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1 Introduction

• Both Choctaw and Basque exhibit Person Case Constraint (PCC) restrictions, which are bans on certain combinations of internal argument clitics, e.g. 1st and 2nd-person:

(1) Choctaw
* John-at a-chi- pila -tok.
John-SUBJ 1SG.APPL- 2SG.ABS- throw -PST
Intended: 'John threw you to me.'

(2) Ondarru Basque (Arregi and Nevins 2012:65)
* Eur-ak su-ri neu presenta n -a
They-ERG you-DAT me.ABS introduce.PRF CL.1SG.ABS -T
-tzu -e.
-CL.2SG.DAT -CL.3PL.ERG
Intended: 'They introduced me to you.'

• PCC effects are typically discussed with respect to ditransitives (e.g. (1-2)). But in Choctaw and Basque, PCC restrictions also afflict transitive unaccusative predicates, e.g. fear, like, be jealous of.

1 I make use of what Broadwell (2006) calls the Modified Traditional Orthography for Choctaw. Doubled letters indicate long vowels or geminated consonants, the diagraphs <sh>, <ch> and <ch> represent /ʃ/, /tʃ/ and /θ/ respectively, and underlined vowels represent nasalized vowels (which are always long). I diverge from this notation in not marking pitch accent.

The following non-transparent glosses are used for Choctaw. TNS: default tense; SS: same-subject switch-reference marker; DS: different-subject switch-reference marker; COM: comitative; BEN: benefactive; SUBJ: subject-marker; OBJ: object-marker; EXH: exhortative; SUPER: superessive.

Finally, Choctaw and Basque clitics are glossed in slightly different ways: Basque clitics are always glossed with a a preceding ‘cl’, e.g. ‘CL.2SG.ABS’, while Choctaw clitics are glossed without it, e.g. 2SG.ABS. This reflects the fact that clitics are the only element in the Choctaw clause on which Case is expressed, while in Basque, Case is also expressed on the arguments themselves.

2 Rezac (2008b) refers to the process as Absolutive Displacement.

• An arresting similarity: when there is a PCC-violating configuration with a transitive unaccusative, Choctaw and the Ondarru dialect of Basque make use of the same repair mechanism:

→ Absolutive Promotion, i.e. promotion of absolutive argument to ergative (Arregi and Nevins 2012).

• But Choctaw and Ondarru Basque differ in one crucial way:
  – Choctaw: The absolutive experiencer is promoted.
  – Ondarru Basque: The absolutive theme is promoted.

• Proposal: the above difference can be derived from a parameterizable property of Appl0 heads: whether or not Appl0 assigns Case to its specifier.
  – Choctaw: Appl0 does not assign Case to Spec-ApplP.
  – Basque: Appl0 does assign Case to Spec-ApplP.

• Absolutive Promotion is the highest Caseless DP moving to Spec-VoiceP (see Arregi and Nevins 2012; Rezac 2008b, 2009 for similar analyses).
- Choctaw: Appl\(^0\) fails to assign Case to its specifier. Therefore \textsc{exp} raises.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{VoiceP} & \\
\text{EXP} & \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Voice}^0 \\
\text{ApplP} \quad V^0 \\
\langle \text{EXP}_\text{[\_\_\_]} \rangle & \quad \text{THEME}_\text{[\_\_\_]} \quad \text{Appl}^0
\end{align*}\]

Basque: Appl\(^0\) assigns dative Case to its specifier. Therefore \textsc{theme} raises.\(^3\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{VoiceP} & \\
\text{THEME} & \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Voice}^0 \\
\text{ApplP} \quad V^0 \\
\langle \text{EXP}_\text{[\_\_\_]} \rangle & \quad \langle \text{THEME}_\text{[\_\_\_]} \rangle \quad \text{Appl}^0
\end{align*}\]

2 Background on Basque and Choctaw

- Both languages are uniformly head-final (only Choctaw example shown).

\[
\text{[ Ish- baliil -ahiina \textsc{modp} -tok TP] -at CP}
\]

\[
\text{ish- ikkaanah.}
\]

\[
\text{2SG.ERG- know}
\]

‘You know that you should have been running’

- In this section:

2.1. In both languages, arguments are doubled by clitics that express Case.\(^4\)

2.2. In both languages, the experiencer starts out in a position where it c-commands the theme, in transitive unaccusatives.

