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Chickasaw and Choctaw have a highly productive comitative derivational prefix ibaa- which can be added to most Chickasaw and Choctaw verbs to add an 'along with' argument:

(1a) Hattak-at hilha. 'The man dances'
     man-subj dance

b) Hattak-at ihoo ibaa-hilha. 'The man dances (along) with the woman'
     man-subj woman with-dance woman

The noun phrase introduced with ibaa- is a syntactic object, but interpretation of its semantic role in sentences which contain an additional NP can pose problems for a lexical study. In this paper I will examine the syntax and semantics of ibaa- arguments, showing that a unified account of them is possible when their interaction with causative verbs is considered.

The examples above are from Chickasaw; except as noted below, the Choctaw facts are similar. In both languages, -at is a subject case marker, and objects (also called "obliques" or "non-subjects" in the literature) are most often unmarked. The added comitative NP in a sentence like (1b) is treated syntactically like any other object, as shown by examples like (2), which contain first- and second-person (i.e., non-zero) pronominal agreement affixes:

(2a) Hattak ibaa-hilha-li. 'I dance with the man'
     man with-dance-1st

b) Hattak-at sa-baa-hilha. 'The man dances with me'
     man-subj 1st-2nd with-dance

(Verb-initial i always drops after a short vowel.) The Roman numeral I is used here to gloss the set of affixes which most often mark the subjects of active verbs, and II is used for the prefixes which most often mark the subjects of non-active or non-volitional verbs and the objects of many transitives. (For a fuller description of the complex lexical facts and a justification of the syntactic relation "subject", see Munro and Gordon (1982).) Chickasaw and Choctaw do not have semantically specified oblique case marking -- ibaa- is one of several affixes which can make explicit the semantic relationship of an added argument to its verb.

All ibaa- verbs take the same agreement marking -- I for subjects, II for objects -- regardless of the normal pattern of the non-ibaa verb. Hilha 'to dance' takes a I subject whether or not ibaa- is used, as shown by (2a) and (3):

(3) Hilha-li. 'I dance'
     dance-1st

Nokhanglo 'to be sad', however, which normally calls for a II subject, takes I subject marking when used with ibaa-, as in (4):

(4) Nokhanglo ibaa-hilha-li. 'I am sad (along) with the man'
     man with-dance-1st
(4a) Sa-nokhanglo. 'I am sad'
    lslI-sad

b) Hattak ibaa-nokhanglo-li. 'I am sad with the man'
    man   with-sad-lsl

c) Hattak-at sa-baa-nokhanglo. 'The man is sad with me'
    man-subj  lslI-with-sad

A sa- prefix on nokhanglo (4a) indicates the subject of 'sad', but a sa-
on the derived verb ibaa-nokhanglo (4c) shows the 'with' argument.

There is no difficulty in interpreting any of the ibaa- sentences
above, since the original verbs are intransitive. When ibaa- is added
to a transitive verb, however, a problem arises. Consider the English
sentence

(5) I killed Tom with Bill.

-- a typical exemplification of syntactic vagueness. Does (5) mean that
Bill and I together killed Tom, or that I killed both Tom and Bill?
Chickasaw and Choctaw comitative sentences also allow varying inter-
pretations, but of a different sort.

There are "subject comitatives", in which the ibaa- argument is a
semantic co-subject -- in other words, it has the same semantic relation
(typically, but not always, that of an agent) to the verb as the syntac-
tic subject does:

(6a) Bill-a Tom ibaa-abi-li-tok      'I killed Tom with Bill', i.e. 'I
    -obl with-kill-lsl-past and Bill killed Tom'

b) Patty-at Tom sa-baa-abi-tok.    'Patty killed Tom with me', i.e.
    -subj  lslI-with-kill-past    'Patty and I killed Tom'

(6a) is a two-object sentence whose phrasal structure is similar to that
of causative sentences or those with indirect objects. It is common but
by no means obligatory for the first object noun in such sentences to be
marked with an ending like the general oblique marker -a. Speakers
sometimes translate the subjects of ibaa-plus-active verb sentences as
enablers -- thus (6a) could be 'I helped Bill kill Tom'. In addition to
abi 'to kill', nahllhi 'to shoot', isso 'to hit', ithana 'to know', imi
'to give', and apila 'to help' are among the verbs whose ibaa- argument
can be interpreted only as a co-subject, never as a co-object. (So (6a)
cannot mean 'I killed Tom and Bill too'.)

