1. Introduction

We describe a possessive construction in the Ngumpin-Yapa (Pama-Nyungan), which has a mismatch in the morpho-syntactic encoding of the possessor:

- the possessor NP remains a modifier within the larger possessive NP
- both the possessor and the possessum are cross-referenced with clause-level agreement morphology

```
(1) [Ngayiny_{psr}  karu_{psm}_{psp}  ngu=yi_{psr}=lu_{psp}  lungkarra  karrinya
IMA.DAT  child  AUX=IMA.O=3AUG.S  cry  be.PST
'The children of mine were crying.'
```

Possessor dissension is different to:

- 'external possessor' constructions - clear evidence that the possessor remains embedded within the possessum NP – i.e. there is no ‘raising’ or valency-changing – despite the fact that it is treated as a clausal argument by the clause-level agreement morphology.

```
(2) [Ngayu_{psr}]  ngu=rna_{psr}  [mila_{psm}]  warrngun  karrinya
IMA  AUX=IMA.S  eye  ache  be.PST
'My eyes were aching.'
```

- alienable possession which shows no agreement with the possessor

```
(3) [Ngayiny_{psr}  karu_{psm}_{psp}  ngu=lu_{psp}  lungkarra  karrinya
IMA.DAT  child  AUX=3AUG.S  cry  be.PST
'My children were crying.'
```

2. An overview of the structure of Ngumpin-Yapa languages

Ngumpin-Yapa languages are suffixing, agglutinating languages which exhibit a mix of dependent-marking and head-marking.

- Nominals are case-marked according to an ergative-absolutive alignment pattern
- Nominals are cross-referenced by obligatory pronominal clitics which have a nominative-accusative system
- Pronominal clitics distinguish person, with 1st person non-singular also making an inclusive/exclusive distinction; and three numbers (singular, dual and plural)
- No clitic form exists for third person singular subjects and objects
(4) \textit{Ngu=ynu-ngku-lu, [nyila=ma kartipa=ma], karrayin-ta}  \\
AUX=3AUG.S>3AUG.O that=TOP whitefella=TOP from.west-LOC  \\
\textit{nya-nga-ni [yarrulan-tu kujarra-lu]}  \\
intake-IMPF-PST young.man-ERG two-ERG  \\
The two young men were watching the whitefellas from the west.  \\
(Gurindji: RWH: EC98_a027)
Of particular relevance for this paper is the functional range of object/oblique clitics and dative case marking. The following discussion will be illustrated with examples from Bilinarra.

### Table 1  
Form of pronominal clitics in Bilinarra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>OBLIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1MIN</td>
<td>=rnta</td>
<td>=yi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MIN</td>
<td>=rli</td>
<td>=ngali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MIN</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=nggu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=rla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>=ja, (=rnawula)</th>
<th>=ngayirra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1UA</td>
<td>=rliwula</td>
<td>=ngaliwula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UA</td>
<td>=nbula</td>
<td>=n.guwula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UA</td>
<td>=bula/wula</td>
<td>=buliny/wuliny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>=rnlalu</th>
<th>=ngandiba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1AUG</td>
<td>=la</td>
<td>=ngala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AUG</td>
<td>=nda</td>
<td>=nyjurra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3AUG</td>
<td>=lu</td>
<td>=jina/yina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MIN, UA and AUG are the same as SING, DUAL, PLURAL for all forms except for INCLUSIVE forms, where they refer to 2, 3 and 3+ respectively.

