

Talking About Location in Chickasaw^{*}

Pamela Munro

Introduction

Below are some examples of relational noun phrases in the Muskogean language Chickasaw:¹

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|
| (1) | chokka' tikba' | 'the front of the house', '(in) front of the house' |
| | aai'pa' pakna' | 'the top of the table', '(on) top of the table' |
| | kaar apootaka' | 'the side of the car', '(at) the side of the car: beside the car, next to the car' |
| | tali' nota' | 'the underside of the rock', '(at) a location under the rock: under the rock' |
| | holissaapisa' ashaka' | 'the back of the school', '(in) back of the school' |
| | aachompa' anonka' | 'the inside of the store', '(at) a location inside the store' |

As the translations given here suggest, these Chickasaw phrases refer to actual component parts of items, but they can also be used in the specification of locations relative to such items. In the first translation of each phrase, the first word (for example, *chokka'* 'house') is the possessor of the following component part word, a "relational noun" (for example, *tikba'* 'front', an inalienable possession of the possessor 'house'). The second translation presented above is a prepositional phrase, with the possessor specifying the item relative to which location is specified.

The gestalt psychology terms "figure" and "ground" have been used in discussions of the linguistics of space for the located and locating entities since the work of Talmy (1972): for instance, in a sentence like *The man is in front of the house*, *man* is the located figure and *house* is the locating ground. Many of the sentences I will discuss in this paper are more complicated: for example, in *The man is dancing in front of the house*, *house* still is the ground, but the figure seems to be the whole proposition *The man is dancing*. Thus, I will sometimes refer in this paper to grounds, but not to figures.

In the sections below I will present background on Chickasaw, introduce Chickasaw relational nouns, and locate them within a typology of component part locatives (Lillehaugen and Munro 2006, 2008). Even when the Chickasaw phrases name a preposi-

^{*} All data in this paper not otherwise identified are from Chickasaw (cic), a Western Muskogean language spoken in the Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma, with fewer than 100 remaining speakers. Many of the Chickasaw facts presented (though by no means not all!) are discussed in Munro and Willmond (1994), Munro (1999), Munro (2000), Munro (2006a), Munro (2007), and Munro and Willmond (2008).

This paper is for my friend Sarah VanWagenen, with love.

¹ Chickasaw is written in the practical orthography of Munro and Willmond (1994, 2008): in particular, note that nasalized vowels are underlined. I will not comment on regular phonological alternations.

tional-phrase-like location, as in the second translations above, they are still grammatically noun phrases (in contrast to the situation in many other languages described as having relational nouns). As I will show, in Chickasaw sentences such phrases are used only as arguments, never as adjuncts, as is more usual with prepositional phrases. Further, when the ground relative to which location is specified is animate (for instance, to express ‘in front of me’), things get considerably more complicated.

1 Some Background on Chickasaw

Chickasaw is a SOV language with nominative-accusative case marking and very strict lexical transitivity. A transitive verb like *chompa* ‘buy’ in (2), for instance, always takes exactly two arguments, a subject and an object; no more nominals can be included in the sentence. As (2)(a) and (b) show, the accusative marker *-a* is “optional” on an object which immediately precedes the verb.

- (2) (a) Ihoo-at bala’ chompa.
 woman-nom bean buy
 ‘The woman buys beans’²
- (b) Ihoo-at bala’-a chompa.
 woman-nom bean-acc buy

The subject and object arguments in (2) need not appear overtly; as we’ll see in many examples below, Chickasaw is a pro-drop language. Thus, the verb of (2) can be an independent sentence: by itself, *Chompa* means ‘She buys it’, ‘He buys them’, and so on.

Chickasaw also has ditransitive verbs such as those in (3) and (4):

- (3) Ihoo-at chipot-a holisso pisa-chi.
 woman-nom child-acc book see-cs
 ‘The woman shows the book to the child’
- (4) Ihoo-at chipot-a holisso im-a.
 woman-nom child-acc book dat-give
 ‘The woman gives the book to the child’

Pisa-chi ‘show’ is a derived causative of independently occurring *pisa* ‘see, look at’; *im-a* ‘give’ includes the dative applicative prefix *im-*, but the root *-a* does not occur alone.³ Such verbs have two objects, here *chipota* ‘child’ and *holisso* ‘book’. These examples show the most common way a speaker would express these ideas, with ‘child’ before ‘book’ (since in general children are more interesting than books), but it is equally possible for the order of the two objects to be reversed in an appropriate discourse context:

- (5) Ihoo-at holisso-a chipota pisa-chi.
 woman-nom book-acc child see-cs
 ‘The woman shows the book to the child’

² Abbreviations used in the glosses in this paper include acc : accusative, cs : causative, com : comitative, cntr : contrastive, cop : copula, dat : dative, dir : directional, ds : different-subject, hab : habitual, inst : instrumental, loc : locative, mvt : movement, neu : neutral, nom : nominative, nmr : nominalizer, perf : perfective, pl : plural, prox : proximate, pt : past/perfective, rem : remote past, sg : singular, ss : same-subject. A period separates elements of a complex gloss, and clitic boundaries are shown with =.