The ibaa- forms of many other Chickasaw and Choctaw transitive
verbs are ambiguous or vague in their interpretation, apparently, it
seems, in much the same way as the English expression in sentence (5).
Here is an example:

(7) Bill-a Tom ibaa-hilha-sh-li-tok.
    -obl  with-dance-caus-lsl-past

    'I made Tom dance with Bill' -- i.e. either 'Bill and I made Tom
dance' or 'I made Tom and Bill dance'.

Hilha-chi 'to make dance' is a derived causative formed with the suffix
-chi (which can reduce to -sh-). In a sentence like (7), the ibaa- argu-
ment ('Bill') can fill the semantic role of either the subject (here, the
one who causes the dancing) or the object (the one who dances). Other
verbs which allow both co-subject and co-object interpretations of an ibaa- argument include nowa-chi 'to make walk', hoppi 'to bury', bohli 'to lay down', inkatabli 'to trap', and pilachi 'to send'.

Toksali-chi 'to make work' is another causative verb which allows only a co-object interpretation of its ibaa- argument:

(8) Bill-a Tom ibaa-toksali-sh-li-tok, -obl with-work-caus-lsl-past

'I made Tom work with Bill' -- i.e. 'I made Tom and Bill work together', never 'I helped Bill make Tom work'

There are, then, three possible ways to interpret an ibaa- argument of an original transitive verb -- as a semantic co-subject, a semantic co-object, or in either way. Given a Chickasaw or Choctaw transitive verb, can the semantics of its ibaa- form be predicted, or must the meanings of all such ibaa-verbs be listed in the lexicon?

Speakers sometimes favor the co-object interpretation of certain verbs in the variable interpretation group, but toksali-chi 'to make work' is the only verb I have found which allows just this reading. Probably there has been a fairly recent lexical specification, perhaps because of the inherent asymmetry of the idea of 'make work' -- usually there are more workers than bosses, so there is little need for a verb referring to several making one work. With this one exception, all ibaa-transitives fall into two groups: those like abi, which allow only the co-subject interpretation of their ibaa- argument, and those like hilhachi, which allow both co-subject and co-object interpretations.

There are no significant generalizations concerning the specific features (animacy, volitionality, and so on) of the subjects and objects of transitives in the two different groups, or aspectual or other features of the two sets of verbs. However, some connection with causation (originally hypothesized by Lynn Gordon) seems clear, since, for instance, no -chi causative falls in the first group (co-subject interpretation only).

In both Chickasaw and Choctaw the -chi causative suffix is almost completely productive, though for certain verbs it must be lexically specified as -chichi:

(9) losa 'to be black'  ishto 'to be big'

losa-chi 'to make black'  ishto-chichi 'to make big'

Like ibaa- verbs, -chi causatives take I subject / II object agreement, regardless of the normal subject marking of the original non-causative:

(10a) Chi-hilha-chi-li-tok.  'I made you dance'
     2sI1-dance-caus-lsl-past

b) Chi-nokhanglo-chi-li-tok.  'I made you sad'
     2sI2-sad-caus-lsl-past

The subject of a -chi verb is always the causer, indicated with I affixes. Even though hilha 'to dance', for instance, normally marks its subject, the dancer, with I affixes, the dancer in (10a) is the cause-object, and so is indicated with a II prefix.

Since an ibaa- form of a -chi causative has the structure
ibaa - VERB - chi,

we can see why there are two possible interpretations of the ibaa- argument. If we think of the string as an ibaa- form of a transitive verb that just happens to be causative, then ibaa- has wider scope than -chi, as schematized in

ibaa - [VERB - chi].

