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1 Introduction

- Person Case Constraint (PCC) restrictions 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) Basque (Ondarru)
  * 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.’

1 I make use of Broadwell’s (2006) Modified Traditional Orthography for Choctaw. Doubled letters indicate long vowels or geminated consonants, the diagraphs <sh>, <ch> and <kh> represent /ʃ/, /tʃ/ and /k/ 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.

- In Choctaw and Basque, PCC restrictions afflict transitive unaccusative predicates, e.g. fear, like, be jealous of.

- An arresting similarity: Choctaw and some dialects of Basque make use of the same repair mechanism to repair PCC violations with transitive unaccusatives:

  → Absolutive Promotion, i.e. promotion of absolutive argument to ergative (Rezac 2008; Arregi and Nevins 2012).

- But Choctaw and Basque differ in one crucial way:

  - Choctaw: The absolutive experiencer is promoted.
  - Basque: The absolutive theme is promoted.

- Assumed argument structure for transitive unaccusatives:

  (3)

  VoiceP
  \[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{ApplP} \\
  \text{Voice}^0 \\
  \text{EXP} \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{Appl}^0 \\
  \text{THEME} \\
  \text{V}^0
  \end{array} \]

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

- Proposal: the Basque/Choctaw difference can be derived from a parameterizable property of Appl^0 heads: whether or not Appl^0 assigns Case to its specifier.

  - Choctaw: Appl^0 does not assign dative Case to Spec-ApplP.
  - Basque: Appl^0 does assign dative Case to Spec-ApplP.

- Absolutive Promotion = the highest Caseless DP moving to Spec-VoiceP (see Arregi and Nevins 2012; Rezac 2008, 2010).
– Choctaw: Appl⁰ fails to assign Case to its specifier. Therefore EXP raises.

![Tree diagram](4)

(4) VoiceP
   EXP
   EXP
   VP
   THEME
   Appl⁰
   Voice⁰

– Basque: Appl⁰ assigns dative Case to its specifier. Therefore THEME raises.

![Tree diagram](5)

(5) VoiceP
   THEME
   Appl⁰
   Voice⁰
   EXP[DAT]
   VP
   THEME
   V⁰

2 Clitics and Case

In this section:

- Unlike Basque, Choctaw lacks dative Case. This is not immediately obvious!

2.1 Background

2.1.1 Basque

- Arguments are doubled by clitics, which attach to the auxiliary

![Tree diagram](6)

(6) Liburu-a emo-n dotzat lagun-arī.
   book-ABS give-PRF aux friend-DAT.SG
   ‘I’ve given the book to my friend.’
   (Lekeitio Basque, Hualde et al. 1994:125, in Arregi and Nevins 2012:19)

- DPs are marked for Case (ergative, absolutive, dative):

![Tree diagram](7)

(7) Morphological composition of aux in (6)³
   d-o-tz-t
   L -PRES.3SG -CL.3SG.DAT -CL.1SG.ERG
   (>dotzat)

- Table adapted from Arregi and Nevins (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>

³Arregi and Nevins (2012) elaborate a complex system of syntactic and phonological processes that result in Basque auxiliaries looking the way they do. This means, however, that the syntactic composition of auxiliaries (at least in their analysis) is often obscured by subsequent morphophonological adjustments. In the Basque examples provided here, I follow their convention, and provide the form of auxiliaries after phonological rules in parentheses, for instance, d-o-tz-t in (6/7) becomes dotzat.
2.1.2 Choctaw

- First glance analysis:
  - **Nom-acc** case system.
  - **Erg-abs-Dat** clitic/agreement system.

- In this talk I focus on the behavior of clitics, as Absolutive Promotion occurs within the clitic domain—nominal case-marking is unaffected.

- Full table of clitics (‘Class I-III’ labels are from Munro and Gordon 1982):\(^4\)

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
 & \text{Class I} & \text{Class II} & \text{Class III} \\
=\text{Ergative} & =\text{Absolutive} & =\text{Dative}??
\end{array}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-li</td>
<td>sa-/s-</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>
</tbody>
</table>

- What the clitics do:\(^5\)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
 & \text{Agentive arguments get erg clitics} & \\
\text{Is}- & \text{balili-h-q} & \\
2SG.ERG- & \text{run-TNS-Q} & \\
& \text{‘Are you running?’}
\end{array}
\]

\(\text{Cl}_{\text{ABS}} + \text{Appl}^0 \Rightarrow \text{‘Class III’}\)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
 & \text{sa} & \text{chi} & \text{pi} & \text{hapi} & \text{hachi} & \text{im-} \\
+ & m & m & m & m & m & m
\end{array}
\]

4 ‘1PL+’ 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-, hapim-, hachim-, im-.