\[^3\text{I make use of a low (as opposed to high) applicative for both Basque and Choctaw. This is purely because it is the structure assumed for these verbs in Basque by Arregi and Nevins (2012), and I want to make the parallelism between the languages as clear as possible. However, the analysis does not hinge on whether ApplP is merged as the sister of the verb (low applicative) or the sister of } V^0/\text{Voice}^0 \text{ (high applicative).}\]

\[^4\text{In Choctaw, there is a lone exception to this: the 1sg ergative marker -tli, which displays highly idiosyncratic behavior and is probably an agreement form rather than a clitic.}\]
2.1 Clitics express Case

2.1.1 Basque
• 3-way Case distinction in clitics, which surface on an auxiliary (On-darru used as a representative dialect, table adapted from Arregi and Nevis 2012:122):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>-t/da</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>g-</td>
<td>-gu</td>
<td>-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>-su</td>
<td>-tzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>s-...-e</td>
<td>-su-e</td>
<td>-tzu-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-ko/-tz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Ø-e</td>
<td>-ko-e/-tz-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Basque DPs are also marked for Case.

2.1.2 Choctaw
• 3-way distinction in argument-referencing verbal morphology – I assume (almost) all are clitics (see Jelinek 1989; Schütze 1995; Tyler 2017 for arguments in favor of this view). 5
  – The ‘Class I-III’ terminology is from Munro and Gordon (1982).
  – Proposal: clitics express the Case of the arguments they double.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Absolutive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-li</td>
<td>s-/-si-</td>
<td>(s)am-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ish-</td>
<td>chi-</td>
<td>chim-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>ii-/-il-</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>pim-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL+</td>
<td>ii-/-il-</td>
<td>hapi-</td>
<td>hapim-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>hash-</td>
<td>hachi-</td>
<td>hachim-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>im-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5The Class I/ergative 1SG form -li displays unusual behavior, cf. Broadwell and Martin 1993. I assume it is, exceptionally, an agreement morpheme rather than a clitic.
61PL+ stands for non-paucal 1st-person plural, and ‘3’ would be more accurately labelled ‘default’, as it occurs in the absence of an argument, as well as with 3rd-person arguments. Before a consonant, the Class III forms are produced with final nasalized vowels, e.g. (s)am-, chim-, pim-, etc.

• Traditionally, verbal morphology is assumed to operate independently of nominal ‘Case’ (Jelinek 1989):

  (8) Chisnaak-oosh ish-baliiilih.
  you.FOC-SUBJ 2SG.I-run
  ‘YOU run.’

  (9) Chishnaak-oosh chi-nokhaklooh.
  you.FOC-SUBJ 2SG.II-sad
  ‘YOU are sad.’

  (10) Chishnaak-oosh chi-takoobih.
  you.FOC-SUBJ 2SG.III-lazy
  ‘YOU are lazy.’

• I make two assumptions:
  – Clitics reveal the ‘true’ Case of arguments.

    * Two ways of dealing with the nominal/verbal Case mismatch:
      → Subject-marking morphology is not Case morphology (see Jelinek 1989; Schütze 1995, Appendix A).
      → Subject-marking morphology is a separate Case system from the verbal agreement system.

  – Clitics only express two Cases: ergative (Class I) and absolutive (Class II).

    → The ‘dative’/‘oblique’ Class III forms are composed of an absolute clitic + Appl0 (Ulrich 1986).

    (11) ClABS + Appl0 ⇒ ‘Class III’

    | ClABS | Appl0 | Class III |
    |-------|-------|-----------|
    | sa    | + m   | (s)am-    |
    | chi   | + m   | chim-     |
    | pi    | + m   | pim-      |
    | hapi  | + m   | hapim-    |
    | hachi | + m   | hachim-   |
    | –     | + m   | im-       |

    → Appl0 is spelled out as /m/, which may become nasalization on a preceding vowel by a regular phonological rule.
We see the ‘Cl_ABS + Appl^0’ decomposition more transparently with other Appl^0 heads:

(12) **Comitative Appl**
    
    John-at chibaa toksalih.
    John-SUBJ 2SG.ABS-COM work
    ‘John works with you.’

