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1 Introduction
Passive of ditransitive, or unaccusative with applicative:

(1) VoiceP
   Voice
   NP
   ... 
   NP
   ...

Part of why this configuration is interesting to syntacticians:
→ Which internal argument becomes the subject? (terminology from McGinnis 2008)

(2) a. **Advancing**
   b. **Skipping**

• Theoretical consequences:
  − Licensing can be **microparametric**—can vary at the lexical item level.
  − Licensing is its own relation, not entailed by Agree or Case-assignment (cf. Sheehan and Van der Wal 2018).

Roadmap:
§2 Background on Choctaw
§3 Applied arguments on non-active verbs
§4 Analysis: licensing and non-licensing Appl’s
§5 Advancing and skipped-over applicatives cross-linguistically
§6 Conclusion

• Choctaw has advancing and skipping configurations.
• Advancing vs. skipping depends on the thematic role of the applied argument.
• Analysis:
  − Some Appl’s license their specifier—results in **skipping**.
  − Other Appl’s fail to license their specifier—results in **advancing**.

Preview of talk

(3) a. **Advancing**
   b. **Skipping**
2 Background on Choctaw

- Western Muskogean language, spoken in Mississippi and Oklahoma.
- Examples and data here come largely from:
  - fieldwork conducted in Pearl River, MS and Bogue Chitto, MS, 2017-2019.
  - published sources (mainly Broadwell 2006).
  - unpublished Mississippi Choctaw lexicon project.
- Important orthographical note! Underlined vowels (a¯ i¯ o¯) are nasalized (/ã ˜ı ŵ/).

2.1 Basic syntactic properties

- Head-/f_inal, rigid SOV.
- NOM/OBL case-marking:

(4) alíkchi-yat alla-m-a masaali-ch-aachi¯-h doctor-NOM child-DEM-OBL heal-CAUS-FUT-TNS

‘The doctor will heal that kid.’

- Pervasive argument drop:

(5) pro pro pro im-aa-tok
    DAT-give-PST

‘She gave it to him.’


(6) SubjP
    Subj
    NP VoiceP

→ Active alignment: an NP’s agreement marking correlates (in part) with its thematic role:

(7) a. chishnaak-oosh taposhshik ish-ikbi-h
    you.FOC-NOM basket 2SG.ERG-make-TNS
    ‘YOU make the baskets.’

b. chishnaak-oosh nipi chi-nna-h-o¯?
    you.FOC-NOM meat 2SG.ABS-want-TNS-Q
    ‘DO YOU want the meat?’

c. chishnaak-oosh sholosh chi-kaniiya-h
    you.FOC-NOM shoe 2SG.DAT-lose-TNS
    ‘YOU lost the shoes.’

Next—the two key ingredients for the analysis:

§2.2 Non-active verbs
§2.3 Applied arguments

2.2 Non-active verbs

Choctaw has a causative alternation:

(8) a. hattak-m-at aayíshko kooli-tok
    man-DEM-NOM cup smash.ACT-PST
    ‘That man smashed the cup.’ [active]

b. aayíshko-t kooli-tok
    cup-NOM smash.NACT-PST
    ‘The cup smashed.’ [non-active]

- The morphological form of the active and non-active are root-conditioned:

(9) a. i. bash-li ‘she cut it’
    ii. bash-a ‘it got cut’ [-li/-a]

b. i. tapaski-li ‘she narrowed it’
    ii. tapaski-Ø ‘it is narrow’ [-li/-Ø]

c. i. takaa-chi ‘she hung it (sg.)’
    ii. takaa-li ‘it hung (sg.)’ [-chi/-li]

d. i. a<ch>chifa ‘she washed it’
    ii. a<ch>chifa ‘it got washed’ [-Ø/<l>]}
The interpretation of the non-active is root-conditioned:

(10) a. i. koo-li 'she smashed it'
    ii. koow-a 'it smashed' [non-active = inchoative]
    b. i. fam-mi 'she whipped him'
    ii. fam-a 'he got whipped' [non-active = passive]
    c. i. lohm-i 'she hid it'
    ii. lom-a 'she hid (herself)' [non-active = reflexive]

Analysis: active/non-active Voice heads merge directly with VP:

(11) a. VoiceP
    NP
    VP
    Theme
    Voice
    [ACT]
    V
    [NACT]

2.3 Applied arguments

Applied arguments are indexed by DAT agreement or [ABS agreement + APPL prefix]:

(12) a. DAT agreement
    Mary-t a-taloowa-tok.
    Mary-NOM 1SG.DAT-sing-PST
    Mary sang for me.'
    b. ABS agreement + APPL prefix
    Anaak-q sa-baa-toksal-aachi-h.
    m-e.FOC-OBL 1SG.ABS-COM-sing-FUT-TNS
    'She will work with ME.'

