Objectives
- Show that Koasati has a construction parallel to the Western Muskogean internally headed relative clause (IHRC).

Introduction
- Koasati has been said not to have relative clauses (Rising, 1992; Kimball, 1991).
- A participle construction fulfills the function of a relative clause (Rising, 1992; Kimball, 1991).
- This construction resembles the internally headed relative clauses (IHRCs) found in other Muskogean languages (Broadwell, 2006).

Notes
- The morpheme -:-smi- (PRES:PART) is homophonous with a nominal suffix translated as “the aforesaid,” from a set Kimball (1991) calls “article suffixes.”
- Subject relatives were extremely uncommon in Koasati data.
- Chickasaw and Choctaw can form RCs with other morphology.
- Not all Muskogean RCs are IHRCs.
- Other constructions in Koasati might be RCs.

Parallel Cases in Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Koasati

(1) Chickasaw Object IHRC:

[Jan-at \(\text{ofi'}\) ipita-\(\text{kaash}\)-\(\text{oo-t}\)] mali-t kaniya-tok
Jan-SBJ dog feed-\(\text{kaash}\)-FOC-SBJ run-SS go=away-PT
“That dog Jan fed ran away.” (Gordon, 1987: 74)

(2) Koasati Object Relative:

[am-tà-ta-k \(\text{tayyì}\) hi:ca-\(\text{sáy-o-k}\)]
1S.POSS-father-SBJ woman see-PRES:PART-FOC-SBJ
ci-halk-ô-k öm
2S.POSS-wife-FOC-SBJ be
“The woman that my father saw is your wife.” (Kimball, 1991: 525)

(3) Choctaw Object Relative:

[\(\text{Ofi'}\) ipita-li-\(\text{k-kaash}\)-mat] balli-t kaniya-h.
dog feed-1SI-TNS-PREV-D:NM run-PART go=away-TNS
“That dog I fed ran away.” (Broadwell, 2006: 299)

Accessibility Hierarchy in Koasati

(4) Subject Relative:

[akkó \(\text{àti-k}\) am-biníli-\(\text{sáy-o-n}\)]
that person-SBJ 1S.DAT-visit-PRES:PART-FOC-OBJ
is-hi:ca-\(\text{V\text{-V\text{-to}}?}\)
2S.SBJ(1A)-see-Q.-III:Past
“Did you see the person who just visited me?” (Kimball, 1991: 289)

(5) Indirect Object Relative:

[aatosi im-ka-t]
child 3S.DAT-give-CONN
is-pa-\(\text{say-o-k}\)
cayahl
2SG.SBJ-eat-PRES:PART-FOC-SBJ walk-3
“The child whom you just fed is walking.” (Rising, 1992: 38)

(6) Oblique Relative:

[\(\text{òla-\text{fa}}\) alía-li-\(\text{sáy-o-k}\)] hahcf
town-in go(SG)-1SG.SBJ-PRES:PART-FOC-SBJ river
apatah-ô-li-s
beside-be-DEDUC-I:Past
“The town to which I went is along a river.” (Kimball, 1991: 525-526)

Features of Muskogean IHRCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Chickasaw</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
<th>Koasati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause Internal Head</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense + Previous Mention</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Marking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Work

- In Choctaw and Chickasaw (Gordon, 1987) case (SBJ or OBJ) or switch reference (SS or DS) can mark relative clauses.
- There is some evidence that this happens in Koasati as well.
- Are relative clauses in these languages nominal or verbal?
- Are there RCs in Koasati that are not IHRCs?
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