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1 Introduction

• Choctaw:
  – Western Muskogean, closely related to Chickasaw
  – Spoken in Mississippi (>5000 speakers, all ages) and Oklahoma (<500 speakers, older generations)
  – This talk concerns the Mississippi dialect, and contradicts some existing literature (Davies 1986, Ulrich 1986, Broadwell 1990, 2006).
  – Data from original fieldwork with 9 native speakers (3 in particular) since 2017.

• There are up to three different ways of showing that an intransitive subject has a possessor:¹

(1) Possessor remains inside subject

John imoofiyat abiikah.

[John im-ofi-yat] abiika-h
[John 3.POSS-dog-NOM] sick-TNS
‘John’s dog is sick.’

¹Underlining on vowels indicates nasalization. I have adopted a slightly modified version of Broadwell’s (1990, 2006) orthography, in which I do not mark pitch accent unless it performs a grammatical function, nor do I mark final glottal stops unless they perform a grammatical function and are clearly audible.

(2) “Possessor raising” (2 variants)

a. John at ofi imabiikah.
  John-at ofi im-abiika-h
  John-NOM dog DAT-sick-TNS
b. John at imoofi abiikah.
  John-at im-ofi abiika-h
  John-NOM 3.POSS-dog sick-TNS
  ‘John’s dog is sick.’

For these latter two constructions, we can show that the possessor and possessee do not form a constituent:

(3) a. John at pilaashaash imofiyat illih.
  John-at pilaashaash im-ofi-yat illi-h
  John-NOM yesterday 3.POSS-dog-NOM die-TNS
  ‘John’s dog died yesterday.’ (Broadwell 2006:304)
b. John at pilaashaash ofi imillih.
  John-at pilaashaash ofi im-illi-h.
  John-NOM yesterday dog DAT-die-TNS
  ‘John’s dog died yesterday.’

Proposal:

• The examples in (2a-b) are not just surface variants of the same underlying structure (as assumed by e.g. Broadwell 1990, 2006).

• They are associated with different syntactic structures, deriving different morphological and semantic properties too.

  – In (2a), the possessor is base-generated externally to the possessee, and receives its own thematic role.
  – In (2b), the possessor is base-generated inside the DP with the possessee, raises out, and receives no extra thematic role.

• Therefore only the (2b) type could accurately be called ‘possessor raising’.

  → I distinguish (true) ‘possessor raising’ from ‘thematic external possession’.
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2 About Choctaw

• Complex verbal morphology:
  (4) Issataalowaachaachimomahog?
  is-sa-taalowaa-ch-aachj-momah-o
  2SG.ERG-1SG.ABS-sing-CAUS-FUT-still-TNS-Q
  ‘Are you still going to make me sing?’

• Pervasive argument-drop:
  (5) Michichih.
  pro pro pro michi-chi-h
  do-CAUS-TNS
  ‘She made him do it.’

• Rigid SOV order, NOM/ACC case:
  (6) Imaabachiyat allama imanopolitok.
  imaabachi-yat alla-m-a im-anopolitok
  teacher-NOM kid-DEM-ACC DAT-talk-PST
  ‘The teacher talked to that kid.’

• ‘Dative agreement’:²

(7) Anaakoosh botta amihaksitok.
  anaak-oosh botta am-ihaksi-tok
  I.FOC-NOM flour 1SG.DAT-forget-PST
  ‘I forgot the flour.’

3 Two different structures

• I distinguish thematic external possession from true possessor raising, based on work by Deal (2013, 2017).

(8) Thematic external possession³
  a. John-at ofi im-abiika-h
     John-NOM dog DAT-sick-TNS
     ‘John’s dog is sick.’
  b. 
     \[ \text{TP} \]
     \[ \text{DP} \]
     \[ \text{John-at} \]
     \[ \text{VoiceP} \]
     \[ \text{T} \]
     \[ \text{-h} \]
     \[ \text{ApplP} \]
     \[ \text{Voice} \]
     \[ t_{DP} \]
     \[ \text{VP} \]
     \[ \text{Appl} \]
     \[ \text{im} \]
     \[ \text{DP} \]
     \[ \text{V} \]
     \[ \text{ofi} \]
     \[ \text{abiika} \]

• The possessor is merged in an Appl(licative)P, where it receives a thematic role.⁴
  – On Spec-AppP as the locus of external possessors, see Cuervo (2003), Kallulli (2006), Bosse et al. (2012), Wood and Marantz (2017) a.m.o.