They may be added to virtually any verb:


(13) a. Unergative
    Mary-t a-taloowa-tok.
    Mary-NOM 1SG.DAT-sing-PST
    'Mary sang for me.'

b. Active (i.e. transitive)
    John-at okkisaa hap-tiwwi-tok.
    John-NOM door 1PL.DAT-open.ACT-PST
    'John opened the door for us.'

c. Non-active
    Katie-at okkisaa j-tiwa-h.
    Katie-NOM door DAT-open.NACT-TNS
    'The door opened on Katie.'

DAT applicatives have a range of meanings:

(14) a. Beneficiary
    Mary-t a-taloowa-tok.
    Mary-NOM 1SG.DAT-sing-PST
    'Mary sang for me.'

b. Source/location
    Töowa-yâ talla i-pilaa-li-tok.
    ball-ACC child DAT-throw-1SG.ERG-PST
    'I threw the ball to the kid.'

c. Goal/recipient
    Naa balíili am oppani-tok.
    car 1SG.DAT-break-PST
    'The crazy fool crashed my car.'

d. External possessor of object
    Tasi-m-at maa balíili am-oppani-tok.
    crazy-DEM-NOM car 1SG.DAT-break-PST
    'The crazy fool crashed my car.'

e. Maleficiary
    Wiha-t chokkowaa-li-fokaali-h.
    move-PTCP enter-1SG.ERG-almost-when-DS
    1-m-chokka am-oppani-t tahli-tok.
    DAT-house 1SG.DAT-break.ACT-PTCP finish.ACT-PST
    'Just as I was about to move in, he tore his down on me.'
Analysis: Choctaw has (high) applicatives (Pyhkkänen 2002, 2008):

(15) VoiceP
  NP
  ApplP [Voice]\n
  NP
  VP Appl

  (NP-theme) V

  • N.B. Low/high Appl distinction not directly relevant for analysis.

3 Applied arguments on non-active verbs

Given this input structure...

(16) VoiceP
  ApplP [Voice]\n
  NP
  VP Appl

  (NP-theme) V

→ What happens when the subject position needs to be filled??

(17) a. Advancing
b. Skipping

(18) a. Advancing
b. Skipping

(19) [Subj NP-Appl Subj [Voice] [Voice]\n
   Subj [Appl] [NP-Appl] [Appl] [VP V NP-theme] ] ] ]
The θ-roles of advancing NP\textsubscript{Apppl}s:

(20) Maleficiary

   1SG.DAT-car-NOM turn.NACT.HG-PST
   'My car flipped over (suddenly).'

b. \textsuperscript{2SG}Chi-car \textsuperscript{}a-filihma-tok!
   2SG.DAT-car 1SG.DAT-turn.NACT.HG-PST
   'Your car flipped (suddenly) on me!'

(21) Predicative possessor

a. Ofi-yat lawa-tok.
   dog-NOM many-PST
   'There were a lot of dogs'

b. \textsuperscript{1SG}Alikchi-m-at\textsuperscript{}ofi i-lawa-h.
   doctor-DEM-NOM dog DAT-many-TNS
   'That doctor has a lot of dogs.'

(22) External possessor

a. Ókfochoosh-at illi-h.
   duck-NOM die-TNS
   'The duck died.'

b. \textsuperscript{1SG}Alikchi-yat\textsuperscript{}ókfochoosh \textsuperscript{}im-illi-tok.
   \textsubscript{1SG}doctor-DEM-\textsubscript{NOM} duck DAT-die-PST
   'The doctor’s duck died.'

(23) 'Engineer' (in the sense of Myler 2016: an intentional indirect causer)

a. Aapisa-t tiwa-tok.
   window-NOM open.NACT-PST
   'The window opened.'

b. \textsuperscript{1SG}Miko-yat\textsuperscript{}aapisa móyyoma-k-a i-tiwa-t
   chief-NOM window all.YG-COMP-OBL DAT-open.NACT-PTCP
   finish.NACT-PST
   'The boss had all of the windows opened.'