³ On its own, *a* is a highly defective verb meaning ‘be’.

- (6) Ihoo-at holiss-a chipota im-a.
 woman-nom book-acc child dat-give
 ‘The woman gives the book to the child’

If two objects are specified, the first one must be marked accusative and the second must be unmarked, but there is no logical difference between the two word order possibilities.⁴

Chickasaw has a switch-reference system, meaning that a subordinate clause is marked for whether its subject is the same as or different from that of a following reference clause, as in (7):⁵

- (7) (a) Ihoo-at [bala’ chompa-tokat] ithána.
 woman-nom bean buy-pt.cmp.ss know
 ‘The woman_i knows that she_i bought beans’
- (b) Chipot-aat [ihoo-at bala’ chompa-toka] ithána.
 child-nom woman-nom bean buy-pt.cmp.ds know
 ‘The child knows that the woman bought beans’

Chickasaw has a large number of pairs of same-subject (ss) and different-subject (ds) switch-reference markers; the sentences in (7) use past complement markers. Since third-person subject and object pronominal agreement is unmarked, switch-reference marking is especially useful in third-person contexts, but it is required even when non-third-person agreement⁶ makes it completely redundant, as in (8)(a) vs. (b):

- (8) (a) [Bala’ chompa-li-tokat] ithána-li.
 bean buy-1sI-pt.cmp.ss know-1sI
 ‘I know that I bought beans’
- (b) [Bala’ ish-chompa-toka] ithána-li.
 bean 2sI-buy-pt.cmp.ds know-1sI
 ‘I know that you bought beans’

2 Specifying Locations with Applicatives and Relational Nouns

Chickasaw has no adpositions. In general, the additional sentence participants that would occur in adjunct prepositional phrases in a language like English must be licensed

⁴ Chickasaw has relatively free word order, but any object that does not immediately precede the verb must be marked accusative (Munro 1999). The situation is somewhat different if one of the objects is non-third-person, but I won’t address this complexity here, since causative and applicative sentences in fact behave differently. For more on this, see Munro and Willmond (2008).

⁵ Subordinate clauses are bracketed throughout this paper. I assume here that a case-marked argument that could belong to either the main or subordinate clause (e.g., *ihoo-at* in (7)(a)) belongs to the higher clause.

⁶ Chickasaw has active-stative verb agreement, with three classes of non-third person agreement markers: class I indicates (mainly) active subjects, class II indicates (mainly) stative subjects and objects of (most) transitive verbs, and class III is combined with the dative prefix *im-* to indicate dative/experiencer subjects and objects. However, some uses of the agreement markers must be lexically marked (Munro and Gordon 1982). In the data below, agreement classes are glossed I, II, III; person is glossed as 1, 2; and pronominal number is glossed as s, p. Independent pronouns are very rare in Chickasaw sentences, and seldom appear except to show contrast or discourse functions such as focus or topic.

The same abbreviations for person and number are used for the Zapotec data in section 3.

by applicative prefixes added to the verb (Munro 2000), such as the *im-* dative prefix in (6) or the *aa-* locative prefix in (9):

- (9) Ihoo-at aachomp-a bala' aa-chompa.
 woman-nom store-acc beans loc-buy
 'The woman buys beans at the store'

While (2), with the verb *chompa* 'buy', is a two-argument transitive sentence, (9) is a three-argument ditransitive—containing the locative applicative verb *aa-chompa* 'buy at' and two object nominals—and thus syntactically comparable to (4). A sentence like (10), then, with the order of the two objects in (9) reversed, means the same as (9):

- (10) Ihoo-at bala'-a aachompa' aa-chompa.
 woman-nom beans-acc store loc-buy
 'The woman buys beans at the store'

The locative applicative *aa-* cannot be omitted from Chickasaw sentences like these. Thus, (11)(a) and (b) are not good sentences, and 'store' is interpreted as a patient rather than locative object in (11)(c):

- (11) (a) *Ihoo-at aachomp-a bala' chompa.
 woman-nom store-acc beans buy
 (for 'The woman buys beans at the store')
- (b) *Ihoo-at bala'-a aachompa' chompa.
 woman-nom beans-acc store buy
 (for 'The woman buys beans at the store')
- (c) Ihoo-at aachompa' chompa.
 woman-nom store buy
 'The woman buys the store' (not 'The woman buys it/them at the store')

In addition to the general locative *aa-* and dative *im-*, the Chickasaw applicatives include *a-* 'against', comitative *ibaa-*, instrumental *isht=*,⁷ *okaa-* 'into', and *on-* 'on'. In this paper, I'll be concerned primarily with the use of *aa-*.