Then this ibaa- verb will be like intransitive ibaa- verbs and the ibaa-forms of verbs like abi, whose ibaa- arguments are interpreted as co-subjects, arguments in the same semantic role as the subject. In other words, the co-subject interpretation occurs when -chi is in the scope of ibaa-.

However, suppose -chi has wider scope than ibaa-:

[ibaa * VERB] - chi.

Then we have a causative of a transitive verb whose subject and object are both doing the same thing with each other (consider the semantics of (2a) and (4) above). Thus, the ibaa- argument names someone who, like the other object, is made to do the action of the original verb -- this is the co-object interpretation of the causative verb.

The basic interpretation of an ibaa- argument, then, is that of a semantic co-subject, as seem with the intransitive and non-causative transitive verbs. The unusual structure of ibaa-plus-chi verbs, in which either a derivational prefix or a derivational suffix can have greater scope, explains the dual interpretation possible for the ibaa- arguments of these verbs alone.

There is at least one other construction in which a PREFIX-VERB-chi structure may have either PREFIX-[VERB-chi] or [PREFIX-VERB]-chi scope relations; surprisingly, this case involves prefixes which are clearly inflectional, the set of II prefixes whose use as markers of the subjects of generally stative verbs and as object markers was described above.

When -chi or -chichi causativizes a transitive verb, the causer-subject is marked with a I affix, just as with the causatives derived from intransitives in (10):

(11) Patty-a Bill isso-chish-li-tok. 'I made Patty hit Bill'
   -obl hit-caus-llI-past

A II prefix on the causative verb can name the causee or "downstairs subject" -- the hitter, with the verb isso-chichi -- just as with the causative forms of intransitives, as in (10). However, as (12) shows, the II prefix can also refer to the "old" object of the causativized verb -- the hittee, in the present case:

(12) Patty-at Bill sa-soo-chish-tok. 'Patty made me hit Bill', 'Patty
   -subj lSIII-hit-caus-past made Bill hit me'

Such cases of ambiguity involving the interpretation of a pronominal agreement affix are truly rare in Chickasaw. This one can be understood, however, in the same way as the ibaa-plus-chi case described above.

The 'Patty made me hit Bill' reading for (11) is the expected one, corresponding to the intransitive case in (10), with the II prefix marking the causee. This is the PREFIX-[VERB-chi] case. When the prefix
is in the scope of -chi, however as [PREFIX-VERB]-chi we get the 'Patty made Bill hit me' reading. Here, -chi marks the causation of the complex event 'hitting me'.

Ibaa-plus-chi verbs have a further interesting feature derived from the ambiguity of scope seen in (12). Sentences like (13) actually have a third reading in addition to the two suggested by the discussion of (7) above:

(13) Bill-at Tom sa-baa-hilha-sh-tok.
    -subj lsi1-with-dance-caus-past
    'Bill made Tom dance with me' (i.e. Bill helped me),
    'Bill made me dance with Tom' (i.e. I danced with Tom),
    'Bill made Tom dance with me' (i.e. Tom danced with me)

The first reading is the standard co-subject interpretation of the ibaa-argument (corresponding to the first one given for (7) above). The second reading, which corresponds to the second reading for (7), is that in which sa- marks the causee, the one who 'dances with'. This could be used, for example, if Tom was already dancing, and Bill made me join him. The third reading could be used in the reverse situation, if Tom was made to join me in the dance. It is this reading which illustrates the [PREFIX-VERB]-chi scope discussed earlier, since in this reading sa- marks the object of the original non-causative verb ibaa-hilha.

In sentences like (13), sa- can be analyzed either as the object of ibaa-hilha 'to dance with' or as the object of ibaa-hilha-chi 'to make dance with'. In the second example of wide -chi scope I will present, however, there is no ambiguity.