3.2 Skipped-over applicatives: when NP\textsubscript{Theme} becomes the subject

(24) \[
\text{[Subj\textsubscript{NP} NP\textsubscript{Theme} Subj\textsuperscript{0} [VoiceP Voice\textsuperscript{0} [Voice\textsubscript{NACT} [ApplP NP\textsubscript{Apppl} Appl\textsuperscript{0} [VP V ⟨NP\textsubscript{Theme}⟩]]]]]}
\]

The θ-roles of skipped-over NP\textsubscript{Apppl}s:

(25) Beneficiary

a. Aka-koshi-m-at alwasha-tok.
   egg-DEM-NOM fry.NACT-PST
   'The eggs were fried.'

b. Aka-koshi-m-at \textsuperscript{sipppókni-m-ak-o¯} im-alwasha-ttook.
   egg-DEM-NOM old.person-DEM-obl DAT-fry.NACT-DPST
   'The eggs were fried for the ELDER (and not for the child).'

(26) Source/location

a. Miko \textsuperscript{1SG}i-katos-at \textsuperscript{}ittola-tok.
   chief DAT-cat-NOM fall-PST
   'The chief’s cat fell down.'

b. Miko \textsuperscript{1SG}i-katos-at \textsuperscript{}pó\textsuperscript{}im-ittola-tok.
   chief DAT-cat-NOM DAT-fall-PST
   'The chief’s cat fell from her.'
• All applied arguments that are introduced with **overt APPL prefixes** are skipped:

(27) **Comitative:** *ibaa-

a. An-aaki-yat sa-low-ana-h.
   I-also NOM 1SG.BEH.BURN-ABS MOD-TRANS
   ’When the house burns down, I will burn too.’

b. *pro*$_{3SG}$ Cho'kka- *ibaa*-sa-low-ana-h.
   COM-3SG.BEH.BURN-ABS MOD-TRANS
   ’I will burn with the house.’

(28) **Locative:** *aa-

a. Chi-kano-m-at náta hohchifo?
   2SG.DAT-relative baby-DEM-NOM what NACT
   ’What’s your cousin’s baby named?’

b. A-kána-m-at iki-ya father-obl pit aa-hohchifo-h.
   1SG.DAT-friend-DEM-NOM father-obl DIR-PRT LOC_NAME.NACT-TRANS
   ’My friend is named after his father.’

(example sentence from modern lexicon)

(30) **Superessive:** *o-

a. Chi-wak nípi-yat lowa-h!
   2SG.DAT-cow meat-DEM-NOM burn-TRANS
   ’Your steak is burning!’

b. Chi-wak ni-pi-yat aahpóoni 0-lowa-ká!
   2SG.DAT-cow meat-DEM 3SG.OBL sup-BURN-AFF
   ’Your steak is burning on the stove!’

---

### Summary of applicatives of non-actives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-role</th>
<th>subj. or obj. of NACT verb?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicative possessor</td>
<td>subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External possessor</td>
<td>subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleficiary</td>
<td>subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>obj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Location</td>
<td>obj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com./Loc./Superess.</td>
<td>obj.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Advancing** applicatives—where NP$_{Appl}$ becomes the subject—are well-behaved, and require no further explanation:

(31) [Subj] NP$_{Appl}$ Subj$^0$ [Voice$^0$ [NACT] [Applp [NP$_{Appl}$] Appl$^0$ [VP V NP$_{Theme}$ ] ] ] ]

• **Skipped-over** applicatives—where NP$_{Theme}$ becomes the subject—violate locality, and require an extra explanation:

(32) [Subj] NP$_{Theme}$ Subj$^0$ [Voice$^0$ [NACT] [Applp NP$_{Appl}$ Appl$^0$ [VP V (NP$_{Theme}$) ] ] ] ]

2. The subject of certain náx-subject verbs, e.g. *im-ittola* ‘drop’, could reasonably be analyzed as having a source/location roles in addition to a maleficiary role.
4 Analysis: licensing and non-licensing Appl\(^0\)s

- Appl heads can vary in terms of their licensing properties.
  - Licensing an NP makes renders it unable to A-move further (cf. Chomsky’s 2000; 2001 Activity Condition).

\[(33)\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Appl does not license Spec-Appl\(^P\)
  \item b. Appl licenses Spec-Appl\(^P\)
\end{itemize}

\[\text{SubjP} \rightarrow \text{VoiceP} \rightarrow \text{ApplP} \rightarrow \text{Voice}_{[\text{NACT}]} \rightarrow \text{tNP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{Appl} \]

\[\text{Spec-ApplP} \rightarrow \text{SubjP} \rightarrow \text{VoiceP} \rightarrow \text{ApplP} \rightarrow \text{Voice}_{[\text{NACT}]} \rightarrow \text{tNP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{Appl} \]

