

**Problem One**

In Choctaw, transitive verbs agree with both the subject and the object:

- (1) Chi- bashli -li -tok  
 2sgOBJ cut 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I cut you'
- (2) Is- sa- sso -tok  
 2sgSUBJ 1sgOBJ hit PAST  
 'You hit me'

(here the numbers stand for persons, "sg" means "singular", and "SUBJ" and "OBJ" stand for "subject" and "object"--so *chi-*, for instance, means "second person singular object").

Intransitive verbs split into two types. In one type, the verb agrees with its subject using the same morphology as that used by transitive verbs to agree with their subjects. In the second type, the agreement morphology is the same as that used by transitive verbs to agree with their objects:

- (3) a. Hilha -li -tok  
 dance 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I danced'
- b. Ish- ipah õ?  
 2sgSUBJ eat Q  
 'Have you eaten?'
- c. I:- bali:li-tok  
 1plSUBJ run PAST  
 'We ran'
- (4) a. Sa- hohchafoh  
 1sgOBJ be-hungry  
 'I am hungry'
- b. Chi- cha:hah  
 2sgOBJ be-tall  
 'You are tall'
- c. Pi- hohfaya -tok  
 1plOBJ be-ashamed PAST  
 'We were ashamed'

First question: what do you think is going on here?

Choctaw exhibits a phenomenon known as "switch-reference marking". Under certain circumstances, the verb in the first of two clauses may bear a morpheme indicating, roughly,

whether the subjects of the two clauses refer to the same person or not (SS stands for "same subject", DS for "different subject"):

- (5) a. Tobi apa -li -**cha** oka ishko -li -tok  
 bean eat 1sgSUBJ SS water drink 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I ate beans and I drank water'  
 b. Tobi apa -li -**na** tāchi ish -pa -tok  
 bean eat 1sgSUBJ DS corn 2sgSUBJ eat PAST  
 'I ate beans and you ate corn'

In (5a), the "same subject" suffix *-cha* indicates that the subjects of the two clauses refer to the same person; in (5b), where the two clauses have different subjects, you get the "different subject" suffix *-na*. These suffixes are obligatory in these examples; using *-na* in (5a), or *-cha* in (5b), would yield an ill-formed sentence.

Consider the following examples of sentences involving switch reference markers. The sentence marked with % is one on which Choctaw speakers disagree; in some dialects of Choctaw (call them Choctaw A), this sentence is well-formed, while in other dialects (Choctaw B), it is ill-formed.

- (6) a. Nita pisa -li -**cha** bali:li -li -tok  
 bear see 1sgSUBJ SS run 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I saw the bear and ran'  
 b. Sa- hohchafo-**cha** tobi hoponi -li -tok  
 1sgOBJ hungry SS bean cook 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I was hungry, so I cooked some beans'  
 c. \*Nita pisa -li -**na** bali:li -li -tok  
 bear see 1sgSUBJ DS run 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I saw the bear and ran'  
 d. % Sa- hohchafo-**na** tobi hoponi -li -tok  
 1sgOBJ hungry DS bean cook 1sgSUBJ PAST  
 'I was hungry, so I cooked some beans'

Second question: give a description of the rules for the use of same-subject and different-subject markers in Choctaw A and Choctaw B.

## Problem Two

The following Hebrew sentence is ambiguous:

- (7) ha-yeladim zarku **li** 'et ha-kadur le-tox ha -gina 'al-yad ha-mitbax  
 the boys threw to-me ACC the ball into the garden next-to the kitchen  
 'The boys threw **my** ball into the garden next to the kitchen'  
 'The boys threw the ball into **my** garden next to the kitchen'  
 'The boys threw the ball into the garden next to **my** kitchen'

There are some things, however, that the sentence cannot mean. For example, it cannot mean 'My boys threw the ball into the garden next to the kitchen'.

Now, consider the following data about **li**:

(8) ha-'uga ne'exla **li**  
the cake was-eaten to-me  
'**My** cake was eaten'

(9) ha-mitriya nafla **li**  
the umbrella fell to-me  
'**My** umbrella fell'

(10) ha- xalon nišbar **li**  
the window broke to-me  
'**My** window broke'

(11) \*ha-kelev šaxav **li**  
the dog lay to-me  
'**My** dog lay down'

(12) \*ha-po'alim 'avdu **li**  
the workers worked to-me  
'**My** workers worked'

What kind of condition on **li** might capture these data?