• The possessor subsequently moves to the canonical subject position.

²Broadwell and Martin (1993), Tyler (to appear, 2018) argue that dative ‘agreement’ forms are actually instances of clitic-doubling, but the distinction is not relevant here.

³This 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.

⁴I assume that the possessor binds a variable in the possessee (Guéron 1985, Borer and Grodzinsky 1986, Hole 2004).
(9) (True) possessor raising
\[a. \text{John-at im-ofi abiika-h} \]
\[\text{John-}\text{NOM 3.POSS-dog sick-TNS}\]
\[\text{‘John’s dog is sick.’}\]

b. 

\[\text{XP} \]
\[\text{DP} \]
\[\text{John-at} \]
\[\text{TP} \]
\[\text{X} \]
\[\text{DP} \]
\[\text{t} \]
\[\text{DP} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{im-ofi} \]
\[\text{VoiceP} \]
\[\text{T} \]
\[\text{abiika-h} \]

- The possessor is merged internally to the subject DP, and receives no additional thematic role.
- The possessor subsequently raises out of the subject DP to a case position above the canonical subject position (here, Spec-XP).

3.1 Relation to previous work
- Broadwell’s (1990, 2006) analysis of all subject possessor raising (see also Baker 2015 for a similar analysis):

(10)

\[\text{TP} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{John-at} \]
\[\text{TP} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{t} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{N’} \]
\[\text{im-abiika} \]

- This structure is essentially what I propose for (true) possessor raising (9), but is not a good fit for thematic external possession (8).
- N.B. There is some inter-speaker variation. See Appendix A.

Up next: differences between the two constructions, and how they fall out of our syntactic structures.

4 Deriving some properties of the structures
This section:
- Morphological differences
- A syntactic difference
- Semantic differences
4.1 Morphological differences

4.1.1 Possessive morphology on possessee

(11) a. Thematic EP: no POSS morpheme
   John-at ofi im-abiika-h
   John-NOM dog DAT-sick-TNS

b. Possessor raising: POSS morpheme present
   John-at im-ofi abiika-h
   John-NOM 3.POSS-dog sick-TNS

• This follows from the analysis:
  – In thematic EP, the possessor and possessee never form a constituent.
  – In possessor raising, they do form a possessed-DP constituent, prior to movement.

(12) a. Thematic EP
   VoiceP
   ApP Voice
   DP Possessor
   VP
   Possessee

b. Possessor raising
   TP
   DP tDP...
   DP Possessor
   NP D
   Possessee

• Support for the claim that only possessor raising involves left-branch extraction:
  – Left-branch extraction always leaves behind a POSS morpheme:

   (13) Katah-o chikayati {ji} hina chanali oppani-tok?
       katah-o chi-kana-yat {t}_i {j}-hina chanali oppani-tok
       who-ACC 2SG.POSS-friend-NOM *(3.POSS)-car break-PST
       ‘Whose car did your friend wreack?’

• N.B. This makes it unlikely that a ‘movement-to-θ-position’ analysis is correct (cf. Lee-Schoenfeld 2006, Rodrigues 2010).

4.1.2 Dative morphology on verb

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

b. Possessor raising: no DAT morpheme
   John-at im-ofi abiika-h
   John-NOM 3.POSS-dog sick-TNS

• This follows from the analysis:
  – In thematic EP, the possessor is an argument of (the extended projection of) the verb. It triggers verbal agreement.
  – In possessor raising, the possessor is not an argument of the verb/its extended projection. It does not trigger verbal agreement.
Support for thematic EP structure: Choctaw has several other oblique-subject constructions where the subject triggers dative agreement:\(^5\)

5. This fits with work showing that external possession is one of several possible interpretations of Appl-introduced arguments (Bosse et al. 2012, Wood 2015, Wood and Marantz 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSS on possessee?</th>
<th>thematic EP</th>
<th>possessor raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\)Appendix B discusses the similarities between thematic EP and other dative-raising constructions in more detail.