Taxonomy of Choctaw Appl\(^0\)s:

\[(34)\]

\[\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
  \hline
  \text{Appl} & \text{Morphology} & 0-\text{roles} & \text{Licenses Spec-ApplP?} \\
  \hline
  \text{Appl}_{\text{ADV}} & \emptyset + [\text{DAT}] & \text{Predicative possessor} & \text{No} \\
  \text{Appl}_{\text{ADV}} & \emptyset + [\text{DAT}] & \text{External possessor} & \text{Maleficiary} \\
  \text{Appl}_{\text{ADV}} & \emptyset + [\text{DAT}] & \text{Engineer} & \text{Source/Location} \\
  \text{Appl}_{\text{COM}} & \text{ibaa-} + [\text{ABS}] & \text{Comitative} & \text{Yes} \\
  \text{Appl}_{\text{SUP}} & \emptyset + [\text{ABS}] & \text{Superessive} & \text{Yes} \\
  \text{Appl}_{\text{LOC}} & \text{aa-} + [\text{ABS}] & \text{Locative} & \text{Yes} \\
  \hline
\end{array}\]

4.1 Theoretical consequences


- Agree does not entail licensing (contra e.g. Chomsky 1981).
  - In both advancing and skipping applicatives, the verb agrees with NP_{Appl}:

\[(35)\]

\[\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Advancing
    - Anaak-oosh ofi [am] abiika-h.
    - me.occ-nom dog 1SG.DAT-be.sick-TNS
    - ‘MY dog is sick.’
  \item b. Skipping
    - Katina pro, chishn-ano [chi] -kchoof-ahii-kiyo-h?
    - why you-obl 2SG.DAT-bend.NACT-PRET-NOM-NEG-TNS
    - Why won’t it bend for you?
\end{itemize}\]

\[\rightarrow \text{Licensing-as-Agree would predict that all applied arguments should behave the same for A-movement.}\]

- Licensing is not the same as receiving inherent Case (contra e.g. Baker 1988; Wolfford 1993; McGinnis 1998, 2004; Alexiadou et al. 2014; Anagnostopoulou and Sevdali 2015).\(^3\)
  - Problem #1: Licensing has no clear morphological correlate (see Appendix B):
    - Some (but not all) NPs with DAT agreement are skipped-over.
    - Some (but not all) NPs with ABS agreement are skipped-over.
    - Some (but not all) NPs with OBL case are skipped-over.
  - Problem #2: Assuming that ‘inherent’ = 0-related, what makes the Appl_{ADV} roles (possessor, maleficiary, engineer) non-0-related?
  - Problem #3: in Chickasaw, Appl_{SUP} and Appl_{LOC} may be advancing or skipped-over—see the conclusion.

\[\text{3. The current analysis is nonetheless similar to ‘Case absorption’ analyses of symmetric passives (Baker 1988; McGinnis 1998; Citko 2008), in that both analyses involve a functional head establishing a relation with the higher argument, which prevents it from moving.}\]
4.2 Against a NP_{Theme} > NP_{Appl} Structure

What if (36) is the wrong structure for beneficiaries and other ‘skipped-over’ applicatives?

(36) \[
\text{Subj NP}_{\text{Theme}} \text{Subj}^{0} [\text{VoiceP} \text{Voice}^{0} [\text{act}] \text{[ApplP} \text{ NP}_{\text{Appl}} \text{ ApplP}^{0} [\text{VP V} (\text{NP}_{\text{Theme}})] ] ]
\]

- What if beneficiaries are base-generated below the theme?\(^5\)

(37) a. ‘Reverse Low’ Applicative
    b. ApplP as PP

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VP Voice} & \quad \text{VP Voice} \\
\text{ApplP} & \quad \text{NP}_{\text{Theme}} \text{ ApplP}^{0} \text{ ApplP}^{0} \text{ V} \\
\text{NP}_{\text{Theme}} & \quad \text{NP}_{\text{Appl}} \text{ Appl} \\
\text{ApplP/PP} & \quad \text{ApplP} \ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Three arguments against a NP_{Theme} > NP_{Appl} structure:
- Argument #1: Beneficiaries pass standard diagnostics for being high applicatives (Marantz 1993; Pylkkänen 2002, 2008).
- Argument #2: Default word order is Beneficiary-Theme (though the reverse is accepted).\(^5\)
- Argument #3: Although they are ABS>DAT on the surface, non-actives with beneficiaries do not show the same PCC signature as established ABS>DAT verbs.
  - PCC signature of ABS>DAT verbs (from Tyler 2019):
    - 1SG>DAT combinations OK (40a).
    - With other combinations, ABS argument becomes erg ((40b) \(\rightarrow\) (40c)).\(^6\)