Reflexives in Chickasaw and Choctaw are verbal -- derived reflexive verbs are marked with the prefix ili-, and always take I subject marking:

(14) ili-sso-li. 'I hit myself'
    refl-hit-1s1

Reflexives of causatives formed from intransitive verbs present no problems:

(15) ili-nokhanglo-chi-li. 'I make myself sad'
    refl-sad-caus-1s1

In each case, the reflexive controller is the subject indicated by the I agreement affix.

However, this is not the case with reflexives of causatives formed from intransitive verbs:

(16) Tom ili-sso-chish-li-tok. 'I made Tom hit himself'
    refl-hit-caus-1s1-past

Sentence (16) cannot mean 'I made myself hit Tom' (presumably the expected reading with the I-marked argument as controller) nor even 'I made Tom hit me'.

Here is a case of [PREFIX-VERB]-chi scope which allows no other interpretation, even though there is no other case in the language in which the reference of a reflexive prefix is not controlled by the I subject of the ili-marked verb. For Chickasaw, there appears to be no possibility of another scope relationship, even where the wide -chi scope
reading is semantically implausible. This is not the case, incidentally, in Choctaw, where (17) is fully acceptable:

(17) CHOCTAW Oka ili-shko-chichi-li-tok, 'I made myself drink the water refl-drink-caus-lsl-past water'

In general, the wide -chi scope interpretation is preferred in Choctaw sentences like (16), but wide ili- scope is allowed in (17), probably because of the anomaly of 'I made the water drink itself' (which, however, is the only possible reading of the Chickasaw equivalent of (17)).

Thus, it is common for -chi to have wide scope over the preceding verbal string, even when it includes inflectional prefixes. Since ibaa- seems fairly clearly to be derivational (there is no single-clause paraphrase for ibaa- verbs), we might expect that it would be even more likely to be included within the scope of -chi -- which may explain the prevalence of the wide-scope co-object reading common for ibaa-plus-chi verbs.

But the ibaa-plus-chi analysis doesn't solve the whole problem, as a reconsideration of the list of verbs in the variable interpretation group will demonstrate. Among these verbs are hoppi 'to bury', inkatabli 'to trap', and bohli 'to lay down', which include neither -chi nor any segmentable 'make', as well as verbs like pilachi 'to send', which, although it ends in chi, is not a causative in Chickasaw.

The possibility of interpreting the ibaa- argument of -chi causatives as a semantic co-object has spread to various other groups of Chickasaw and Choctaw verbs which formally or functionally resemble -chi causatives.

Verbs like hoppi and inkatabli are members of lexical verb pairs like those in

(18) wakaa 'to fly' wakiili 'to make fly'
pasa 'to be cut thin' pasli 'to cut thin'
inkatapa 'to be trapped' inkatabli 'to trap'
tiwa 'to open (intr.)' tiwwi 'to open (tr.)'
holoppi 'to be buried' hoppi 'to bury'
altota 'to be paid' atobbi 'to pay'

Most of the verbs in the second column are historically derived from those in the first by suffixation of -li (a reflex of the Proto-Muskojean transitive auxiliary described by Haas (1977)). -Li suffixation may combine with vowel change or deletion plus assimilation (Nicklas 1972, Ulrich 1982; comparatively, cf. Haas 1946). Such relationships are idiosyncratic and in no way productive, but speakers appreciate and syntactically exploit the connection between the members of such pairs, treating similarly additional pairs of verbs like the last two in (18), in which l or lh is infixed in the first-column verb.

Verbs like those in the first column have been labeled "lexical passives" in the literature (e.g. by Munro and Gordon (1982)), and it is true that many of them take II subject marking and often have a stative interpretation, with the second-column verbs being more active. However, examples like tiwa/tiwwi and wakaa/wakiili suggest that the basic relationship might be better seen as a causative one. Whatever the ultimate analysis of paired verbs, it is not surprising that speakers
choose to treat the transitive members of many such pairs as causatives for the purpose of ibaa- interpretation. Not all "second-column" members of verb pairs can receive both co-object and co-subject interpretations of their ibaa- arguments, but many can, and this phenomenon appears to be spreading gradually through the lexicon.