### POSS = DAT?

The two morphemes share a paradigm:

\begin{align*}
\text{am-} & \text{-ofi} & \text{‘my dog’} \\
\text{am-} & \text{-ihaksi} & \text{‘I forgot’} \\
\text{chim-} & \text{-ofi} & \text{‘your dog’} \\
\text{chim-} & \text{-ihaksi} & \text{‘you forgot’} \\
\text{pim-} & \text{-ofi} & \text{‘our dog’} \\
\text{pim-} & \text{-ihaksi} & \text{‘we forgot’}
\end{align*}

→ They are likely the same element (a generalized oblique-argument-introducing functional head or dative clitic), but I gloss them separately here since they perform different functions.

### 4.2 Syntactic differences

\begin{align*}
\text{(17) a. Thematic EP} & \quad \text{b. Possessor raising} \\
\text{DP} & \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{Possessor} & \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
\text{VoiceP} & \quad \text{T} \\
\text{ApplP} & \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{Appl} \\
\text{DP} & \quad \text{Possessee} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{D} \\
\text{t}_{\text{DP}} & \quad \text{t}_{\text{DP}} \\
\end{align*}

- In thematic EP, we expect the possessee to **fail** subjecthood tests.
- In possessor raising, we (possibly) expect the possessee to **pass** subjecthood tests.
  - Although the possessee is not the highest argument in its own clause here.
• One subjecthood test: ability to associate with the extrinsic plural marker *okl(ah)* (Broadwell 2006, Tyler to appear).

• How it works: plural subjects may associate with *okl(ah).

(18) 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 hapi-nokshoo-pa-t taha-h.
PL 1PL.ABS-scared-PRT finish-TNS
‘We’re done being scared.’

• ...but plural objects may not associate with *okl(ah).*

(19) 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 an argument’s (in)ability to associate with *oklah* to diagnose the status of the possessee in thematic EP and possessor raising.

(20) a. Thematic EP: *okl(ah)* cannot associate with possessee

Alikchi-yat 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. Possessor raising: *okl(ah)* can associate with possessee (%)

*John at imoofi oklah abiiakah.*
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 possessor raising, the possessee is (some kind of) a subject

• These findings are consistent with the proposed structures.

4.3 Semantic restrictions on predicates

• The structures again:

(21) a. Thematic EP

b. Possessor raising

• We can interpret these results to mean...

  – thematic EP is very semantically restricted, in terms of the available predicates and the available types of possession relation.
  – possessor raising is compatible with any (intransitive) predicate, and any possession relation.

• This contrast falls out of the constructions’ different syntax.

---

6There is a caveat, which is that *okl(ah)* can associate with clitic-doubled objects (i.e. 1st and 2nd-person objects). See Tyler (to appear) for discussion of the conditions on *okl(ah)*-licensing.

7Some speakers do not allow *oklah* to appear before a verb in an possessor raising sentence, under any reading.
4.3.1 Thematic EP imposes an extra thematic role on the possessor

- The structures again:

(22) a. Thematic EP

```
TP
  DP
  VoiceP
  T
  ApplP
  Voice
  tDP
  VP
  Appl
  tDP
  DP
  V
  DP
  Possessee
```

b. Possessor raising

```
XP
  DP
  Possessor
  VoiceP
  T
  ApplP
  Voice
  tDP
  NP
  D
  tDP ...
```

- Spec-ApplP being a T-position, the possessor should receive an extra thematic role in thematic EP, but not in possessor raising.

- We can test for this extra thematic role using inanimate possessors:

(23) a. Thematic EP

```
*chokka-m-at okkisa im-oppolo-h
house-DEM-NOM door DAT-broken-TNS
(The house’s door is broken.)
```

b. Possessor raising

```
Chokkamat imokkisa oppoloh.

chokka-m-at im-okkisa oppolo-h
house-DEM-NOM 3.Poss-door broken-TNS
(The house’s door is broken.)
```

→ EP cross-linguistically tends to impose a ‘(mental) affectedness’ interpretation on the possessor (e.g. Hole 2004, 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.