(40) PCC signature of ABS>DAT verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Formulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>(\text{1-sa} \text{nokshoopa-h. DAT-1SG.ABS-be.afraid-TNS} ) (\checkmark) 1SG.ABS&gt;3.DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>(\text{1-chi} ) (\text{nokshoopa-h. DAT-2SG.ABS-be.afraid-TNS} ) (int.: ‘You are afraid of her.’) (\times) 2SG.ABS&gt;3.DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>(\text{ish-i} \text{nokshoopa-h 2SG.ERG-DAT-be.afraid-TNS} ) (\checkmark) 2SG.ERG&gt;3.DAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) The default word order with an instrumental applicative is NP_{Theme}-NP_{Appl}. This likely reflects the fact that instrumental applicatives are not fully grammaticalized from participial phrases.

\(^6\) In Tyler 2019 I called this process ‘absolutive promotion’, following Arregi and Nevins’ (2012) analysis of a similar phenomenon in Western Basque (see also Rezac 2008).

\(^4\) The structures in (37) correspond to two different families of analyses of prepositional-object ditransitives, a.k.a. to-datives. The ‘reverse low applicative’ in (37a) is akin to Harley’s (2002) ‘P_{loc}’ analysis, while the ‘ApplP as PP’ analysis in (37b) is advocated for ditransitives by Marantz (1993), Bruening (2001, 2010), Miyagawa and Tsujoka (2004), a.o.

What makes both kinds of analysis unsuitable for Choctaw’s always-object applicatives is that the beneficiary role in Choctaw need not be a recipient, and is interpreted as benefiting from the event rather than the theme NP—even if it is a canonical high applicative.
Non-actives with benefactive applicatives do not behave in this way:

(41) PCC signature of non-active verb with beneficiary

a. * [1-sa-] fama-h.
   DAT-1SG.ABS-whip.NACT-TNS
   (int.: 'I got whipped for him.')
   \[X \; 1SG.ABS > 3.DAT\]

b. * [1-chi-] fama-h.
   DAT-2SG.ABS-whip.NACT-TNS
   (int.: 'You got whipped for him.')
   \[X \; 2SG.ABS > 3.DAT\]

c. * [ish-] fama-h
   2SG.ERG-DAT-whip.NACT-TNS
   (int.: 'You got whipped for him.')
   \[X \; 2SG.ERG > 3.DAT\]

→ Non-actives with beneficiaries behave differently from the established class of ABS > DAT transitives.

In summary, a NP\textsubscript{Theme} > NP\textsubscript{Appl} analysis is implausible.

5 Advancing and skipped-over applicatives cross-linguistically

If the licensing-from-Appl account is really on the right track, we expect to find a similar pattern in other languages:

- Advancing vs. skipped-over applied arguments, where the difference...
  - ...correlates with thematic role of NP\textsubscript{Appl}.
  - ...may correlate with a different overt applicative morpheme.

5.1 Applicatives of unaccusatives in Central Alaskan Yupik

(42) a. Kic-aq kit'-uq.
   anchor.ABS sink-IND.3SG
   'The anchor sank'

b. Adversative applicative: NP\textsubscript{Appl} advances to subject
   Kic-i-aq maklaar-t-a-qa.
   sink-APPLADV-IND[1SG3] young.seal-catch-RLVZ-ABS.
   'The young spotted seal I caught sank on me.'

c. General applicative: NP\textsubscript{Appl} is skipped
   Kic-a-m kis'-ut-aanga.
   'The anchor sank with me.' (Miyaoka 2015:1190-1191)

→ Here, advancing vs. skipping correlates with different thematic roles for NP\textsubscript{Appl}, and different overt Appl morphemes.

5.2 Applicatives in Swahili passives


(43) Baseline: Some applied objects can advance in passives

a. A-na-mw-imb-i-a
   mw-anamke huyu
   1S-PRES.PROG-1O-sing-APPL-FV this.woman
   'He is singing for this woman.' (Swahili, Liu 2014:(4b))

b. Wa-zee wa-li-imb-i-w-a
   na vi-jana.
   2S-PST-sing-APPL-PASS-FV by 8-young.people
   'The elders were sung for by the young people.' (Swahili, Ngonyani 1998:77)

7. This only works with non-active verbs that have passive interpretations. For non-active verbs with inchoative interpretations, erg agreement is standardly used with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd}-person subjects.