Bohli 'to lay down', named above as another verb which allows both co-subject and co-object interpretations of an ibaa- argument, ends in -li but has no synchronic intransitive counterpart. However, bohli is certainly perceived as a causative verb by contemporary Chickasaw speakers, since it serves as the suppletive causative of ti'wa 'to lie', which is the only important positional verb in the language which does not have a derived causative in -li.

Thus, the possibility of multiple interpretation of an ibaa- argument, which arises because of the ambiguity of scope in ibaa-plus-chi causatives, has been extended to a variety of other sorts of verbs which are also perceived to be in a true causative relation, not in terms of some arbitrarily assigned semantic feature, but within the synchronic grammar of the language.16

The cases considered so far illustrate how the multiple interpretation possibility for the ibaa- arguments of -chi causatives has spread to other verbs which functionally resemble -chi causatives. In addition, multiple interpretation is also used for verbs which resemble the -chi causatives only formally, and which are not grammatical causatives (with corresponding non-causatives) at all. Because of their formal similarity to the -chi causative verbs, other transitive verbs which end in chi can receive both co-object and co-subject interpretations of an ibaa- argument, even though they are not causative verbs. An example is pilachi 'to send', which is not a synchronic causative -- there is no Chickasaw verb *pila. Since pilachi ends in chi, however, its ibaa- argument can receive either a co-subject or a co-object interpretation.

The prefix ibaa-, then, adds a comitative argument in the same semantic role as the subject of the verb to which it is attached. This co-subject interpretation is possible with any ibaa- argument, even that of a causative verb formed with the suffix -chi.17 However, the causative suffix -chi tends in a number of constructions to have wider scope than prefixes on the causativized verb. When -chi has wide scope in an ibaa- verb, the ibaa- argument is interpreted as a co-causee, filling the same semantic role as the "old" subject of the causativized verb -- in other words, a semantic co-object of the derived causative. So ibaa- arguments of -chi causatives may have either their expected semantic co-subject interpretation or, in the case where -chi has wide scope, that of a semantic co-object. This dual possibility of interpretation has spread from the -chi causative verbs to other types of causatives, which resemble the -chi causatives in function, and to other verbs ending in the string chi, which resemble the -chi causatives in form.18

Footnotes

1. I would like to thank Lynn Gordon for her helpful comments on this paper, and Catherine Willmond, as always, for the Chickasaw tutelage. Thanks too to Josephine Wade for her patient help with Choctaw, to the other speakers of both languages in Oklahoma who have shared
their judgments with me, and to the many people who have considered the problem described here with me -- especially Winfried Boeder and the students in my Winter 1982 Linguistics 114a class. The work on which this paper is a brief report has been supported by the Academic Senate and Department of Linguistics of U. C. L. A.

2. The two languages are certainly very similar, and have been described as dialects (most recently by Pulte (1975)). There are numerous phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical differences between them, however -- for instance, Mrs. Wade occasionally substitutes iibi for ibaa-, while Mrs. Willmond rejects iibi- verbs unconditionally.

For a general background on Chickasaw, see Munro and Gordon (1982). Some relevant facts on Choctaw are in Nicklas (1972) and Davies (1981).

The examples in this paper are in practical orthography. For consonants, I follow standard Choctaw orthographies (Nicklas 1972), except that the phonemic glottal stop in Chickasaw is written with '. Long vowels are written double, and nasalized vowels are underlined.

3. With few exceptions, independent pronouns are only emphatic or contrastive in both Chickasaw and Choctaw.

The pronominal affixes used at various points in the text and footnotes include

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 singular (1s)</td>
<td>-li</td>
<td>sa-</td>
<td>an-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 singular (2s)</td>
<td>ish-</td>
<td>chi-</td>
<td>chin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 singular (3)</td>
<td>(zero)</td>
<td>(zero)</td>
<td>in-/im-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 plural (2p)</td>
<td>hash-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are Chickasaw; the Choctaw morphemes are just about the same. (III agreement is described in footnote 8 below -- the n's in the forms above are assimilated from underlying m's. For more details, and the missing forms, see the sources named in footnote 2.)