4.3.2 Thematic EP is restricted to unaccusatives

- Thematic EP is restricted to a set of unaccusative predicates. Unergative predicates are banned:

(24) Thematic EP

```
a. Mary at ofi imillitok.
Mary-at ofi im-illi-tok
Mary-NOM dog DAT-die-PST
‘Mary’s dog died.’

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

→ The compatible set of unaccusatives includes illi ‘die’, abiika ‘be sick/get sick’, oppolo ‘be broken/break’, kaniya ‘be lost/go away’, and is subject do dialectal/idiolectal variation.

---

8 We also expect dead possessors to be incompatible with the thematic EP construction, but I have so far been unable to test this.

10 (25a) does in fact have an available meaning: ‘the doctor ran away from the dog’. Here, the dat-referenced argument is the dog, rather than the doctor, and the doctor is interpreted as the agent of the predicate.
Possessor raising is compatible with unaccusative and unergative predicates:

(25) Possessor raising
   a. *Mary at imoofi illitok.
      Mary-NOM 3.POSS-dog die-PST
      ‘Mary’s dog died.’
   b. *Alikchiyat imoofi baliilitok.
      doctor-NOM 3.POSS-dog run-PST
      ‘The doctor’s dog ran.’

The ban on unergatives with thematic EP arises because unergative subjects are introduced above Spec-AppP.

– The derivation in (26) is ruled out because it violates standard syntactic locality restrictions (e.g. Relativized Minimality, MLC).

(26) Thematic EP with unergative predicate (impossible)

How solid is the ban on unergatives?

• Examples like these show up sometimes in the Choctaw literature and often in the Chickasaw literature:

(27) The unaccusativity restriction in Chimwiini
   a. Maana Ø-fur-ile miimba.
      1.child 3SG-swell-PST 9.stomach
      ‘The child’s stomach swelled.’
      (Chimwiini, Henderson 2014:302)
      1.child 3SG-run-PST 4.feet
      ‘The child’s feet ran.’
      (Chimwiini, Henderson 2014:302)

• Very tentative proposal: In Chickasaw and older/Oklahoma Choctaw, possessors can be introduced in a ‘very high ApplP’—we might want to call it a VoiceP—which sits above VoiceP (cf. Rivero 2009 on Bulgarian, Kim 2012 on English).
4.3.3 Thematic EP is restricted to stage-level predicates

- Thematic EP is restricted to a set of stage-level unaccusatives. Individual-level unaccusatives are uniformly incompatible: 11

(29) Thematic EP

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

b. *Ohooyo-yat ofi i-homma-h
   woman-NOM dog DAT-red-TNS
   (‘The woman’s dog is red.’)

- As expected, possessor raising is compatible with these verbs:

(30) Possessor raising

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

b. Ohooyoyat imofi hommah.
   ohooyo-yat im-ofi homma-h
   woman-NOM 3.POSS-dog red-TNS
   ‘The woman’s dog is red.’

- The ban can be stated as a selectional restriction between adjacent heads Appl0 and V0, as in (31a).

- No such restriction is possible with possessor raising, since no selectional restriction can hold between V and the specifier of one of its arguments, as shown for an external argument in (31b).

(31) a. Thematic EP

   VoiceP
   ApplP Voice
   DP Possessor VP Appl
   DP Possessee V

b. Possessor raising (pre-raising)

   VoiceP
   DP Possessor NP D
   VP Possessee

- Further support for the role of selection in restricting the availability of thematic EP: dialectal/idioclectal variation in which stage-level predicates are compatible.
  - E.g. %hokchafo ‘be hungry/get hungry’, %showa ‘stink’.
  - Aaron Broadwell, p.c.: a Choctaw speaker accepted homma ‘be red’ with thematic EP, but it meant that the possessee was becoming redder, i.e. a stage-level interpretation was coerced.

4.4 Summary

Some distinctions between thematic EP and possessor raising:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>thematic EP</th>
<th>possessor raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSS on possessee?</td>
<td>N12</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>

11Interestingly, even in Chickasaw, where the thematic-EP-like construction is compatible with a much larger set of verbs, including unergatives, 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 compatible with the (true) possessor raising construction.

12See Appendix C for some exceptional cases.