With an original intransitive like *taloowa* 'sing' (12)(a), adding the locative applicative produces a derived transitive verb *aa-taloowa* 'sing at', as in (12)(b):

- (12) (a) Ihoo-at taloowa.
 woman-nom sing
 'The woman sings'
- (b) Ihoo-at chokka' aa-taloowa.
 woman-nom house loc-sing
 'The woman sings at the house'

⁷ Unlike the other applicatives, *isht=* is a proclitic, but it otherwise works similarly. See Munro and Willmond (1994, 2008) and Munro (2000) for details.

More specific locations can be identified in Chickasaw sentences with relational nouns like those in (1),⁸ such as *tikba* ‘front’, as in *chokka’ tikba* ‘the front of the house; (in) front of the house’ or *anonka* ‘inside’, as in *aachompa’ anonka* ‘the inside of the store, (at) a location inside the store’. Thus, in (13), *chokka’ tikba* identifies a more specific locative object than in (12)(b), and in (14) the relational noun phrase *aachompa’ anonka* is a more specific accusative-marked first object than *anonka* in (9):

- (13) Ihoo-at chokka’ tikba’ aa-taloowa.
 woman-nom house front loc-sing
 ‘The woman sings in front of the house’
- (14) Ihoo-at aachompa’ anonk-a bala’ aa-chompa.
 woman-nom store inside-acc beans loc-buy
 ‘The woman buys beans in(side) the store’

As noted earlier, the first word in a relational noun phrase (e.g., *chokka* ‘house’ or *aachompa* ‘store’) is the possessor of the following component part word (e.g., *tikba* ‘front’ or *anonka* ‘inside’), in the same structure used generally in Chickasaw for inalienable possession, as in (15), which shows that a third-person possessor simply precedes an inalienably possessed noun (a, c), while a non-third-person possessor is indicated with a pronominal prefix (b, d).⁹

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----|---|
| (15) (a) | ihoo ishki’
woman mother
‘the woman’s mother’ | (c) | chokka’ tikba’
house front
‘the front of the house’ |
| (b) | sa-shki’
lsII-mother
‘my mother’ | (d) | sa-tikba’ ¹⁰
lsII-front
‘my front’ |

Just as with the simple locative nominals in (11), the relational nouns in sentences like (13) and (14) cannot be used to specify locations unless applicative *aa-* appears on the verb:

- (16) *Ihoo-at chokka’ tikba’ taloowa.
 woman-nom house front sing
 (for ‘The woman sings in front of the house’)
- (17) *Ihoo-at aachompa’ anonk-a bala’ chompa.
 woman-nom store inside-acc beans buy
 (for ‘The woman buys beans in(side) the store’)

Therefore, although *tikba* ‘front’, *anonka* ‘inside’, and the other relational nouns in (1) and in the sentences in this section follow the nouns in their phrases, they are not postpositions (Munro 2006a; Lillehaugen and Munro 2006, 2008). Rather, relational noun

⁸ Depending on how you count, Chickasaw has at least 15 of these, most of which have corresponding forms of the sort described in section 5.

⁹ The *sa-* prefix in (15)(c) and (d) is from the II series (see fn. 6).

¹⁰ One might think that since *chokka’ tikba* can be used to specify ‘in front of the house’, as in (12)(c), *sa-tikba* could be used to specify ‘in front of me’, and indeed, some such translations are (regrettably) given for inflected relational nouns in Munro and Willmond’s dictionary (1994). However, such translations generally are not judged as appropriate, at least by conservative speakers, as discussed in section 6.

phrases headed by relational nouns like *tikba'* and *anonka'* are just like the locative nominals without following relational nouns in sentences like (9), (10), and (12)(b), which are licensed in their clauses by the applicative prefixes on the verbs of these clauses. Indeed, the same relational noun phrases can be used as more conventional subject and object arguments in sentences like

- (18) Aachompa' anonk-aat litiha.
 store inside-nom be.dirty
 'The inside of the store is dirty'

- (19) Chokka' tikba' aabi-li-tok.
 house front paint-1sI-pt
 'I painted the front of the house'

The fact that locatives and other elements licensed in Chickasaw sentences by added applicatives are arguments has another consequence: there is a limit on how many nouns may appear in such sentences, regardless of their semantic role, or, to put it another way, there is a limit on how many objects a verb may have. I've never seen a sentence with more than two applicative prefixes, but there are occasional four-argument sentences, such as that in