- **pronominal clitics**
  - three way number distinction (minimal, unit augmented and augmented)
  - NOM-ACC/DAT declension
  - obligatorily mark core arguments (A, S, O)
  - object pronouns also cross-reference (dative) obliques and adjuncts (e.g. indirect objects benefactors, purposes, animate goals)
  - where more than one referent is encoded:
    - SUBJ.PERS - OBJ/OBL - ngu- SUBJ.NUM - 3OBL/RR
    - 1MIN > 2, 3
  - third person minimal A, S and O pronouns are unexpressed
  - attach to prominent constituent, usually the first element of the clause

- **dative case marker**
  - forms: -wu (vowel-final stem) and -ku (consonant-final stem)
  - used to mark benefactives (5), indirect objects (6), animate goals (7), malefactives (8), purpose (9) and alienable possessors (10)
  - dative-marked nominals are cross-referenced with a pronominal clitic from the object/oblique series (or =rla ‘3OBL’)

(5)  
Wanyja-rruwarrgab wajarra, gardiba-wu=rlaanguluₚₑₚ, jala=ma leave-POT dance corroborree white.fellas-DAT=1AUG.INC>3AUG.O now=TOP  
‘We’ll dance a corroboree for the whitefellas today.’  
(Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 131)
(6)  
\textit{Jarragab-rni=pina=m} \textit{yalu-wu=rni=wai}l\textit{a} \\
talk=EP=1MIN.S=3AUG.O talk=PST that-DAT=ONLY=FOC

\textit{ngama-rlang-gu} \\
mother-DYAD-DAT \\
‘So I talked to just those mother and daughters instead.’ \\
(Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 131)

(7)  
\textit{Ngayi=ma=rna=rla=nga} \textit{ya-n.gu janggarni-wu gardiba-wu} \\
1MIN=TOP=1MIN.S=3OBL=DUB go-POT big-DAT whitefella-DAT \\
‘I might have to go back to my boss.’ \\
(Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 131)

(8)  
\textit{Nyamba-wu=yi=nda} \textit{ngayiny ba-rra warlagu}?
\textit{what-DAT=1MIN.O=2AUG.S 1MIN.DAT hit-PST dog} \\
‘Why did you mob kill the dog on me?’ (Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 132)

(9)  
\textit{Ya-ni=lu, garlarra mirlarrang-gu}. \\
go-PST=3AUG.S west spear-DAT \\
‘They went west to (make) spears.’ (Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 133)

(10)  
\textit{Baya-rni=wliny [ngayiny warlagu jiya]} \\
bite-PST=3UA.O 1MIN.DAT dog kangaroo \\
‘He killed my dog and kangaroo.’ (Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 203)

3. **Possessor dissension (PIP) and its properties in Ngumpin-Yapa languages**

Possessor dissension construction contains:

- dative-marked possessor NP
  - modifier of the NP headed by the possessum
  - cross-referenced with clause-level pronoun clitic, as if it were a clausal argument

(11)  
\textit{Ngu=wliny_{psr} [Japalyi-wu_{psr} kurruri_{psm}] ya-na-na wart, jalang=ma} \\
AUX=3UA.O SUBSECT-DAT car go-1MPF-PRS return today=TOP \\
‘The car of Jimmy [and Biddy]’s came back today.’ (Gurindji: VW: FM09_14_1a)

(12)  
\textit{Yapa-ngku \textit{ka=ju=lu} [ngaju-ku_{psm} murdukayi_{psm}] wirrja-pi-nyi}. \\
people-ERG PRS=1SG.O=3PL.S 1SG-DAT car covet-NPST \\
‘People covet my car.’ (Warlpiri: Simpson 1991: 11)

(13)  
\textit{Ngadu nga=rna=nggula_{psr} nyinang-an [ngurra_{psm}-ngganyunungu-la_{psr}].} \\
1SG AUX=1SG.S=2SG.LOC sit-PRS camp-LOC 2SG.DAT-LOC \\
‘I sit in your camp.’ (Jaru: Tsunoda 1981: 140)

- contrasts with regular alienable possession which has a dative-marked possessor but no cross-referencing of the possessor
BUT unlike regular alienable possession, it is not obligatory that the possessor be expressed with an overt NP and often the pronominal clitic is the sole element encoding the possessor.

similar to inalienable possession which also has a cross-referencing pronoun (but no dative-marked possessor)