(13) **Benefactive Appl**
    
    Is-sa mj shol ashkii.
    2SG.I-1SG.ABS-BEN hug -EXH
    ‘Hug him for me.’

Summary: clitics express Case in both languages. Basque has a dative clitic, Choctaw does not.

### 2.2 Experiencer c-commands theme in transitive unaccusatives

I assume EXP >> THEME in both languages:

(14) 

   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{ApplP} \\
   \text{DP_Exp} \\
   \text{DP_Theme} \\
   \text{Appl^0}
   \end{array}
   \]

For Basque, this is a standard assumption (Elordieta 2001, Chapter 3 and works cited there).

Evidence from Choctaw: **subject-marking morphology**.

- Flow of argumentation here:
  1. Establish a diagnostic for determining the highest DP in the clause.
  2. Apply that diagnostic to transitive unaccusatives.
- Diagnostic: the highest argument in a Choctaw clause is marked with a **subject-marker** -at/-sh (cf. 8-10); other DPs (usually) may not be subject-marked.

- Case #1: Causatives. Causer always carries subject marking, causee cannot:

  (15) John-at im-ihaksih.
    John-SUBJ 3.APPL-forget
    ‘John forgot.’

  (16) Bill-at John(=a/\at) im-ihaksi-\chi-tok.
    Bill-SUBJ John(=OBJ/\SUBJ) 3.APPL-forget-\CAUS-PST
    ‘Bill made John forget.’

- Case #2: Copy-raising. In (17), chimalikchi ‘your doctor’ is the highest argument of the matrix clause, so is subject-marked.

      your-doctor-SUBJ 2SG.ABS-happy 3.APPL-seem
      ‘Your doctor thinks you’re happy.’

→ In (18), there is now an external argument in the matrix clause.7 Experiencer argument chimalikchi ‘your doctor’ can no longer be subject-marked.

  (18) Chim-alikchi-\*(t) [chi-nayoppah] ish-im-ahoobah.
      your-doctor-\*SUBJ 2SG.ABS-happy 2SG.ERG-3.APPL-seem
      Lit. ‘You seem to your doctor like you’re happy.’

→ Upshot: we can use subject-marking as a diagnostic for the highest argument.

→ Applying this diagnostic to transitive unaccusatives:

  (19) Bill-at Mary \*nokshoopah.
    Bill-SUBJ Mary 3.APPL-be.scared
    ‘Bill is scared of Mary.’
    * ‘Mary is scared of Bill.’

- Summary: EXP c-commands THEME in transitive unaccusatives in both Basque and Choctaw.

---

7I assume (18) to be derived by copy-raising of the embedded subject because a 2nd-person clitic remains in the embedded clause. This is reflected in the translation.
3 Absolutive Promotion in Basque and Choctaw

3.1 Description


• PCC effects are usually discussed with respect to ditransitives (see Appendix B), but transitive unaccusatives also trigger PCC effects. These are repaired by **absolutive promotion**:


    (20)  
    * Ni-ri su-Ø ondo jaus-ten s -a  
    me-DAT you-ABS well fall-IMPF cl.2SG.ABS -PRES.2SG  
    -t. (>sasta)  
    -CL.1SG.DAT  
    (Arregi and Nevins 2012:65)

  – Choctaw: **ABS → ERG**, reflected in clitic morphology.

    (22) * Pi- chi- nokshoopah.  
    1PL.APPL- 2SG.ABS- be.scared

    (23) Ish- pi- nokshoopah.  
    2SG.ERG- 1PL.APPL- be.scared  
    ‘You are scared of us.’

• But note **one crucial difference**:  

  – In Basque, the absolutive argument that gets promoted is the **theme**.  

  – In Choctaw, the absolutive argument that gets promoted is the **experiencer**.

An advertisement for Choctaw morphosyntax  
(Rezac 2008b:80) notes that in Basque, Absolutive Promotion has an extremely limited distribution: DAT-ABS verbs, where DAT >> ABS.

• Rezac lists **ondo jausi ‘like’, gustatu ‘like’** (from Spanish, with more ‘romantic’ connotations), **erori ‘seem’, iruditu ‘seem’**.

  → By contrast, in Choctaw, configurations that trigger Absolutive Promotion occur with **most psych verbs** (as well as a handful of clearly ABS-ABS verbs, e.g. banna ‘want’, see Section 3.4).