5 I assume almost all forms are clitics (see Jelinek 1989; Schütze 1994; Tyler to appear for arguments in favor of this view). The one exception is the Class I/ergative 1SG form -li, which displays unusual behavior, cf. Broadwell and Martin 1993; Tyler to appear. I assume it is an agreement morpheme rather than a clitic.

2.2 Choctaw has no dative

- Analysis: there are only 2 kinds of clitic in Choctaw: ERG and ABS.

→ Class III clitics are composed of an ABS clitic + Appl\(^0\) (based on a proposal in Ulrich 1986).

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Cl}_{\text{ABS}} & + & \text{Appl}^0 & \Rightarrow & \text{‘Class III’} \\
\text{sa} & + & m & \Rightarrow & (s)am- \\
\text{chi} & + & m & \Rightarrow & chim- \\
\text{pi} & + & m & \Rightarrow & pim- \\
\text{hapi} & + & m & \Rightarrow & hapim- \\
\text{hachi} & + & m & \Rightarrow & hachim- \\
\text{im-} & + & m & \Rightarrow & \text{im-}
\end{array}
\]

- Appl\(^0\) is spelled out as /\(i\)m/ (it may become nasalization on the preceding vowel, by a regular phonological rule).
• But wait! The class III forms sure look like they’re doubling dative arguments:

(15) Indirect objects
Sa-tiikchi-yat towwa a- pila-tok.
my-wife-SUBJ ball 1SG.III- throw-PST
‘My wife threw me the ball.’

(16) Some direct objects (mainly goals)
Ii- chi- paya-tok.
1PL.ERG- 2SG.III- call-PST
‘We called you.’

(17) Some subjects (mainly experiencers)
A-chiloosa-h.
1SG.III-lonely-TNS
‘I feel lonely.’

• But the Class-III-as-dative analysis hits a snag:

– In transitive unaccusatives, the Class III clitic doubles the theme argument, rather than the experiencer!

(18) EXP = Bill; THM = me
Bill-at a- nokshoopa-h.
Bill-SUBJ 1SG.III- scared-TNS
‘Bill is scared of me.’

• Syntactic evidence: ABS clitic and Appl⁰ may be separated (or fail to merge) in some constructions:

(21) ‘Clitic raising-to-object’⁶
a. [Ik- [sa- m- achokma-] ahni-h.]
   [IRR- 1SG.ABS- APPL- happy-JUSS] think-TNS
b. [Ik- [im- achokma-] [si- ahni-h.]
   [IRR- APPL- happy -JUSS] 1SG.ABS- think-TNS
‘She wants me to be happy.’

Summary

• Basque:
  – ERG, ABS and DAT Case, realized on clitics also.

• Choctaw:
  – Nominal ‘case’ is a separate system (set aside here).
  – 2 clitic series: ERG and ABS.
  – ‘Class III’ clitics are ABS + Appl⁰.

• Morphological evidence for ClABS+Appl⁰ decomposition: other Appl⁰s.

(19) Comitative Appl
John-at chi- baa- tksalih.
John-SUBJ 2SG.ABS- COM- work
‘John works with you.’

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

⁶See Tyler (to appear) and Appendix E for further discussion of this construction, and evidence that it does not involve quotation.
3 Transitive unaccusatives

- Verbs with two internal arguments and no external argument.
- I assume this structure for both Basque and Choctaw:

\[ (22) \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{ApplP} \quad \text{Voice}^0 \\
\text{EXP} \quad \text{Appl}^0 \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{THEME} \quad \text{V}^0
\end{array}
\]

- Crucially, \textit{EXP} c-commands \textit{THEME}.
  - For Basque, this is a standard assumption (Elordieta 2001, Chapter 3 and works cited there).
  - Next: the same holds for Choctaw