These distinctions reflect different syntactic structures:

(32) a. Thematic EP

b. Possessor raising

Up next: “possessor raising” of objects (and why it’s more like thematic EP than true possessor raising).

5 Object “possessor raising”

• The phenomenon is similar to what we find in European languages: the dative possessor is treated as an object.

(33) a. John at holisso chito a-hoklih.
   John-at pro holisso chito a-hokli-h
   ‘John is holding my book.’

b. Jimmy ishitwashooha imoppanilitok.
   Jimmy ishitwashooha im-oppani-li-tok
   ‘I broke Jimmy’s toy.’

• We can see from (33) that the morphological character of these constructions is like thematic EP rather than possessor raising:
  – DAT morphology on verb.
  – No POSS morphology on possessee.

• What about the semantic properties of the construction?

• 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/ihkooli ‘go to’, foloota ‘visit’)
  – Transaction verbs (e.g. cho¯pa ‘buy’, ka¯chi ‘sell’)
  – Others: ahoochi ‘find’
• Acceptable examples tend to involve the possessor being (mentally) affected by the event:

(35) a. Tasi¯bomat hina chanalli amoppanitok.
   tasibo-m-at hina chanalli am-oppani-tok
crazy-DEM-NOM car 1SG.DAT-break-PST
   ‘The crazy fool crashed my car.’

b. Ili¯pa ofi chimipiitalaachi¯h.13
   ili¯pa ofi chim-ipita-l-aachi¯-h
food dog 2SG.DAT-feed-1SG.ERG-FUT-TNS
   ‘I’ll feed the food to your dog.’

• Inanimate possessors are *:

(36) *chokka aapisa i¯-kooli-li-tok
   house window DAT-break-1SG.ERG-PST
   (‘I broke the house’s windows.’)

• The affectedness requirement restricts the availability of object EP in the right direction (for instance, by ruling out perception verbs—see e.g. Landau 1999). But it doesn’t rule everything we want to rule out.
  – There is likely a role for selection: external-possessor-introducing Appl may still only appear with a idiosyncratic, restricted set of verbs.

6 Conclusions

• “Possessor raising” in Choctaw is not uniform.
  – True possessor raising involves left-branch extraction from a possessed DP to a case position above the canonical subject position (i.e. actual ‘raising’).
  – Thematic external possession involves a possessor DP being merged independently of the possessee DP, and receiving its own thematic role in the extended projection of the verb.

• More generally, we should be careful how we talk about EP/PR:
  – Statements like “External possession in Language X works like this” are fairly common.
  – But there’s no reason why a language should be restricted to just one strategy!

• As-yet-unexplored avenues for cross-linguistic comparison:
  – ‘Construction A’ and ‘Construction B’ in Bulgarian (Cinque and Krapova 2009).
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6.1 A puzzle: the intransivity condition

- Both thematic EP and possessor raising can only apply to intransitive predicates:

(37) *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.’)

(38) *Possessor raising of a transitive
   *Mary-at im-ofi sa-kopooli-tok
   Mary-NOM 3.Poss-dog 1SG.ABS-bite-PST
   (‘Mary’s dog bit me.’)

- For thematic EP, the intransitivity condition is fairly easy to explain:
  - Transitives that involve external arguments (e.g. (37a)) are incompatible with thematic EP (see section 4.3).
  - Transitives that involve two internal arguments (e.g. (37b)) are ruled out by a general prohibition against sequences of dative clitics:

(39) *imaabaachi chim-im-anopol-aachi-h
    teacher 2SG.DAT-DAT-talk-FUT-TNS
    (‘I’ll talk to the teacher for you.’)

- But for possessor raising, the intransitivity condition is hard to explain—nothing obviously rules it out in the syntax.14

- A possible explanation: the raised possessor occupies a DP-licensing position, depriving the object of one.

14See Appendix D for an intriguing exception, where possessor raising out of a thematic EP possessor is possible.
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Appendix A: inter-speaker variation

- There is some variation in judgments of possessor raising, mainly with respect to the availability of (true) possessor raising.
- Many speakers treat the two types of possessor raising differently—these are the judgments reported below.