4. The others are the locative prefix aa- and the instrumental clitic isht-, as discussed in Munro and Gordon (1982).

5. Only the ibaa- argument triggers pronominal agreement -- thus (6b) cannot mean 'I killed you with Tom'. (There is no way to say this in one clause.) However, the surface order of the object nouns in two-object sentences like (6a) is not fixed, so (6b) might be translated 'I killed Bill with (helping) Tom'. Out of context, the translation in the text would be favored, since the first surface object in such sentences is generally the one in the same grammatical role as that which can be indicated by pronominal agreement on the verb -- here, the ibaa- argument.

6. I should note explicitly that these paraphrases, and those using 'help' above, are intended only as aids to interpretation. Chickasaw and Choctaw use complex sentences to express literally both nominal conjunction and complement structures like 'help to'.

7. This is noted for Choctaw by Byington (1870: 347), though I can find no support for the semantic distinction he reports, nor for any other. The only apparent generalization is that all verbs that take -chichi have a heavy next-to-last syllable. But it is by no means the case that all verbs with heavy penults select -chichi as their causative marker, as examples like nowa-chi 'make walk' or homna-chi 'make red' illustrate.
8. This is an oversimplification. There is a third type of subject agreement in Chickasaw and Choctaw which will not be considered in the text: III agreement (typically often "dative"; cf. Munro and Gordon (1982)). An example is the verb in-takho'bi 'to be lazy' (III markers are never zero, even in the third person, and III subject verbs are cited with the III prefix), as in

(i) An-takho'bi, 'I am lazy'
1sIII-lazy

The -chi causative form of an intransitive verb which takes a III subject has a I subject (causer) and a III object (causee):

(ii) Chin-takho'bi-chi-li, 'I make you lazy'
2sIII-lazy-caus-lsI

However, this is not the case for ibaa- forms of the same verbs:

2sII-with "in"-lazy-1sI 1sII-with "in"-lazy
'I am lazy with you' 'He is lazy with me'

The III prefix in- remains bound to the stem takho'bi even when ibaa- is prefixed. As stated in the text, the ibaa- argument is always marked with a II prefix.

9. Incidentally, sentence (13) cannot mean 'Bill made me dance with Tom', where Tom is a co-subject (i.e. 'Tom helped Bill make me dance'), because in such a case sa- would mark the object of hilha-chi. Because sa- occurs directly before ibaa-, it must mark an argument of a verbal string which includes ibaa-, either ibaa-hilha or ibaa-hilha-chi.

10. In fact there is another case where the subject of a sentence does not control ili- reflexivization, where the possessor of a reflexive subject is "raised" (cf. Munro and Gordon 1982) to subject, as in

(v) Hoo-at hattak-at im-ili-bi-tok. 'The woman had her hus-
woman-subj man-subj 3III-refl-kill-past band kill himself'

In sentences like (v) the derived subject controls III agreement on the verb and there can be no I-marked argument.

11. Exactly the same -chi scope facts hold for reciprocal sentences, which are formed (with plural subjects only) with the prefix itti- (the it is lost after a I prefix). Here is an example:

(vi) Hash-ti-bi-sh-tok. 'You all made them kill [or, idiomatically,
2p1-rcp-kill-caus-past 'fight'] each other'

Normally, the second-person plural I prefix hash- plus the reciprocal means only 'you all did it to each other', but no reading like 'You all made each other fight' is possible for (vi).