3.1 Experiencer c-commands theme

- Flow of argumentation here:
  1. Establish a diagnostic to determine the highest DP within VoiceP.
  2. Apply that diagnostic to transitive unaccusatives.
- Diagnostic:

\[ (23) \]

\[ \text{The highest argument in a Choctaw VoiceP is marked with SUBJ } -\text{at/} -\text{sh. Other DPs (generally) may not be subject-marked.}\]

\footnote{Broadwell (2006:304-5) shows that in subject possessor-raising constructions, the original subject of the clause may bear subj, as well as the derived subject. Davies (1986) also lists several other constructions in which a second argument may optionally be subject-marked. I leave these aside as I am uncertain of their empirical status. Even in these cases, however, the linear order of the arguments is fixed, and the leftmost argument obligatorily carries subject-marking, while the other argument carries it optionally.}

- Case #1: Causatives. Causer, introduced high, ‘steals’ the subject marking from original subject:

\[ (24) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Without causer} \\
\text{John-at} \quad \text{im-ihaksi-h.} \\
\text{John-SUBJ APPL-forget-TNS} \\
\text{‘John forgot.’}
\end{array} \]

\[ (25) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{With causer} \\
\text{Bill-at John(-a/\text{at}) im-ihaksi-chi-tok.} \\
\text{Bill-SUBJ John(-OBJ/\text{SUBJ}) 3.APPL-forget-CAUS-PST} \\
\text{‘Bill made John forget.’} \\
\end{array} \quad \text{(Broadwell 2006:129)}
\]

- Case #2: ‘Copy-raising’.\footnote{I call (27) a copy-raising construction as that was the English translation given by my consultants, but I make no claims about any similarities between the constructions in each language, beyond what’s said here.} Copy-raised argument ‘steals’ the subject-marking from experiencer:

\[ (26) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Without copy-raised argument} \\
\text{Chim-alikchi-t \quad [chi-nayoppah] im-ahoobah.} \\
\text{your-doctor-SUBJ 2SG.ABS-happy 3.APPL-seem} \\
\text{‘Your doctor thinks you’re happy.’}
\end{array} \]

\[ (27) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{With copy-raised argument} \\
\text{Chim-alikchi-(\text{t}) \quad [chi-nayoppah] ish-im-ahoobah.} \\
\text{your-doctor-(\text{SUBJ}) 2SG.ABS-happy 2SG.ERG-3.APPL-seem} \\
\text{Lit. ‘You seem to your doctor like you’re happy.’}
\end{array} \]

- Upshot: we can use subject-marking as a diagnostic for the highest argument.
- Applying this diagnostic to transitive unaccusatives:

\[ \rightarrow \text{It is always the experiencer that carries the subject-marker.} \]

\[ (28) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{a. Bill-at Mary i-nokshoo-pa-h.} \\
\text{Bill-SUBJ Mary APPL-scared-TNS} \\
\text{‘Bill is scared of Mary.’} \\
\text{\*Bill, Mary is scared of.}
\end{array} \]
b. Bill-at Mary-at j-nokshoopa-h.
   Bill-OBJ Mary-SUBJ APPL-scared-TNS
   ‘Bill, Mary is scared of.’
   ‘Bill is scared of Mary.’

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

4 Putting the pieces together: Absolutive Promotion

Structure of transitive unaccusatives:

(29)

[VoiceP
  [ApplP Voice0]
  [EXP VP Appl0]
  [THEME V0]
]

I’ve proposed that EXP gets dative Case in Basque, but not in Choctaw:

(30)

a. Basque

[VoiceP
  [ApplP Voice0]
  [EXP VP Appl0]
  [THEME V0]
]

b. Choctaw

[VoiceP
  [ApplP Voice0]
  [EXP VP Appl0]
  [THEME V0]
]

• Much of the time, sentences are formed as you’d expect:

(31) Basque. EXP: DAT, THEME: ABS

Ni-ri Jon-Ø ondo jaus-ten g -a -t. (>gasta)
me-DAT Jon-ABS well fall-IMPF L -T.AGR -CL.1SG.DAT
‘I like Jon.’
(Arregi and Nevins 2012:65)

(32) Choctaw. EXP: ABS, THEME: ABS(+Appl0)

Chi- sa-nokshoopa-h.
2SG.APPL- 1SG.ABS-scared-TNS.
‘I’m scared of you.’