- (20) Aachompa' anonk-a bala' aa-chin-chompa-li-tok.
 store inside-acc bean loc-2s.III.dat-buy-1sI-pt
 'I bought beans for you at the store'

Chickasaw, then, has what Munro and Gordon (1982) called "low NP density," since it is uncommon for a clause to contain more than one applicative. Below is an example showing how locative and instrumental applicative objects can be introduced in separate switch-reference marked clauses to express a sentence corresponding to a single clause in English:

- (21) Ashila tiwa'sh-li-kat aalhponi' aa-tiwa'sh-li-kat folosh ish=tiwa'sh-li-tok.
 soup stir-1sI-cmp.ss kitchen loc-stir-1sI-cmp.ss spoon inst=stir-1sI-pt
 'I stirred the soup, and I stirred it in the kitchen, and I stirred it with a spoon':
 'I stirred the soup in the kitchen with a spoon'

3 Component Part Locatives in Typological Perspective

One might argue that the applicative prefixes on Chickasaw verbs are in a sense underlyingly the equivalent of adpositions, though I will not pursue this line here. But since Chickasaw does not have any surface postpositions or prepositions, it is typologically very unusual. Peter Svenonius, a specialist in how languages express relational ideas, has written (p.c., 2007) that Chickasaw is "the best example I have seen of a language with no adpositions, and I have been looking."

The data in this section shows that Chickasaw relational nouns are not the same as most elements that have been called relational nouns, particularly in languages of Mesoamerica (Munro 2006a, Lillehaugen and Munro 2006). In a language like Tlacolula Val-

ley Zapotec (TVZ),¹¹ for example, inalienably possessed component or body part words can also be used to specify location. Thus, TVZ *loh* is an inalienably possessed body part ‘face’ in (22)(a), but a preposition ‘on, in front of’¹² in (22)(b) and (c):

- (22) (a) Zagrùu nàa loh mnààa’.
pretty cop face woman
‘The woman’s face is pretty’ (TVZ)
- (b) Bèe’cw zuu loh gyizhi’iilly.
dog neu.stand on chair
‘The dog is standing on the chair’ (TVZ)
- (c) Ri’cy gu-hcbèe’=ëng x:a mo’od r-cah btoony loh laihsdy.
there perf-know=3s.prox how way hab-hang button on clothing
‘There she learned how buttons are put on clothing’ (TVZ)

Chickasaw component part relational nouns and TVZ component part prepositions are very different typologically (Lillehaugen and Munro 2006, 2008; Munro 2006a). First, TVZ prepositional phrases like *loh gyizhi’iilly* ‘on the chair’ and *loh laihsdy* ‘on clothing’ are adjuncts freely added to TVZ sentences without other syntactic changes, while, as we’ve seen, Chickasaw relational noun phrases must be licensed in their sentences.

Second, Chickasaw relational noun phrases function no differently from Chickasaw argument nouns (compare (10) and (13) or (12)(b) and (c))—the relational nouns add specificity but are not necessary for the expression of a general locative idea). In contrast, however, TVZ component part prepositions (just like English ones) are necessary for expressing the locative—thus (23), with the preposition omitted, is ungrammatical:

- (23) *Bèe’cw zuu gyizhi’iilly.
dog neu.stand chair
(for: ‘The dog is standing on the chair’) (TVZ)

TVZ *ri’cy* ‘there’ (seen in (22)(c)) is a demonstrative locative pronoun. Yet another indication that Chickasaw specifications of location are basically nominal is that Chickasaw has no words like *ri’cy*. *Yammako*, the word that expresses ‘there’ in (24)(a), is the same word that expresses the accusative ‘that one’ in (24)(b):¹³

- (24) (a) Yammako aa-taloowa-li-tok.
that.cntr.acc loc-sing-1st-pt
‘I sang there’

¹¹ TVZ (zab) is a Zapotec language (a member of the Otomanguean stock) spoken in the Tlacolula District of central Oaxaca, Mexico. TVZ is known in the Ethnologue (Lewis et al., eds., 2013) as “San Juan Guelavía Zapotec”; I see no reason, however, to privilege a single community in the name of this language, which is spoken throughout the valle de Tlacolula. TVZ data are presented in the orthography of the Munro and Lopez et al. (1999) dictionary of the San Lucas Quiavini dialect of TVZ. (22)(c) is a sentence from a narrative from Munro and Lopez, eds. (in progress), showing a natural use of prepositional *loh*.