8. The reader may be wondering why pronominal or variable-binding aren't employed as tests. Pronoun-binding is not employed because Conditions B and C are evaluated following A-movement, obscuring mid-derivation reversals in c-command order. Variable-binding (e.g. 'I held each dog, for its, owner' vs. 'I held their dog for each owner,' is not employed because: (a) Chickasaw's quantifiers are verbal or coverbal and I have no clear expectation of what their scope-taking behavior should be (see Munro 2017 for some discussion of quantifiers and their scope in closely-related Chickasaws); (b) variable-binding may not be a particularly good source of evidence for c-command anyway (Barker 2012).

9. I have reglossed Miyaoka's examples for ease of exposition.
Reason: Applicatives must be skipped in passives\(^\text{10}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ndovu wa-windaji wa-li-wa-wind-i-a} & \text{pesa.} \\
& \text{2.elephant 2-hunter 2S-PST-2O-hunt-APPL-FV} & \text{tO:money} \\
& \text{'The hunters hunted the elephant for money.'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{z\-li-wind-i-wa ndovu.} \\
& \text{10:money 10S-PST-hunt-APPL-PASS-FV 9.elephant} \\
& \text{(int.: 'The money was hunted elephants for.')}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{?Ndovu wa-li-wind-i-wa} & \text{pesa.} \\
& \text{9.elephant 9S-PST-hunt-APPL-PASS-FV 10:money} \\
& \text{'Elephants were hunted for money.'} \quad \text{(Swahili, Ngonyani 1998:87-89)}
\end{align*}
\]

Reason: Applicatives cannot advance in passives of applicativized intransitives

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{A-ki-hy\-m\-e} & \text{ma-lig.} \\
& \text{1S-PST-be.angry-APPL} & \text{6-insults} \\
& \text{'He got angry because of the insults.'} \quad \text{(Ndendeule, Ngonyani 1998:72)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Ma-tusi ya-li-kasirik-i-w-a} & \text{na mw-enyekiti.} \\
& \text{6-insults 6S-PST-be.angry-APPL-PASS-FV by 1-chairperson} \\
& \text{'The insults were got angry at by the chairperson.'} \quad \text{(Swahili, Ngonyani 1998:77)}
\end{align*}
\]

→ Here, advancing vs. skipping correlates only with a difference in thematic role.

→ See also: Alsina and Mchombo (1990) on reason applicatives in Chichewa, which also cannot advance to subject position.

5.3 Datives in Japanese passives

Baseline: Some applied dative objects can advance in passives

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ooame-ga Tokyo-ni hutta} \\
& \text{heavy.rain-NOM Tokyo-DAT descend.PST} \\
& \text{'Heavy rain descended on Tokyo.'} \quad \text{(Ishizuka 2010:11)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Tokyo-ga ooame-ni hurareta} \\
& \text{Tokyo-NOM heavy.rain-DAT descend.PASS.PST} \\
& \text{'Tokyo was descended on by heavy rain.'} \quad \text{(Ishizuka 2010:5)}
\end{align*}
\]

Benefactive dative cannot advance in passive\(^\text{11}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Hahaoya-ga Naomi-ni huku-o katta.} \\
& \text{mother-NOM Naomi-DAT clothes-ACC buy.PST} \\
& \text{'Mother bought Naomi the dress.'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Naomi-ga hahaoya-ni huku-o kawareta.} \\
& \text{Naomi-NOM mother-DAT clothes-ACC buy.PASS.PST} \\
& \text{(int.: 'Naomi was bought the dress by her mother.')} \quad \text{(Ishizuka 2012:93)}
\end{align*}
\]

Locative dative cannot advance in passive

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Kyoko-wa imai Osaka-ni iru.} \\
& \text{Kyoko-TOP now Osaka-DAT exist.PRES} \\
& \text{'Kyoko is in Osaka now.'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Osaka-ga Kyoko-ni irareta.} \\
& \text{Osaka-NOM Kyoko-DAT exist.PASS.PST} \\
& \text{(int.: 'Osaka was existed in by Kyoko.')} \quad \text{(Ishizuka 2012:87)}
\end{align*}
\]

→ Like in Swahili, advancing vs. skipping correlates only with a difference in thematic role (and here there is no overt applicative morpheme).

\(^{10}\) The object *ndovu* 'elephant' in (44a) is topicalized in order to circumvent certain restrictions on adjacent objects in Swahili (Ngonyani 1998).

\(^{11}\) The benefactive reading of the dative is only possible in the presence of another internal argument, so we cannot set up an ideal contrast with the pair in (46) (Tomoko Ishizuka, p.c.).
6 Conclusion

- Different Appl heads may license or fail to license Spec-ApplP.
- When there is no external argument, this difference is decisive in determining which argument moves to subject position.