12. Notice that sa- (and, in this use, other II prefixes), ili-, and ibaa- are all object-related. Causative -chi cannot have wide scope over a preceding I subject prefix:

(vii) Ish-hilha-chi. 'You make him dance', never 'He makes you dance'
2sI-dance-caus

There is phonological evidence for a significant boundary between the I prefix and the other sorts of prefixes named above.
13. See footnote 6. The complex sentences referred to there, however, contain an explicit 'and' or 'help'. There is no way to capture the general comitative sense of 'with' except by using ibaa-.

14. Continuing the topic of footnote 8, in-katapa/in-katabli is an example of a verb pair whose intransitive member has a III subject and whose transitive member uses I subject / III object agreement.

15. It is not clear whether the association between -li suffixation and 1/1h infixation has obscured all analytical distinction between these two processes. Possibly 1/1h infixation is remotely associated with something more like passivization, while -li suffixation is more strongly causative. (I have found no 1/1h verbs which seem really "active".) However, a causative relationship certainly exists between 1/1h verbs and their "second column" correspondents.

I am grateful to the members of my 1981-82 U.C.L.A. Choctaw field methods class, especially Charles Ulrich, Andreas Wittenstein, and Michael Hammond, for stimulating my thinking about verb pairs and causatives.

16. There are a number of transitive verbs ending in li, it should be noted, which have no synchronic non-causative ("first column") correspondents -- examples include kisili 'to bite', halalili 'to pull', nannabli 'to swallow', and halili 'to touch'. No verb of this type can receive a co-object interpretation of its ibaa- argument, since it is not a synchronic grammatical causative.

17. With the exception, of course, of the verb toksalig-chi 'to make work', which was discussed in the text. Mrs. Willmond has said, in fact, that a co-subject interpretation of the ibaa- argument of toksalig-chi probably "is there" (her phrase for grammatical utterances which are for some reason difficult to contextualize).

18. When I presented this paper in Santa Cruz, Wallace Chafe raised the provocative question of whether the ibaa-plus-causative interpretation process might have spread from the lexical -li causatives to the -chi causatives, rather than in the direction I argue for in the text. True, -li causatives are less productive, look more archaic, and may well be in some sense "older", but the ibaa- prefix seems like a relatively recent development (Booker (1980) does not reconstruct a Proto-Muskogean source for it), so the relative age of the two causative patterns is probably immaterial. If the dual ibaa- argument interpretation is derived, as I argue, from a scope difference, it seems most likely that such a difference would have been most readily perceived by speakers in the case of an ibaa-VERB-SUFFIX string with a clearly segmentable causative suffix. The -li suffix has in many cases merged with the stem it follows and is not easily segmentable or even, probably, perceived: the causative meaning in -li verbs is paradigmatic rather than analytic. So the -chi verbs would have been more likely to have served as the starting point for a dual scope interpretation. Still another argument is that the dual interpretation has spread in two directions from the -chi causatives -- to verbs which resemble them only in function and to those which resemble them only in form. As footnote 16 above makes clear, transitive verbs which formally resemble the -li verbs but which are not synchronic grammatical causatives do not receive the dual ibaa- interpretation.
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PREFACE

Unfortunately, everyone who presented a paper at the 1982 Conference on Far Western American Indian Languages was not able to prepare a final version for inclusion in this volume. All the papers in this volume were presented in an earlier version at the 1982 workshop. The papers are arranged in the order they appeared on the program.

The participants of the conference gratefully acknowledge all the work done by Professor William Shipley and his students, which made the conference run so smoothly and enjoyably. We also wish to thank the Center for Syntactic Research at the University of California, Santa Cruz, for the support of the conference, without which the conference would not have been possible.

Copies of the 1977, 1978, 1980, and 1981 workshop proceedings are still available from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901. The volumes of the 1973 and 1976 workshops, which appeared in the SIU-C series, University Museum Studies, and of the 1979 workshop, which appeared in the OPOL series, are now out of print, but copies may be obtained in microfiche or hard bound volumes from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3250 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, DC 20007.

The 1983 Hokan Languages Workshop will meet at The University of California, San Diego, June 16-18, 1983.

James E. Redden, Editor
Carbondale, July 1983
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