3.2 Absolutive Promotion really is a repair strategy

• In Basque, absolutive themes of transitive unaccusatives can only be promoted when a PCC-violating configuration arises (Arregi and Nevins 2012:70, Rezac 2008b).
(24) \(\text{Ni-ri \ Jon ondo jaus-ten ga-t. (}>\text{gasta})\)  
\(\text{me-DAT Jon-ABS well fall-IMPF C \ -CL.1SG.DAT}\)  
\('I like Jon.'\)  
(Arregi and Nevins 2012:70)

(25) \(*\text{Ni-ri \ Jon-(ek) ondo jaus-te do-t} \ -O.\)  
\(\text{me-DAT Jon-ERG well fall-IMPF C \ -CL.1SG.DAT \ -CL.ERG.3SG} \)  
\( (>\text{sta})\)  
Intended: 'I like Jon.'  
(Arregi and Nevins 2012:70)

• Similarly in Choctaw, absolutive experiencers can only be promoted in the presence of a theme argument.\(^9\)

(26) a. \(\text{Chi- nokhakachah} \ -Q?\)  
\(2\text{SG.ABS- be.shocked} \ -Q\)  
‘Are you surprised?’

b. \(*\text{Ish- nokhakachah} \ -Q?\)  
\(2\text{SG.ERG- be.shocked} \ -Q\)  
‘Are you surprised?’

(27) \{\(*\text{Chi/Ish}-\)  
\text{sa-} \text{nokhakachah} \ -Q?\}  
\{\(*\text{2SG.ABS/2.SG.ERG-}\) \text{1SG.APPL- be.shocked} \ -Q\}  
‘Are you surprised at me?’

→ So Absolutive Promotion really can be characterized as a ‘repair strategy’.

3.3 Analysis

• I assume that in Choctaw, ergative Case is assigned by Voice\(^0\) to its specifier (see Deal 2016 on Nez Perce; Appendix C for discussion):

(28) \begin{align*}  
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{ERG}} \text{VP} \text{Voice}^0 
\end{align*}

• In transitive unaccusatives in both languages, no argument is externally-merged into Spec-VoiceP. And in non-PCC-violating configurations, both arguments stay low:

(29) \begin{align*}  
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{VP} \text{Voice}^0 \\
\text{ApplP} \text{V}^0 \\
\text{DP}_{\text{EXP}} \text{DP}_{\text{THEME}} \text{Appl}^0 
\end{align*}

• But a PCC-violating configuration needs to be repaired. And the way Choctaw and Basque do this is to raise one of the arguments to Spec-VoiceP, where it acquires ergative Case.

\(\rightarrow\) But which argument raises?

(30) \begin{align*}  
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{VP} \text{Voice}^0 \\
\text{ApplP} \text{V}^0 \\
\text{DP}_{\text{ERG}} \text{DP}_{\text{THEME}} \text{Appl}^0 
\end{align*}

– Ondarru Basque: Appl\(^0\) assigns dative Case to its specifier, so the lower DP (the theme) is the only argument capable of being assigned Case.

\(^9\)When the experiencer is 1SG, however, the structure appears to not require repair, although it can be ‘spuriously’ repaired. I provide an account of this in Section 4.2.2.
Therefore the theme raises to Spec-VoiceP and is realized with ergative Case.\textsuperscript{10}

(31)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP} \rightarrow \text{Spec-VoiceP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{DP} \rightarrow \text{Spec-ApplP} \\
\langle \text{DP} \rangle \\
\text{Appl} \rightarrow \text{Spec-ApplP} \\
\end{array}
\]

- Choctaw: Appl\textsuperscript{0} does not assign dative Case, so either DP is capable of being assigned Case.

→ Moving the lower DP (the theme) would violate locality (Relativized Minimality/Closest Attract), therefore the higher DP (the experiencer) must raise to Spec-VoiceP.

(32)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP} \rightarrow \text{Spec-VoiceP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{DP} \rightarrow \text{Spec-ApplP} \\
\langle \text{DP} \rangle \\
\text{Appl} \rightarrow \text{Spec-ApplP} \\
\end{array}
\]

- What happens to Caseless DPs?