- Some speakers (2 consultants) are reluctant to accept possessor raising (in elicitation contexts). The conditions on the acceptability of thematic EP sentences are the same as for other speakers.
- One speaker (mid-30s) accepted possessor raising sentences with the same predicates where thematic EP is acceptable.
  - Instructive to compare with Chickasaw: Munro (1999, 2016) treats the two patterns as essentially surface morphological variants.
- There is no doubt systematicity to this variation—for future work!

Appendix B: other transitives with dative subjects

- Section 4.1.2 discussed three other constructions where there is dative agreement with the subject.
- Thematic EP shares other properties with these constructions, including...
- Optional nominative case on the theme:

\[
\text{(40) a. Thematic EP} \\
\quad \text{katos-(at) am-illi-h} \\
\quad \text{cat-(NOM) 1SG.DAT-die-TNS} \\
\quad \text{‘My cat died.’} \\
\text{b. Predicative possession} \\
\quad \text{katos-(at) a-lawa-h} \\
\quad \text{cat-(NOM) 1SG.DAT-many-TNS} \\
\quad \text{‘I have a lot of cats.’} \\
\text{c. ‘Indirect causer’ constructions} \\
\quad \text{a-hina chanalli-(yat) am-aayiska-tok} \\
\quad \text{1SG.POSS-car-(NOM) 1SG.DAT-fixed-PST} \\
\quad \text{‘I got my car fixed.’} \\
\text{d. ‘Affected experiencer’ constructions} \\
\quad \text{towwa-(yat) am-ittola-tok} \\
\quad \text{ball-(NOM) 1SG.DAT-fall-PST} \\
\quad \text{‘I dropped the ball.’} \\
\]

- Restriction to unaccusatives:

\[
\text{(41) #Shayla-at im-alla i-hoponi-tok} \\
\quad \text{Shayla-NOM 3.POSS-child DAT-cook-PST} \\
\quad \text{‘Shayla cooked for her kid.’} \\
\quad \text{‘Shayla got her kid to cook.’} \quad \text{*indirect causer reading} \\
\quad \text{‘Shayla had her kid cook (for her).’} \quad \text{*experiencer reading}
\]
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Theme cannot associate with extrinsic plural marker okl(ah) (no data for indirect causer constructions):

(42) a. Predicative possession
ofi-yat (*okl=) am-asha-h
dog-NOM (*PL) 1SG.DAT-be-TNS
‘I have a lot of dogs.’

b. ‘Affected experiencer’ constructions
katos alhi̱i̱ha-t (*okl=) im-ittola-tok
cat PL-NOM (*PL) DAT-fall-PST
‘She dropped the cats.’

Appendix C: Marking both possessive and dative morphology

• Sentences like (43) are occasionally seen (though speakers I asked rejected them in elicitation contexts):

(43) a. Mary akoosh imooshiyat ikaniiyatok.
Mary-FOC-nom 3.POSS-uncle-NOM DAT-leave-PST
‘It was Mary whose uncle passed away.’ (Broadwell 2006:305)

b. John at imoofi imillitokoosh, nokhakoosh binniilih.
John-nom 3.POSS-child-NOM DAT-die-SS sad-SS
‘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:

(44) 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)

Appendix D: Stacking possessor raising on thematic EP

• It’s possible!

(45) a. Katahoosh inallayat chokfi imabiikah.
katahoo-sh |t|t i alla-yat | chokfi imabiika-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, |t|t imalla | ofi imilli-h
Mary-NOM 3.POSS-child dog DAT-die-PST
‘Mary’s kid’s dog died.’
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Appendix E: External inalienable possessors

- Possessor raising behaves predictably with inalienable possessors:

(47) a. Chokfimat haksobis falaayah.
   chokfi-m-at haksobis falaaya-h
   rabbit-DEM-NOM ear long-TNS
   ‘That rabbit has long ears.’

b. Kiiyo, chishnakoosh chinoshkoboyat chitoh.
   kiyo, chishnak-oosh chi-noshkobo-yat chito-h
   no you.FOC-NOM 2SG.POSS.INALIEN-head-NOM big-TNS
   ‘No, YOU are the one with the big head.’

- Note that there is no overt POSS morpheme on the possessee in (47a) because the inalienable possession paradigm is Ø for 3rd-person.


(48) *(sa)-ibbak-at sa-basha
    *(1SG)-hand-NOM 1SG.ABS-cut
    ‘My hand got cut.’

- Here, the verb is marked with absolutive rather than dative agreement morphology, and the possessee must retain its possessive morphology.

- It is uncertain if this should even be considered apiece with thematic EP. More research is required.

- Interestingly, in many languages, only inalienable possessors may participate in external possession constructions, e.g. French (Kayne 1975), English (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992), Korean (Yoon 1990).