[ food \quad dog \quad 2SG.DAT-feed-1SG.ERG-FUT-TNS \]
\[ ‘I’ll feed the food to your dog.’ \]

- **Inanimate possessors are:**

\[ (88) *chokka aapisa i-kooli-li-tok \]
\[ house \quad window \quad DAT-break-1SG.ERG-PST \]
\[ (‘I broke the house’s windows.’) \]

---

\[ ^30 \] *ipiita* ‘feed’ takes two internal arguments. Interestingly, the dative possessor can only be related to the indirect object, not the direct object.