\textsuperscript{10}If this movement operation is triggered by an Agree relation with Voice\textsuperscript{0}, then it appears to violate defective intervention (Chomsky 2000). There are two ways round this problem: one is to say that defective intervention does not affect the configurations in question (see Braun 2014 for arguments against defective intervention). Alternatively, we could assume that, being Last Resort/repair movement, it is non-feature-triggered, and so is not subject to defective intervention.

→ They receive absolutive Case postsyntactically, as a default (Legate 2008).

→ So they are doubled by absolutive clitics.

(33) \begin{align*}
\text{Ergative/‘Class I’} & = \text{DP}_{[\text{ERG}]} \\
\text{Absolutive/‘Class II’} & = \text{DP}_{-}
\end{align*}

3.4 More evidence for the role of syntactic hierarchy in absolutive promotion

・ We see the same effects even when the Appl\textsuperscript{0} head is null, clearly revealing the absolutive clitics underneath.

(34) \text{Chi-bannah.} \\
\text{2SG.ABS- want} \\
‘You want it.’ (Or: ‘It wants you.’)

(35) \text{John-at chi-bannah.} \\
\text{John-SUBJ 2SG.ABS- want} \\
‘John wants you.’

(36) \text{Chi-sa-nnah.\textsuperscript{11}} \\
\text{2SG.ABS- 1SG.ABS- want} \\
‘I want you.’

・ As we’d expect, only the wanter (i.e. the experiencer of the wanting event) may be promoted in PCC-violating configurations:

(37) \text{PCC-violating configuration} \\
\text{* Pi-chi-nnah -q?} \\
\text{1PL.ABS- 2SG.ABS- want -Q} \\
\text{Intended: ‘Do you want us?’}

(38) \text{Promoting experiencer argument: OK} \\
\text{Ish-pi-bannah -q?} \\
\text{2SG.ERG- 1PL.ABS- want -Q} \\
‘Do you want us?’

\textsuperscript{11}In Mississippi Choctaw, banna typically becomes nna when preceded by a clitic that indexes the wanter. The unreduced form of (36), *chi-sa-bannah, is in fact ungrammatical.
Promoting theme argument: not OK

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{(39) } \textbf{Promoting theme argument: not OK} \\
\# \text{Ii-chi- bannah} -o? \\
\text{1PL.ERG- 2SG.ABS- want } -Q \\
\text{Intended: ‘Do you want us?’}
\end{array}
\]

Essentially, *banna* ‘want’ functions just like any other transitive unaccusative verb, except its ‘Appl\(^0\)’ has no phonological realization.\(^{12}\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(40) VoiceP} \\
\text{bannaP} \quad \text{Voice}\(^0\) \\
\text{ApplP} \quad \text{banna} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{Appl}\(^0\) \quad \emptyset \\
\end{array}
\]

3.5 Interim summary

- Absolutive Promotion is raising of a Caseless DP to Spec-VoiceP, where it receives ergative Case.
- Only the highest Caseless DP may move, thanks to locality.
- Languages are parameterized thus: Appl\(^0\) does or does not assign Case (dative) to Spec-ApplP.
  - **Choctaw**: Appl\(^0\) does not assign dative Case. DP in complement of Appl\(^0\) is highest Caseless DP.
  - **Basque**: Appl\(^0\) assigns dative Case. DP in complement of Appl\(^0\) is highest Caseless DP.
- So the languages share a PCC repair strategy. Can they be given a unified PCC restriction?

4 Unifying the PCC in Basque and Choctaw

- We have seen that PCC repairs in Basque and Choctaw share a particular strategy (with a single parameterized difference).
  \rightarrow “Take an argument that is usually absolutive and make it ergative.”
- A hypothesis: PCC restrictions in Basque and Choctaw also share a particular principle.
- In particular, PCC restrictions arise because two clitics cannot adjoin to the same head:

\[
\text{(41) Condition on Clitic Hosts (CCH) (Arregi and Nevins 2012:60):} \\
\text{‘A clitic host in Basque (T or C) can only attract one clitic.’}
\]
- I claim that we can generalize the CCH to Choctaw:

\[
\text{(42) A clitic host in Choctaw (Clitic}\(^0\)\text{ and Voice}\(^0\)\text{) can only attract one clitic.}
\]
- It’s the same restriction, it just applies to different heads.
4.1 Clitic landing sites

- Basque: clitics adjoin at the auxiliary (T⁰/C⁰) complex.
  → T⁰ hosts an absolutive or dative clitic, C⁰ hosts an ergative clitic,
  (tree adapted from Arregi and Nevins 2012:58).