• But sometimes, these verbs hang out with the wrong combinations of arguments, and trigger PCC violations.

– N.B. I ignore here how Choctaw and Basque’s PCC restrictions come about. I focus solely on how they’re fixed (see the conclusion and Tyler 2017 for some thoughts on the PCC in Choctaw).

4.1 Description of Absolutive Promotion

• Basic recipe: you take the argument that would be absolutive, and you make it ergative.9


(33) *Ni-ri su-Ø ondo jaus-ten s me-DAT you-ABS well fall-IMPF CL.2SG.ABS
    -a -t. (>sasta)
    -PRES.2SG -CL.1SG.DAT
    ‘I like you.’ (Arregi and Nevins 2012:69)

(34) Ni-ri su-Ø/k ondo jaus-te d -o me-DAT you-ABS/ERG well fall-IMPF AUX -PRES.3SG
    -t -su. (>stasu)
    -CL.1SG.DAT -CL.2SG.ERG
    ‘I like you.’
    (Arregi and Nevins 2012:69)

9Some literature (e.g. Anagnostopoulou 2005) states that PCC effects only occur in the presence of an external argument—this cannot be true, given the data from Basque and Choctaw.
Choctaw: (N.B. only visible in clitic behavior, does not affect nominal ‘case’)

(35)  *P₁⁻chi⁻nokshoopah.  
1PL.APPL- 2SG.ABS- be.scared

(36)  Ish⁻p₁⁻nokshoopah.  
2SG.ERG- 1PL.APPL- be.scared
‘You are scared of us.’

• But note the difference:
  – Basque: theme is promoted
  – Choctaw: experiencer is promoted.

4.2 Analysis

• Voice⁰ assigns erg to Spec-VoiceP.

(37)  VoiceP
     \[DP_{[ERG]} \rightarrowXP \rightarrow Voice^0\]

• DPs can raise to Spec-VoiceP to get erg
  – i.e. a structural ergative (see Arregi and Nevins 2012; Rezac et al. 2014 on Basque, Deal 2016 on Nez Perce)

(38)  VoiceP
     \[DP_{[ERG]} \rightarrowXP \rightarrow Voice^0\]

• Absolutive promotion = raising to Spec-VoiceP to get erg.
  – Basque: EXP already has dat, so THEME is the only argument capable of being assigned Case.
    → Therefore THEME is promoted.¹⁰

(39)

\[\text{VoiceP} \quad \text{THEME}_{[ERG]} \quad \text{ApplP} \quad \text{Voice}^0\]
\[\text{EXP}_{[DAT]} \quad \text{Voice}^0 \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Appl}^0\]
\[\langle \text{THEME}_{[\_]} \rangle \quad V^0\]

– Choctaw: Both DPs are Caseless, so either is capable of being assigned Case.
  → EXP raises to satisfy locality.¹¹

(40)

\[\text{VoiceP} \quad \text{EXP}_{[ERG]} \quad \text{ApplP} \quad \text{Voice}^0\]
\[\langle \text{EXP}_{[\_]} \rangle \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Appl}^0\]
\[\langle \text{THEME}_{[\_]} \rangle \quad V^0\]

¹⁰If this movement operation is triggered by an Agree relation with Voice⁰, then it appears to violate defective intervention (Chomsky 2000). There are two ways around this problem: one is to say that defective intervention does not affect the configurations in question (see Bruening 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.

¹¹Locality could be Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990), Shortest Move (Chomsky 2000), Attract Closest (Chomsky 1995) or the Minimal Link Condition (Chomsky 1995).
• What happens to Caseless DPs?
  – They receive ABS postsyntactically, as a default (Legate 2008).
  – So they are doubled by ABS clitics.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ERG clitic} & = \text{DP}_{[\text{ERG}]} \\
\text{ABS clitic} & = \text{DP}_{\square}
\end{align*}
\]

• Up next: Absolutive Promotion requires a PCC-violating configuration.