BUT in inalienable possession, the possessor is performing relevant grammatical function of the verb whereas in possessor dissension the possessor is always an oblique

subject ‘My body is heating up.’ (Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 206)

object ‘The child feels my hand.’ (Gurindji: VW: FM14_a228)
- i.e. bound pronoun reflects the grammatical relation of the possessor
  o in an inalienable construction, the possessor bears an argument relation to
  the verb (which may be subject, object, etc)
  o in a possessor dissension construction the possessor is always a dependent
  of the possessive NP (and therefore always an oblique)

(22) \( Ngarrab\-ba=\text{rna}_{\text{psr}} \quad ma\-ni \quad \text{bu}y_{\text{psr}}=\text{ma} \quad ngay_{\text{psr}}=\text{ma} \).
\hspace{1cm} \text{hot-EP=1MIN.S} \quad \text{do-PST} \quad \text{body=TOP} \quad 1\text{MIN}=\text{TOP}
INALIENABLE ‘My body is heating up.’ (Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 206)

(23) \( Ngayin_{\text{psr}}\-\text{ba}=\text{yi}_{\text{psr}} \quad nyila=\text{ma} \quad \text{warlagu}=\text{ma} \).
\hspace{1cm} 1\text{MIN.DAT-EP=1MIN.O} \quad \text{that=TOP} \quad \text{dog=TOP}
DISSENSION ‘Lit: My (dog) is that dog.’ (Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 208)

- Since the object/oblique bound pronoun series in most Ngumpin-Yapa languages cross-
  references both objects and obliques, it is not obvious that the possessor in possessor
  dissension constructions is an oblique rather than an object.
  o BUT if the possessor were a type of object, it would trigger the use of the
    reflexive pronoun clitic in clauses where it is coreferential with the subject which
    happens in inalienable possession constructions

(24) \( Nyawa=\text{ma}=\text{ma}_{\text{sub}}=\text{nyunu}_{\text{obj}} \quad \text{ba}\-\text{ni} \quad \text{ngarlag}_{\text{la}}=\text{ma} \quad ngay_{\text{rni}}=\text{ma} \).
\hspace{1cm} \text{this=TOP}=1\text{MIN.S}=\text{RR} \quad \text{hit-PST} \quad \text{head-LOC=TOP} \quad 1\text{MIN}=\text{ONLY}
wardan-jawung.
hand-PROP
OBJECT ‘I hit myself on the head with my own hand.’
(Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 235)

(25) \( An\quad gula=\text{rna}=\text{yi}_{\text{obj}} \quad ngayin_{\text{obj}}=\text{ma} \quad ngamay=\text{ma} \quad ngarrga\quad ma\-ni \).
\hspace{1cm} \text{and} \quad \text{NEG}=1\text{MIN.S}=1\text{MIN.O} \quad 1\text{MIN.DAT=TOP} \quad \text{mother=TOP}
ngarrga ma-ni.
remember do-PST
OBLIQUE ‘And I didn’t recognise the mother of mine.’
(Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 96)

- in possessor dissension constructions, both the possessor NP and the whole possessive
  NP will be cross-referenced

(26) \( [Ngayin_{\text{psr}}\-\text{ju} \quad \text{karu}_{\text{psr}}\-\text{ngku}_{\text{psr}}]_{\text{psp}} \quad ngu=\text{yi}_{\text{psr}}=\text{lu}_{\text{psp}} \quad \text{tawirrjip} \).
\hspace{1cm} 1\text{MIN.DAT-ERG} \quad \text{child-ERG} \quad \text{AUX}=1\text{MIN.O}=3\text{AUG.S} \quad \text{pelt}
pa\-\text{ni} \quad \text{marluka-wu} \quad \text{kurrurij}.
hit-PST \quad \text{old.man-DAT} \quad \text{car}
DISSENSION ‘The children of mine threw rocks at the old man’s car.’ (Gurindji: VW: FM13_a194)
This contrasts with inalienable constructions where there is no bound pronoun cross-referencing the possessum, only the possessor.