(43)

- Choctaw: clitics adjoin in the Voice⁰ region.
  → Claim: Voice⁰ hosts an absolutive clitic, Clitic⁰ hosts an ergative clitic.

(44)

- N.B. ‘Clitic⁰’ is a placeholder label. The important point is that
  the clitic host is in the VoiceP region (Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004).

- Evidence that Choctaw clitics adjoin low: it is possible for clitics to
  show up on verb forms that cannot bear tense.

- Participles:
  (45) Ii-balili-t tahli-tok.
      1PL.ERG- run-PART AUX -PST
      ‘We finished running.’
  (46) Chi-nokshoopa-t iiyah.
      2SG.APPL- be.scared-PART AUX
      ‘He’s getting scared of you.’

- Nominalizations:
  (47) Ish-hihjlha -y -q?
      2SG.ERG- dance.ASP -NMZ -Q
      ‘Are you a dancer?’
  (48) Mary-at a-nokshoopa -y -q.
      Mary-SUBJ 1SG.APPL- be.scared -NMZ -Q
      ‘Is Mary ever scared of me?’
      (lit. ‘Is Mary a scared-of-me type of person?’)

4.2 A CCH-based characterization of Choctaw PCC restrictions

- The CCH says that a PCC violation is triggered when a clitic host (H⁰)
  tries to host more than one clitic.

(49) a. ✓ H⁰
    Cl
    H⁰
  b. * H⁰
    Cl
    H⁰

→ For Basque, a dative and an absolutive clitic would both target
  T⁰ (Arregi and Nevins 2012)
  → For Choctaw, two absolutive clitics would both target Voice⁰.
Two challenges for this approach:

- Challenge 1: Choctaw appears to allow clusters of two absolutive clitics, where the inner clitic is 1SG:

  (50) Chi- sa- nokshoopah.
      2SG.APPL- 1SG.ABS- be.scared
      'I’m scared of you.'

  (51) I- sa- nokshoopah.
      3.APPL- 1SG.ABS- be.scared
      'I’m scared of him.'

- Challenge 2: Is this account preferable to a feature-relativized probe analysis, à la Béjar and Rezac (2003, 2009)? See Appendix D.

4.2.1 Accounting for absolutive clitic clusters: Choctaw 1SG gets its own head

- Choctaw allows absolutive clitic clusters where the inner clitic is 1SG, as in (50-51).

- Proposal: 1SG absolutive clitics get their own landing site: Author\(^0\) (cf. the Person\(^0\) and Addressee\(^0\) heads of Myler 2016).\(^{13}\)

\[
\text{(52) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{Author}^0 \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Clitic}^0 \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Voice}^0 \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

- Independent evidence for Author\(^0\), a head that gives ‘special treatment’ to 1SG:

- Evidence #1: 1SG ergative is the only clitic/agreement form to follow, rather than precede, the stem:

  (53) \{Ish/ii/hash\}- baliilih
      \{2SG/1PL/2PL\}.ERG- run
      'You/we/y’all run.'

  (54) Bialiili -lih
      run -1SG.ERG
      'I run.'

- Evidence #2: 1SG ergative can’t show up on non-finite verbs.

  (55) (Ii)-Baliili-t (ii)-tahlih.
      1PL.ERG-run-PART 1PL.ERG-AUX
      'We finished running.'

  (56) Bialiili(-*li)-t ahli-lish.
      run-1SG.ERG-PART AUX-1SG.ERG
      'I finished running.'

- Broadwell and Martin (1993): -li is an agreement morpheme, in contrast to the other ergative/Class I forms, which are clitics.

- Upshot: Author\(^0\) is locus of 1SG ergative agreement, and also attracts 1SG absolutive clitics.

- An open question: what is the featural specification of the Author\(^0\) probe, such that it attracts only 1SG arguments?

\(^{13}\)The tree in (52) does not show several stages of head-movement, including the adjunction of Voice\(^0\) to Clitic\(^0\) and the resulting Voice\(^0\)+Clitic\(^0\) complex adjoining to Author\(^0\).
4.2.2  More on absolutive clitic clusters: ‘spurious repair’

- Certain clusters of absolutive clitics are grammatical (50-51).