¹² By extension *loh* is also used to mean ‘to’ and as a general dative (cf. Lillehaugen 2004). (The full form of the word is *lohoh* when no possessor follows.)

¹³ Other Chickasaw nouns that can specify what seem like adverbial locatives include *aba* ‘up’ (also ‘ceiling’), *akka* ‘down’ (also ‘floor, ground’), and *kochcha* ‘outside’. Like *yammako* and relational nouns, these nouns can be used with nominative and accusative case marking and must be licensed in their clauses. Unlike the relational nouns, however, these words are not possessed.

- (b) Yammako chompa-li-tok.
 that.cntr.acc buy-1sI-pt
 ‘I bought that one’

4 Verbs Subcategorized for Locative Arguments

Verbs like ‘buy’ and ‘sing’ require an added applicative to license a locative argument, but Chickasaw also has verbs that are specified for locatives. For example, weather verbs such as *omba* ‘rain’ are intransitive, with a single argument, a locative subject, as in

- (25) Oklahomm-aat omba-tok.
 Oklahoma-nom rain-pt
 ‘It rained in Oklahoma’

Some locative argument verbs are ditransitive, like *ani* ‘put’, which takes three arguments, a subject, a patient object, and a locational object, here the relational noun phrase *talhpak anonka* ‘(the) inside (of) the basket’.

- (26) Ta’oss-a talhpak anonka’ ish-ani-taam?
 money-acc basket inside 2sI-put-Q.pt
 ‘Did you put the money in the basket?’

The most common type of verb that is subcategorized for a locative object argument, however, is a positional verb, such as *binni’li* ‘sit’, *ti’wa* ‘lie’, *hikki’ya* ‘stand’, or *takka’li* ‘hang’ (Munro 2006b).¹⁴ We don’t need to use these verbs in English locational statements, but they are required in Chickasaw:

- (27) Chokka’ tikba’ binni’li-li.
 house front sit.sg-1sI
 ‘I am (sitting) in front of the house’
- (28) Ofi’-at chokka’ nota’ ti’wa-tok.
 dog-nom house underside lie.sg-pt
 ‘The dog was (lying) under the house’
- (29) Hattak-at kaar apootaka’ hikki’ya.
 man-nom car side stand.sg
 ‘The man is (standing) next to the car’
- (30) Aashoppala’-at aai’pa’ pakna’ takka’li.
 lamp-nom table top hang.sg
 ‘The lamp is (hanging) above the table’¹⁵

¹⁴ Chickasaw has 24 sets of positional verbs specifying different positions and orientations, almost all of which have different forms (fully or partially suppletive) for singular, dual, and triplural (more than two) subjects: for example, *binni’li* is the singular subject form of ‘sit’, *chi’ya* is the dual subject form, and *binoh maa* is the triplural subject form. I give the positional verbs simple glosses like ‘sit’ here, but they are all stative, so better glosses would probably be ‘be sitting’ and so on.

¹⁵ The relational noun phrase *aai’pa’ pakna’* can express both ‘on top of the table’ and (as here) ‘above the table’. Hollenbach (1995) provides a useful discussion of how the meaning of component and body part words is metonymically extended to cover areas projecting from the originally named items, as illustrated for all the relational nouns in these examples. See also Lillehaugen (2006).

As these examples show, the locative applicative *aa-* is generally not used on these verbs when a relational noun phrase appears as their locative argument.¹⁶

Once again, a Chickasaw sentence whose verb is specified for a locative argument need not include a relational noun, as in

- (31) Ofi'-at chokka' tí'wa-tok.
 dog-nom house lie-pt
 'The dog was (lying) at the house', 'There was a dog (lying) at the house'

5 Movement Relational Nouns

Almost all relational nouns have corresponding "moving" nouns formed by the addition of *-ali*.¹⁷

- | | | | | |
|------|----------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|
| (32) | anonka' | 'in' | anonkali' | '(moving in the) inside' |
| | ashaka' | 'back' | ashakali' | '(moving at the) back' |
| | nota' | 'bottom, underside' | notali' | '(moving on the) underside' |
| | pakna' | 'top' | paknali' | '(moving on or over the) top' |
| | taakcha' | 'edge' | takchali' | '(moving on the) edge' |
| | tikba' | 'front' | tikbali' | '(moving in the) front' |

Movement relational nouns are typically used with locational objects of non-directed motion verbs, such as *áa* 'go along' (33), which is subcategorized for a locational object:

- (33) Issosh-at aai'pa' taakchali' áa-tok.
 bug-nom table mvt.edge go.along-pt
 'The bug went along on the edge of the table'

Like the ordinary relational nouns introduced in section 2, these movement relational nouns can also be used in sentences whose verbs with the applicative prefix *aa-*, as in (34):

- (34) Itti' notali'-a ish-aa-lhopoll-a'hi bíyyi'ka.
 tree mvt.underside-acc 1st-loc-go.through-may always
 'You can go through under the tree'

The relational noun object is marked accusative in (34), just as we've seen in many previous cases.