(27) Jiya-rna-na ngu=yina_{psr} [kuya-ny-kujarra tingarri-kujarra-purrupurrur]{psm} burn=IMPF-PRS AUX=3AUG.O thus-NMLZ-DU knee-DU-AND INALIENABLE ‘It smokes their pairs of body parts (you need for crawling) including their two knees.’ (Gurindji: VD: FM08_a085: 7:05min)

Morphosyntactic evidence that the possessor is part of the larger possessive NP in these possessor dissension constructions, despite being cross-referenced at the level of the clause:
- both nominals can occur together before the second position clitic complex suggesting that they are a single constituent
- possessor NP must show case agreement with the possessum like any other nominal modifier

(28) [Ngayiny_{psr}-ju karu_{psr}-ngku]_{psm} ngu=yi_{psm}=lu_{psm}=rla_{ben} ka-nya
1MIN.DAT-ERG child-ERG AUX=1MIN.O=3AUG.S=3OBL take-PST

nga=marluka-wu_{ben} meat old.man-DAT
‘The children of mine took meat for the old man.’ (Gurindji: VW: FM13_a194)

One possibility is that these are actually benefactive constructions:
- Polysemy between benefactives/malefactives) and possessive constructions well-known (e.g. Lichtenberk 2002; Rapold 2010; Zúñiga and Kittilä 2010) and common in Australian languages as a function of dative case (Blake 1977; Dixon 2002: 394ff).
- also use an object/oblique pronominal clitic to cross-reference a human participant
- nominal is dative-marked if expressed by an overt nominal or free pronoun

(29) Wanyja-ruwarrgab wajarra, gardiba-wu=rlaangulu jala=ma leave-POT dance corroborree whitefellas-DAT=1AUG.INC>3AUG.O now=TOP
‘We’ll dance a corroboree for the whitefellas today.’
(Bilinarra: Meakins and Nordlinger 2014: 131)

Many sentences are ambiguous (although this is usually sorted out by context):

(30) Ngu=yi maral pa-na-na tuja-ngku murlu-ngku.
AUX=1MIN.O cut.badly hit-IMPF-PRS blunt-ERG this-ERG MALEFACTIVE ‘This blunt axe is making it hard for me to cut (the wood).’
DISSENSION ‘This blunt axe of mine is making it hard to cut (the wood).’
(Gurindji: VW: FM07_a05_1a: 7:01min)

Benefactive/malefactive constructions can be distinguished from possessor dissension:
- case agreement marking:
benefactive/malefactive constructions - the dative-marked NP has its own clausal relation and therefore never shows case agreement with another NP

possessor dissension constructions - the possessor shows case agreement with the possessum

\[(Ngayiny_{psr} \text{-} ju \text{ karu-ngku}_{psp} \text{ ngu=yi}_{psr} \text{-} lu_{psr} \text{-} rl}_{ben} \text{ ka-nya} \]
\[\text{1MIN.DAT-ERG \ child-ERG \ AUX=1MIN.O=3AUG.S=3OBL \ take-PST} \]

ngarin marluka-wu\text{ben}. meat old.man-DAT ‘The children of mine took meat for the old man.’ (Gurindji: VW: FM13_a194: 19:48min)

• two constructions can be shown to be distinct by the fact that they may co-occur

\[(Nyila \text{ nga}=yi_{psr} \text{-} rl}_{ben} \text{ [guyarr-gu]}_{ben} \text{ guyu } [\text{nganingu}_{psr} \text{-} wu]_{ben}. \text{ that } \text{ AUX=1SG.O=3SG.OBL } \text{ dog-DAT } \text{ meat } 1SG.DAT-DAT \]

‘That meat is for my dog.’ (Jaru: Tsunoda 1981: 139)

\[(\text{Karu-wu]}_{ben} \text{ ngu=yi}_{psr} \text{-} rl}_{ben} \text{ [ngayiny}_{psr} \text{-} ku]_{ben} \text{ jiya-wu.} \text{ child-DAT } \text{ AUX=1MIN.O=3OBL } 1MIN.DAT-DAT \text{ boil-POT} \]