![Diagram](49)

- Licensing is not entailed by Agreeing with the verb.
- Licensing cannot be reduced to receiving inherent Case.

Further issues:

- The ‘usual’ bifurcation in subjectless double-object configurations (Baker 1988; Alsina and Mchombo 1990; Woolford 1993):
  - Symmetric: advance either argument.
  - Asymmetric: advance the higher argument.

(...and we know that symmetry can vary by thematic role and by verb, e.g. Van der Wal 2016)

- The Choctaw bifurcation of subjectless double-object constructions:
  - ‘Standard asymmetric’ (advancing): advance the higher argument.
  - ‘Reverse asymmetric’ (skipping): advance the lower argument.

→ Does Choctaw have any symmetric configurations?
  - Not obviously, but see Chickasaw:

(50) Skipping or advancing with locative applicative a-

  a. Nampanaa‘-at [a-sa-shiylalchi-taha.]
     string-NOM tsg.ACC LOC-1SG.ABS-be.tied.done
     'The string is tied onto me.'

  b. Anaakoot [a-sa-shiylalchi-taha.]
     string-NOM LOC-1SG.ABS-be.tied-done
     'I have the string tied on me.'

(Chickasaw, Munro 1999:263)

(51) Skipping or advancing with superessive applicative on-

  a. Hashi‘-at [on-toomi-tok.]
     sun-NOM Jan-AACC SUP-shine-PERF
     'The sun shone on Jan.'

  b. Jan-at [on-toomi-tok.]
     Jan-NOM sun-NOM SUP-shine-PERF
     'Jan had the sun shine on her.'

(Chickasaw, Munro 1999:263)

→ Possible analysis: Chickasaw ApplLOC and ApplSUP are optional licensors.

- A final question: looking at applicatives of unaccusatives cross-linguistically, the ‘reverse asymmetric’ (a.k.a. skipping) configuration is the norm—see Appendix C. Why?
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A Appendix: Other ways to violate locality in A-movement

Let’s assume that skipped-over applicatives (e.g. beneficiaries, comitatives, etc) are merged above the theme (§4). How else could superiority be violated?

- The beneficiary is inside a covert PP shell (Baker 2014, 2015) (§A.1).
- The theme moves such that both internal arguments are equidistant from the probe (Ura 1996; McGinnis 1998; Anagnostopoulou 2003) (§A.2).
- Antilocality blocks the beneficiary from moving (Deal 2019).
- A ’Case-based approach’: nact morphology ’absorbs’ case intended for theme, needs to move to get case (Baker 1988; Woolford 1993; Haddican and Holmberg 2015).

- Current approach is not dissimilar to this.
- The theme is ’smuggled’ to the subject position inside a larger constituent (Collins 2005)

A.1 Are skipped-over applied arguments inside covert PPs?

Answer: probably not!

Analysis based on Baker (2014, 2015):

(52) SubjP
   NP   VoiceP   Subj
   ApplP   Voice
   NACT
   PP
   VP   Appl
   NP   P   t
   V

- Choctaw doesn’t have obvious PPs. Analysis is nonetheless unlikely:
- PP must be transparent for Agree, so why is it opaque for A-movement?
- NP
   Appl
   and NP
   Theme
   do not c-command each other, hence they would be equidistant from the subject position...
   - ...yet only NP
   Theme
   can raise.
- With PP-like phrases, the P-obj doesn’t agree with the main verb:

(53) PP-like phrase: verb does not agree with P-obj

a. [pp
   pro
   Si-øashaka
   ]
   ish-(’sa/*sa’)-hikyiya-h-o?
   1SG.ABS-behind
   2SG.ERG-((’ISG.ABS’/DAT)-stand.NG-TNS-Q
   ’Are you behind me?’
b. Achi-t [PPF an-aak-ʔ si-aapakna ]
  blanket-NOM me-FOC-OBL 1SG.ABS-on.top
  (*sa/-*am)ittola-h.
  (*1SG.ABS-/*1SG.DAT)-REC.NAT-TNS
  'The blanket is on top of me.'

- See Preminger (2014); Deal (2019) for some other critiques of covert PPs accounts of.

A.2 Do themes raise to Spec-AppP?

Answer: perhaps, but this doesn’t differentiate skipped-over from other applicatives.

- Basic idea: NP_theme raises to a specifier of ApplP—this movement step does not violate locality.
- NP_theme and NP_Appl are now equidistant from the subject position (Ura 1996; McGinnis 1998, 2004; Anagnostopoulou 2003; Doggett 2004; Haddican and Holmberg 2015).