In contrast to the relational nouns exemplified up to now, however, movement relational nouns apparently do not have concrete reference and cannot be used as subjects (which does not seem surprising given their meaning):

- (35) *Aachompa' anonkali-at litiha.
 store mvt.inside-nom be.dirty
 (for 'The inside of the store is dirty'; cf. (18))

¹⁶ Sometimes *aa-* may appear on a positional verb to indicate a different shade of meaning. For example, *aa-tákka'li* (loc-hang) means 'hang from'. Cf. also the discussion in section 6 below.

¹⁷ It's not at all clear what this *-ali* element is! Interestingly, the unpossessed nouns mentioned in fn. 13 may also have movement equivalents, such as *akkali* 'moving down' and *kochchali* 'moving outside'.

6 When the Ground is Animate¹⁸

Many if not most languages that use component part locatives specify animate locations the same way they would specify animate possessors. For example, TVZ *loh* ‘face’, (used as both a body part and a preposition ‘on’ in (22)), is used identically to mean ‘my face’ and ‘on me/myself’ in

- (36) (a) *lù=a’*
face=1s
‘my face’ (TVZ)
- (b) *B-cwàa=a’* *mandi’illy* *lù=a’*
perf-throw=1s apron on=1s
‘I put on the apron’, ‘I put the apron on myself’ (TVZ)

Chickasaw relational nouns work differently, however. While these nouns can be used with normal inalienable possessive marking in possessive constructions, as in (15)(d), to specify location relative to a person or animal (when the ground is animate) a different construction is used, as in (37)(a). *Asashaka* ‘means ‘my back’, but it can’t be used to specify location in a sentence like (37)(b).¹⁹

- (37) (a) *Lynn-at* [*aa-bínni’li-li-ka*] *ashaka’* *bínni’-tok*.
Lynn-nom loc-sit.sg-1sI-cmp.ds back sit.sg-pt
‘Lynn is sitting in back of me
- (b) **Lynn-at* *asashaka’* *bínni’-tok*.
Lynn-nom 1sII,back²⁰ sit-pt

The relational noun phrases in sentences like (37)(a) and the additional examples in (38)-(40) are more complicated than those we’ve seen previously. Rather than just the living creature relative to which location is specified (‘me’, ‘the girl’, ‘you’, and ‘the dog’) and the relational noun, there is a full clause (bracketed) containing a nominative-marked subject and a positional verb (or, as in (37)(a) or (39), a positional verb marked for a non-third-person subject). The person or animal that serves as the ground is the subject of a positional verb in the relational noun phrase, which tells that person or animal’s position or orientation. Thus, more complete translations of these sentences would be ‘Lynn is sitting in back of where I am sitting’, ‘I am sitting in front of where the girl is sitting’, ‘The woman was standing next to where you were standing’, and ‘The cat was sitting in back of where the dog was lying’. The clause specifying the location is center-embedded in (39) and (40)(a), while (40)(b) shows that a location clause can also be extraposed.

- (38) [*Chipota tiik-at* *aa-bínni’li-li-ka*] *tikba’* *bínni’li-li*.
child female-nom loc-sit.sg-cmp.ds front sit.sg-1sI
‘I am sitting in front of the girl’

¹⁸ Some of the data in this section is also discussed in Munro (2007) and in unit 15 of Munro and Willmond (2008).

¹⁹ As noted in fn. 10, sometimes a speaker may feel that translations like ‘in back of me’ for *asashaka* ‘are “easy,” but the same speaker may feel that using *asashaka*’ in a sentence like (37)(b) is wrong.

²⁰ A comma is conventionally used in the gloss ‘1sII,back’ (in (37)(b)) to indicate that the first item (the 1sII prefix *sa-*) is infixed into the second (*ashaka* ‘back’).