‘It will boil for the child of mine.’ (Gurindji: VW: FM07_a01_1e: 2:02min)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>CASE ON POSSESSOR</th>
<th>BOUND PRONOUN CROSS-REFERENCES</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL FUNCTION OF BOUND PRONOUN</th>
<th>FUNCTION OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inalienable possession</td>
<td>core</td>
<td>possessor only (argument of verb)</td>
<td>subject, object/oblique (depending on grammatical relation of possessor)</td>
<td>possesum is a body part, shadow, image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alienable possession</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>whole possessive phrase (argument of verb)</td>
<td>subject, object/oblique (depending on grammatical relation of possessive phrase)</td>
<td>possesum is all other potentially possessed objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessor dissension</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>possessor (oblique) and whole possessive phrase</td>
<td>possessor: oblique only possessive phrase: subject, object/oblique (depending on grammatical function)</td>
<td>preferred construction for human possessors of alienable possessums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefactive/malefactive</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>beneficiary/maleficiary (adjunct)</td>
<td>oblique only (always an adjunct)</td>
<td>introduces a beneficiary/ maleficiary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Function of possessor dissension constructions

Why use a possessor dissension construction instead of an alienable possessive construction to express a relation between a possessor and an alienable entity?
Three options for expressing alienable possession:

- **(i)** Dative-marked nominal only (regular alienable)
- **(ii)** Bound pronoun only (possessor dissension)
- **(iii)** Dative-marked nominal + Bound pronoun (possessor dissension)

(33) (Gurindji: TD: FM10_22_1b: 0:13min)

(a) *Yijarni nyawa-ngka ngulu karrinyani*

That's true - they all used to live here.

(b) *Nyutaim Afghan-camp-ma=lu karrinyani Walyjiwalyji Ajarraman nguwula karrinyani.*

The Afghan camp was here and Walyji and Ajarraman used to live here.

(c) *An hiva-rla karrarrowra.*

And here in the east.

(d) 

```sga
[Ngayiny]_{psr} ngu=[wula]_{psp} karrinyani [papa kujarra]_{psm} \[ Ngayiny \]
```

Wadrill-*u*   *daddy*

Violet-DAT father

My two brothers were here - Violet's fathers.

(e) *Nyila-ngka karrarrowra, an daddy-yayi*

There in the east, and father who has passed away.

(f) 

```sga
[Tapayi-yu]_{psr} ngayirra=[daddy]_{psp} [daddy]_{psp} \[ Tapayi-yu \]
```

NAME-DAT=1UA.O   father

The father of Tapayi and me.

- Preferred construction in elicitation contexts
- BUT in texts not preferred
- In texts - reinforces and highlights the involvement/role/importance of the possessor
- Possessor dissension constructions are used to present a possessor as the correct candidate in a set of possible possessors e.g. high stakes ownership

(34) *Nyila=ma_{psm} ngantipanguny_{psr} ngurra=ma_{psm} ngu=ngantipa_{psm} Number 19*

that=TOP 1AUG.EXC.DAT country=TOP AUX=1AUG.EXC.O Number 19

```sga
bore={psm} kankarra={psm}
```

bore   upstream

That country at Number 19 bore which is upstream belongs to us.

(Gurindji: VW: LIM07_030913: 0:47min)
• Possessor dissension could be a type of contrastive focus in that it either sets up a restricted set of alternatives and puts forward one of the alternatives
  o Dik (1997: 331-32) refers to this type of focus as a counter-presuppositional contrastive focus
  o Kibrik & Seleznéva (1980; cited in Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011: 122) has a similar analysis for non-subject agreement in Tabassaran (North Caucasian) where they say agreement makes the referent more “prominent” or “emphatic” i.e. selected from a set of alternative candidates

(35) "Kula=nta nga-lu, yarrularn-tu=ma janka-ku=ma," kuya.
NEG=2AUG.S eat-POT young.man-ERG=TOP woman-ERG=TOP thus
"You shouldn't eat it, young men and women," she said.