- A weird fact: these structures can still be ‘repaired’ via Absolutive Promotion!

(57) Chi- sa- nokshoopah.
    2SG.APPL- 1SG.ABS- be.scared
    ‘I am scared of you.’

(58) Chi- nokshoopa -lih.
    2SG.APPL- be.scared -1SG.ERG
    ‘I am scared of you.’

- How to explain this?

  → Each option involves a different repair mechanism:

    * Having an un-promoted clitic cluster (57) means generating the Author\^0 head.
    * Doing Absolutive Promotion (58) means raising the highest Caseless DP.

    - The grammar has a choice of which to use.

5  Conclusions

- Basque and Choctaw have more in common than you’d expect: they both make use of Absolutive Promotion as a strategy to repair PCC violations.

- Absolutive Promotion involves raising the highest Caseless DP to Spec-VoiceP.

  - Basque: Appl\^0 assigns dative Case to the experiencer in Spec-ApplP. Therefore the theme is the highest Caseless argument, and so raises to Spec-VoiceP in PCC-violating contexts.

  - Choctaw: Appl\^0 does not assign dative Case. Therefore the experiencer is the highest Caseless argument, and so raises to Spec-VoiceP in PCC-violating contexts.

- Implications for Case theory: Absolutive Promotion results in a clear instance of derived ergative Case (in violation of Marantz’s Ergative Case Generalization).

- Implications for a theory of PCC restrictions: the PCC in Basque and Choctaw amounts to a syntactic restriction on clitic adjunction, and does not require a feature-relativized probe (à la Béjar and Rezac 2003, 2009).
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Appendix A: Choctaw subject-marking morphology is not Case

Firstly, subject-marking must be absent from elliptical answers that correspond to subjects, which would be unexpected if subject-marking were case morphology.14

(59) Q: Kata-sh apa-tok?
who-SUBJ eat-PST
‘Who ate it?’ (Broadwell 2006:69)

A: John-at apa-tok.
John-SUBJ eat-PST
‘John ate it’

A’: John(*-at).
John(*-SUBJ)

Secondly, subject- and object-markers are homophonous with switch-reference (SR) markers, with subject-markers corresponding to same-subject SR markers, and object-markers corresponding to different-subject SR markers:15

14Schütze (1995), citing personal correspondence with Aaron Broadwell, shows that short answers corresponding to objects can have object-marking morphology. I have no account of this.

15Examples from Broadwell (2006) have been reglossed.
save-1SG.ERG-PST

‘Because I wanted a car, I saved money.’ (Broadwell 2006:263)

Katy -SUBJ 1SG.ABS-see-PST

‘It was Katy who saw me.’

(61) a. Pisachokma-k -at ikkaana-h.
handsome-COMP -SUBJ know-TNS

‘He; knows that he; is handsome.’ (Broadwell 2006:264)

b. Katy -at sa-pisa-tok.
Katy -SUBJ 1SG.ABS-see-PST.

‘Katy saw me.’

Thirdly, if we did treat subject and object-markers as case morphology, Choctaw would have a previously-unattested typological status: a language with nominative-accusative case morphology, and active-stative agreement morphology. Woolford (2008) cites Anderson (1977, 1985); Comrie (1978); Moravcsik (1978); Wierzbicka (1981), all of whom have claimed that no language has been attested with a nominative-accusative Case system and an ergative agreement system. This suggests that ergative agreement is dependent on ergative Case. Woolford also points out that even those languages which display the opposite mismatch, with an ergative Case system and a nominative-accusative agreement system (e.g. Warlpiri), still exhibit only a fairly limited degree of independence between the two systems. If Choctaw DPs do exhibit nominative-accusative Case alongside ergative agreement (with active-stative agreement being a type of ergative agreement), then Choctaw would not occupy a typologically unattested position, it would exhibit a system that is predicted to be impossible by many theories of ergative agreement.

Appendix B: PCC repairs in ditransitives

In Basque and Choctaw ditransitives, PCC violations are repaired by deletion of a clitic:

- Basque:

(62) * Eur-ak su-ri neu presenta n -a
They-ERG you-DAT me.ABS introduce.PRF CL.1SG.ABS -T
-tzu -e.
-CL.2SG.DAT -CL.3PL.ERG

(63) Eur-ak su-ri neu presenta do -tzu
They-ERG you-DAT me.ABS introduce.PRF T CL.2SG.DAT
-e. CL.3PL.ERG

‘They introduced me to you.’