- (39) Ihoo-at [ish-aa-híkki'ya-ka] apootaka' híkki'ya-tok.
 woman-nom 2sI-loc-stand.sg-cmp.ds side stand.sg-pt
 'The woman was standing next to you'
- (40) (a) Kowi'-at [ofi'-at aa-tí'wa-ka] ashaka' bínni'-tok.
 cat-nom dog-nom loc-lie.sg-cmp.ds back sit.sg-pt
 'The cat is sitting in back of the dog'
- (b) [Ofi'-at aa-tí'wa-ka] kowi'-at ashaka' bínni'-tok.
 dog-nom loc-lie.sg-cmp.ds cat-nom back sit.sg-pt

The full relational noun phrase in (40) is²¹

- (41) [ofi'-at aa-tí'wa-ka] ashaka'
 dog-nom loc-lie.sg-cmp.ds back

Literally, then, (41) is 'in back of where the dog is/was lying'. (40) would be different if the dog's position was different:

- (42) (a) Kowi'-at [ofi'-at aa-bínni'li-ka] ashaka' bínni'-tok.
 cat-nom dog-nom loc-sit.sg-cmp.ds back sit.sg-pt
 'The cat was sitting in back of (where) the dog (was sitting)'
- (b) Kowi'-at [ofi'-at aa-híkki'ya-ka] ashaka' bínni'-tok.
 cat-nom dog-nom loc-stand.sg-cmp.ds back sit.sg-pt
 'The cat is sitting in back of (where) the dog (was standing)'

There is a different-subject switch-reference marker *-ka* on the positional verbs here,²² perhaps appropriately given that the subject of 'lie' ('dog') is different from the subject of the higher clause, 'cat'. Note, then, that the animate being relative to which location is specified in English is not the possessor of the relational noun. Moreover, it is better not to think of the animate being as the ground: as the literal translations above suggest, the actual ground is the location in which the animate being assumes a particular position.

Since positional verbs are generally not marked with locative *aa-*, why is there an *aa-* on the positional verbs in (38)-(40)? *Aa-* is generally used in 'where' clauses, as in

- (43) Chihoow-aat chokfalhpoo**bapiisachi'** alhih-a [chipota aa-tí'wa-ka]
 God-nom shepherd bunch-acc child loc-lie.sg-cmp.ds
 im-oktani-chi-ttook.
 dat-appear-cs-rem
 'God revealed to the shepherds where the child was (lying)'

Indeed, *aa-* is used in many locative nominalizations, such as (44)(a) (seen in several early examples) and (b) (which uses a punctual form of the positional verb *bínni'li*):

- (44) (a) aa-chompa-'
 loc-buy-nzr
 'store' ('where one buys')
- (b) hattak aa-binohli-'
 person loc-sit.pl-nzr
 'living room' ('where people sit down')

²¹ Sometimes, as we'll see in (45)(b) below, nominative marking on the subject of the positional verb is absent.

²² Occasionally speakers omit the different-subject marking in these constructions.

It turns out that it is possible to use the more complex “animate” locative construction even with inanimate grounds, as in (45)(b) (more literally ‘I laid the money behind where the chair was standing on four legs’):

- (45) (a) Ta’oss-a aaombinili’ ashaka’ pit=bohli²³-li-tok.
 money-acc chair back dir=lay-1sl-pt
 ‘I laid the money behind the chair’
- (b) Ta’oss-a [aaombinili’ aa-wáyya’a-ka] ashaka’ pit=bohli-li-tok.
 money-acc chair loc-be.on.four.sg-cmp.ds back dir=lay-1sl-pt

(This example shows that the subject of the bracketed positional clause need not always be nominative-marked.) I suggested above that the reason that the bracketed clause is marked with a different-subject switch-reference marker is that the positional verb (here, *wáyya’a* ‘be on four legs’) has a different subject (‘chair’) from the main verb *bohli* ‘lay’ clause, whose subject is ‘I’. However, consider (46), in which both the positional verb of the lower clause and the main verb have the subject ‘I’:

- (46) (a) Ta’oss-a [aa-bínni’li-li-ka] ashaka’ pit=bohli-li-tok.
 money-acc loc-sit.sg-1sl-cmp.ds back dir=lay-1sl-pt
 ‘I laid the money behind me’, ‘I laid the money behind where I was sitting’
- (b) *Ta’oss-a [aa-bínni’li-li-kat] ashaka’ pit=bohli-li-tok.
 money-acc loc-sit.sg-1sl-cmp.ss back dir=lay-1sl-pt

The lower verb must still be marked for different-subject (46)(a); same-subject marking, as in (46)(b), was judged unacceptable. (When I asked about this, my Chickasaw teacher Mrs. Willmond commented, “They’ll understand, but it’s not right.”)

Such sentences, then, must actually have a structure more like ‘I caused the money to lie in back of where I was sitting’. By this analysis, there is another clause between the main clause and the ‘sit’ clause. This middle clause has as its subject ‘money’, which is different from both the higher and the lower ‘I’ subjects. Indeed, *bohli* ‘lay’ is functionally the causative of the positional verb *tí’wa* ‘lie’ (28), but they are not paradigmatically related, so any such connection must be at an abstract level.

The animate ground data described in this section thus provide additional syntactic support for a biclausal analysis of both morphological and lexical Chickasaw causatives, such as that argued for in Munro (1983).