"Ngu=ngantipa ngantipanguny jangkakarni-lu
AUX=1AUG.EXC.O 1AUG.EXC.DAT adult.REDUP-ERG
"It is ours, as adults.

ngu=rnalu nga-lu kajijirri-lu kuya-ny.
AUX=1AUG.EXC.S eat-POT old.woman.REDUP thus-NMLZ
Only us older women can eat that type." (Gurindji: VW: FM09_a123: 1:09min)

• In Itelmen (Chukotko-Kamchatkan, Russia), the use of an oblique bound pronoun to cross-reference a possessor of a subject in contrast to subject bound pronoun cross-referencing the whole possessor phrase in intransitive sentences is claimed to accord prominence to a possessor (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand, 2002: 24 onwards). In this case, however, prominence is taken to mean that the referent under discussion is salient, i.e. topical prominence (which differs from contrastive focus)

5. In theoretical and typological context

• PIPs challenge standard analyses of agreement since we have clausal agreement with an NP-internal modifier (‘trigger-happy’ agreement (Comrie 2003), ‘topical non-subject agreement’ (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011), ‘verb agreement with possessives’ (Corbett 2006))
• Morphosyntactic disagreement (or dissension) between the syntactic position of the possessor as an NP-internal modifier, and its treatment as an argument at the clausal level.

An analysis of these constructions in Ngumpin-Yapa languages needs to take into account the following properties:
• Possessor is not the head of the NP, as shown by:
  o Agreement with the possessum head is maintained as well
  o Agreement with the possessor is always OBLIQUE so doesn’t correspond to the grammatical function of the possessive NP
  o Possessor shows case agreement with head of the NP
• No evidence that possessor is in a different structural position in the NP in PIP constructions (cf. Nikolaeva 2014a)
• Analyses that use valence-changing (e.g. Camilleri and Sadler 2012, Ritchie 2016) are also problematic since it is possible to have more than one PIP within a single clause:

(36) \[\text{Ngayiny}_{\text{PSR1}} \text{ju} \text{ karu-ngku}_{\text{PSP}} \text{ ngu=yi}_{\text{PSR1}}=\text{lu}_{\text{PSR}}=\text{rla}_{\text{PSR2}}=\text{nyanta}_{\text{BEN}}\]
    1MIN.DAT-ERG child-ERG AUX=1MIN.O=3AUG.S=3OBL=3OBL

\[\text{ka-nya} \text{ ngarin} \text{ [nyanuny}_{\text{PSR2}} \text{ku} \text{ ngumparna-wu}_{\text{BEN}}\]
bring-PST meat 3MIN.DAT-DAT husband-DAT

‘The children of mine take the meat for her husband.’
(Gurindji: VW: FM13_a195: 4:38min)

Instead these languages show us that internal possessors can control agreement themselves (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011). This can be captured in LFG by simply allowing the object/oblique markers to optionally encode a possessor for any grammatical function:

(37) \[=yi \quad (\uparrow \text{OBJ} | \text{OBL} | \text{GF POSS}) = \downarrow \]
    \[=yi \quad (\uparrow \text{PRED}) = \text{‘PRO’}) \]
    \[=yi \quad (\downarrow \text{PERS}) = 1 \]
    \[=yi \quad (\downarrow \text{NUM}) = \text{MIN} \]

\(f\)-structure for (36):

![f-structure diagram]
6. Concluding remarks

- PIP constructions in Ngumpin-Yapa languages expand our typology of these constructions: the internal possessor is marked on the clause as an additional argument without any valence changing.
- We have shown how this can be straightforwardly captured in LFG by simply adding an option to encode a POSS to the information associated with OBJ/OBL markers.
- Given the range of properties associated with PIP constructions crosslinguistically, the question remains as to whether they constitute a single morphosyntactic construction type.
- Could they arise instead from different approaches to the general preference for giving human participants morphosyntactic prominence?
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