(Arregi and Nevins 2012:65)

(64) * John-at a- chi- pila -tok.
John-SUBJ 1SG.APPL- 2SG.ABS- throw -PST

Intended: ‘John threw you to me.’

(65) John-at chishnaak-o chi-ishi-cha iit
John-SUBJ you.FOC-OBL 2SG.ABS-take-COMP.SS DIR
si- ø- pil -aachit.
1SG.ABS- SUPER- throw FUT

‘John’s going pick you up and throw you at me.’

Appendix C: Choctaw Voice\(^\circ\) assigns ergative Case to its specifier

- This is the approach taken in Arregi and Nevins’s (2012) analysis of Basque. Deal (2016) also argues that it is the correct analysis of Nez Perce.

\(^\circ\)Not all speakers consulted were able to make use of clitic-deletion strategy. Some simply found the combination of arguments ineffable, though this could be an artefact of my fieldwork rather than a fact about their grammars.
Deal shows that in Nez Perce, raising-to-ergative occurs with applicatives of unaccusatives – essentially the configurations discussed here for Choctaw.

- The approach takes as its basis the inherent Case approach to ergative (Woolford 1997, 2006; Legate 2008, 2012).

- ...in that the Spec-VoiceP/vP position is associated with ergative Case.

- It is unlike dependent-Case approaches to ergative Case (Baker 2014, 2015).

- In Choctaw, quantifiers, which behave like any other verbal/adjectival predicate, take ergative clitics. It would be difficult to argue that the arguments of quantifiers are assigned Agentive ?-roles.

Appendix D: Why a CCH analysis, over a relativized-probe analysis?

- Recall the Condition on Clitic Hosts (CCH): Choctaw Voice, like Basque T, can’t handle more than a single clitic adjoining to it.

  → The question: how is this better than a Béjar and Rezac-style relativized probe analysis?

- Firstly: the ‘bare’ Appl head in- participates in Choctaw PCC restrictions.

  - in- shows up in the presence of 3rd-person applicative arguments but is not an argument-doubling clitic (Ulrich 1986; Broadwell 2006).

  - Therefore we would not expect 3rd-person arguments to trigger PCC violations under a relativized-probe model – because when the theme argument is 3rd-person, it is not clitic-doubled!

  - Secondly: Choctaw PCC effects are typologically unusual

    - Choctaw PCC effects interact with number – unusual (unattested?).\footnote{I await correction on this point.}

    - Even considering only combinations of singular arguments, the Choctaw PCC can’t be mapped to any known PCC:

      \[
      \begin{array}{ccc}
      \text{EXP↓/THM} & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
      \hline
      1 & \text{NA} & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
      2 & * & \text{NA} & * \\
      3 & \text{NA} & \text{NA} & \text{NA} \\
      \end{array}
      \]

    - ...and here are the documented flavors of the PCC (Nevins 2007, table from Graf 2014):

      \[
      \begin{array}{ccc}
      \text{IO↓/DO} & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
      \hline
      \text{Strong PCC} & 1 & \text{NA} & * & \checkmark \\
      & 2 & * & \text{NA} & \checkmark \\
      & 3 & * & * & \text{NA} \\
      \text{Ultra-strong PCC} & 1 & \text{NA} & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
      & 2 & * & \text{NA} & \checkmark \\
      & 3 & * & * & \text{NA} \\
      \text{Weak PCC} & 1 & \text{NA} & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
      & 2 & * & \text{NA} & \checkmark \\
      & 3 & * & * & \text{NA} \\
      \text{‘Me-first’ PCC} & 1 & \text{NA} & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
      & 2 & * & \text{NA} & \checkmark \\
      & 3 & * & * & \text{NA} \\
      \end{array}
      \]

- But, if we strip out the 1SG exceptions, then we end up with a relatively clean picture: Choctaw just doesn’t like having multiple clitics on the same clitic host

  → We now have a unified account of Basque and Choctaw PCC restrictions, using the proposal made in Arregi and Nevins (2012).

  → Shlonsky (1997) suggests a similar picture for Cairene Arabic.