7 Conclusion

In this paper I have surveyed the expression of locative arguments of many types in Chickasaw, a language with no surface adpositions. While some verbs (intransitive, transitive, or ditransitive) are specified for locative arguments, most verbs must have those arguments licensed by added applicative markers. Finer specifications of location can be achieved by using relational nouns (body or component part words) as the heads of the locative argument phrases. A derived class of relational nouns do not appear to have concrete reference, but otherwise work similarly.

²³ *Bohli* ‘lay’, like *ani* ‘put’ in (26), is a ditransitive verb specified for a singular patient object and a second locative object. *Pit=* is a directional proclitic whose appearance has no direct connection with valence.

Chickasaw is thus typologically different from most other languages in which body and component part words are used in specification of location, in that in those languages the body and component part words function not as “relational nouns,” but as adpositions, introducing adjuncts into their sentences.

Sentences with animate grounds use a complex structure whose analysis supports a biclausal analysis of Chickasaw causative verbs, even if they are not morphologically derived.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to my teacher and collaborator Catherine Willmond and the other Chickasaw speakers who have taught me about their wonderful language, as well as my collaborator Felipe H. Lopez and the other speakers who have shared the TVZ language with me. I also thank Brook Lillehaugen and Peter Svenonius for generous earlier input. Members of the UCLA American Indian Seminar, John Dyson, Brook Lillehaugen, and Carson Schütze made other helpful comments.

References

- Hollenbach, Barbara E. 1995. Semantic and Syntactic Extensions of Body Part Terms in Mixtecan: The Case of ‘Face’ and ‘Foot’. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 61:168–190.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Seventeenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Lillehaugen, Brook Danielle. 2004. Is Valley Zapotec *lohoh* a Dative Marker? Presented at the First Conference on Otomanguean and Oaxacan Languages, Berkeley.
- Lillehaugen, Brook Danielle. 2006. *Expressing Location in Tlacolula Valley Zapotec*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.
- Lillehaugen, Brook Danielle, and Pamela Munro. 2006. Prepositions and Relational Nouns: Toward a Typology of Component Part Locatives. Presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Boston.
- Lillehaugen, Brook Danielle, and Pamela Munro. 2008. Hacia una tipología de locativos de partes. In *Memorias: IX Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noroeste, Tomo 2*, ed. by Rosa María Ortiz Ciscomani, 231–252. Hermosillo, Sonora: Editorial Unison.
- Lopez, Felipe H., and Pamela Munro (eds.). In progress. *X:a Mo’od Bìe’d Ra Bìunny Sann Lu’uc Lohs Aa’nngl: Zapotec Immigration Narratives [How People of San Lucas Came to Los Angeles]*. Ms.
- Munro, Pamela. 1983. Comitatives and Causatives in Chickasaw and Choctaw. In *Proceedings of the 1982 Conference on Far Western American Indian Languages*, ed. by J. E. Redden, *Occasional Papers on Linguistics* (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) 11:32–41.

- Munro, Pamela. 1999. Chickasaw Subjecthood. In *External Possession*, ed. by Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi, 251–289. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Munro, Pamela. 2000. The Leaky Grammar of the Chickasaw Applicatives. In *The Proceedings from the Main Session of the Chicago Linguistic Society's Thirty-Sixth Meeting*, ed. by A. Okrent and J. P. Boyle, 285–310. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Munro, Pamela. 2006a. From Parts of Speech to the Grammar. In *Perspectives on Descriptive Grammars*, ed. by Thomas Payne and David Weber, special issue of *Studies in Language* 30(2):307–350. Reprinted 2007 in *Perspectives on Grammar Writing*, ed. by Thomas E. Payne and David J. Weber, 71–112. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Munro, Pamela. 2006b. Chickasaw Positional Verbs. Presented at the 2006 meeting of the Society for the Study of Indigenous Languages of the Americas, Boston.
- Munro, Pamela. 2007. Specifying Animate Grounds with Chickasaw Relational Nouns. Presented at the 2007 meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest, Denver.
- Munro, Pamela, and Lynn Gordon. 1982. Syntactic Relations in Western Muskogean: A Typological Perspective. *Language* 58:81–115.
- Munro, Pamela, and Catherine Willmond. 1994. *Chickasaw: An Analytical Dictionary*. Norman/London: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Munro, Pamela, and Catherine Willmond. 2008. *Let's Speak Chickasaw: Chikashsh-anompa' Kilanompoli'*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1972. *Semantic Structures in English and Atsugewi*. UC Berkeley Ph.D. dissertation.

Affiliation

Pamela Munro
Department of Linguistics
UCLA
munro@ucla.edu