(54)

```
(54)  SubjP
     /\     /
    NP   VoiceP
      /\   /
     ApplP Voice[NACT]
       /\  /
      NP   VP
       /\  /
      Appl
       /\  /
      V
```

Empirical support—NP_Appl and NP_theme can appear in reversed order in ditransitives:

(55) Theme-Beneficiary variable order

a. Sippòkni-mə 1 oo an-aak-ya \ tiwwi-li-tok.
   old-FOC-OBL door 2SG.DAT-CAUS-PST
   'You made the cat climb the tree.'

b. Boo-qa\ i-sa 2SG.DAT-burn-PST
   'I will burn with the house.' [Skipped-over]

b. Okkisa-ya\ door-FOC-OBL 1SG.ABS-on.top
   old-FOC-OBL 1SG.ABS-scare-NAT-TNS
   'I opened the door for the elderly person.'

...But this is really just a property of all ditransitives:

(56) Theme-Causee variable order

a. kátos iti \ ish-aboxya-chi-tok.
   cat tree 2SG.ERG-climb-CAUS-PST
   'You made the cat climb the tree.'

b. iti kátos \ ish-aboxya-chi-tok
   tree cat 2SG.ERG-climb-CAUS-PST
   'You made the cat climb the tree.'

- A problem for equidistance approaches: they predict that NP_theme and NP_Appl should both be targetable for movement to subject position—i.e. they should behave symmetrically.

  - Choctaw has no ‘symmetric’ applicatives (Chickasaw may have some, cf. §6).

B Appendix: case/agreement morphology and ability to A-move

(57) NP with ABS agreement

a. Anaak-oosh \ ofi-mə 1-sa-nokshoopa-h.
   me-FOC-NOM dog-DEM-OBL DAT-1SG.ABS-scare-NAT-TNS
   'I am scared of the dog.' [A-moves]

b. pro\ Chokka 2SG.DAT-car a-filhima-tok!
   house COM-1SG.ABS-burn-MOD-TNS
   'Your car flipped (suddenly) on me!' [A-moves]

(58) NP with DAT agreement

a. pro\ Chi-car a-filhima-tok!
   2SG.DAT-car 1SG.DAT-turn-NAT-HG-PST
   'Your car flipped (suddenly) on me!' [A-moves]
b. Akašōshi-m-at sippōki-ni-m-ak-o im-alwasha-ttook.
   egg-DEM-NOM old.person-DEM-FOC-OBL DAT-fry.NACT-DPST
   'The eggs were fried for the ELDER.' [Skipped-over]

(59) NP with obl case
a. pro Aayishko-m-a kooli-tok.
   cup-DEM-OBL smash.ACT-PST
   'He smashed the cup.' [Capable of A-moving\(^2\)]

b. Akašōshi-m-at sippōki-ni-m-ak-o im-alwasha-ttook.
   egg-DEM-NOM old.person-DEM-FOC-OBL DAT-fry.NACT-DPST
   'The eggs were fried for the ELDER.' [Skipped-over]

\(^{12}\) See (8b) for evidence that the theme argument that associates with this VP is capable of A-moving to the subject position.

C Appendix: Applicatives of unaccusatives in various languages

When an applied argument is added to an unaccusative, the theme often becomes the subject (i.e. a skipping configuration):

(60) Shipibo: subjecthood of theme diagnosable by erg case
   fruit-PRT ripen-PRF
   'The fruit ripened.'

   fruit-ERG-PRT RΩsa ripen-APPL-PRF
   'The fruit ripened for Rosa.' (Baker 2014)

(61) Nez Perce: subjecthood of theme diagnosable by erg case and verb agreement
a. Ha’-aayat hi-pa-pay-no’-kom.
   pl-woman.NOM 3SUBJ-S.PL-PL-come-APPL-FUT-CIS
   'The women will come.'

b. Ha’-aayat-om inuńe hi-pa-naas-pay-noo-yo’-kom.
   pl-women-ERG 1PL-ACC 3SUBJ-S.PL-PL-come-APPL-FUT-CIS
   'The women will come to us.' (Deal 2019:390)

(62) Inuktitut: subjecthood of theme diagnosable by erg case and verb agreement
a. Jiisusi tuqu-lauq-tuq
   Jesus.ABS die-PST-3SGS
   'Jesus died.'

b. Jiisusi-up tuqu-jjutigi-lauq-taatigut
   Jesus-ERG die-APPL-PST-3scS/1PLO
   'Jesus died for us.' (Yuan 2018:106)