5 Absolutive Promotion really is a repair strategy

• A sufficient condition to call Absolutive Promotion a ‘repair strategy’:

\[\text{No PCC violation, no Absolutive Promotion}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Chi-} & \text{ nolkhakgha-h-q}\? \\
\text{2SG.ABS- be.shocked-TNS-Q} & \text{ ‘Are you shocked?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Absolutive Promotion is ungrammatical}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{*Ish-} & \text{ nolkhakgha-h-q}\? \\
\text{2SG.ERG- be.shocked-TNS-Q} & \text{ Intended: ‘Are you shocked?’}
\end{align*}
\]

→ So Absolutive Promotion really can be characterized as a ‘repair strategy’.\(^{13}\)

• Up next: against a purely morphological analysis of Absolutive Promotion in Choctaw

6 Absolutive Promotion is syntactic

• Unlike Basque, Choctaw Absolutive Promotion does not affect nominal case-marking.

→ So you might think: it’s a purely morphological operation!

6.1 Evidence #1: Absolutive Promotion involves ‘retreat from the unmarked’

• When morphological operations manipulate features, they delete them or change them to their unmarked value (Noyer 1992; Bobaljik 2002; Pescarini 2005, 2010; Rezac 2011; Nevins 2011).

  – Hence the ubiquity of impoverishment within DM (Halle and Marantz 1993); ‘enrichment’ less so (though see Müller 2007; Johnson 2014).

\[^{13}\text{The adherence of each language to the claim in (42) was demonstrated in two different ways. In Basque, it was shown by trying to do Absolutive Promotion to a non-PCC-violating configuration of arguments. In Choctaw, it was done by trying to do Promotion on a single experiencer argument in the absence of any argument whatsoever. The fact that there is no single syntactic test that can be applied to both languages is unfortunate, but follows from independent facts about the languages. See Appendix D.}\]

\(^{12}\text{When the experiencer is 1SG and theme is present, Absolutive Promotion is optional. See Appendix C for further discussion of this ‘spurious repair’.}\)
But if Absolutive Promotion was morphological, it would involve change from unmarked (ABS clitic) to marked (ERG clitic).

- Evidence that ABS is default/unmarked:
  - The form of the ABS clitics reoccur in several other contexts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>Inalien. poss.</th>
<th>Neg, ERG</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>sa-</td>
<td>sa-</td>
<td>a-k-</td>
<td>a-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>chi-</td>
<td>chi-</td>
<td>chi-k-</td>
<td>chi-shno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>kii-/kil-</td>
<td>pi-shno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL+</td>
<td>hapi</td>
<td>hapi</td>
<td>kii-/kil-</td>
<td>hapi-shno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>hachi</td>
<td>hachi</td>
<td>hachi-k-</td>
<td>hachi-shno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>ik-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Negative ergative series particular notable: ERG clitics become ABS clitics when adjacent to the exponent of negation (k)—a good candidate for impoverishment!

6.2 Evidence #2: Absolutive Promotion when the arguments are morphologically undifferentiated

- The verb (ba)nna ‘want’ takes two bare ABS clitics:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2SG. ABS- want</td>
<td>‘You want it.’ / ‘It wants you.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If Absolutive Promotion was morphological, we might expect that either ABS clitic could be promoted.

- Yet only the experiencer argument may be promoted:

- 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.

Summary

- Absolutive Promotion is syntactic.
- Absolutive Promotion is a repair strategy.
  - It follows the ‘if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it’ principle.
- Absolutive Promotion involves raising the highest Caseless DP to Spec-VoiceP, where it receives ERG Case.
  - Choctaw: highest Caseless DP is EXP (Appl^0 doesn’t assign dative).
  - Basque: highest Caseless DP is THEME (Appl^0 assigns dative to EXP)

7 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.
The difference in which argument is targeted by the operation can be reduced to an independently motivated difference between the two: does the experiencer get Case?

• Implications for Case theory:
  - In Choctaw, Absolutive Promotion occurs within the clitic system; the nominal case system is unaffected.

• Implications for a theory of PCCs:
  - Repairs can involve syntactic operations (movement, Case-assignment).
  - Repairs respect syntactic constraints (locality).

An advertisement for Choctaw morphosyntax

(Rezac 2008:80) 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.

7.1 Further direction: what are the Basque/Choctaw PCC restrictions?

• Huge literature on Basque (Laka 1993; Albizu 1997; Ormazabal and Romero 2001, 2007; Rezac 2008; Arregi and Nevins 2012, among many others); Choctaw, not so much (Davies 1986:84 in an endnote).

• Choctaw generalization:

53 PCC in Choctaw
All ABS-ABS clitic clusters (including ABS-APPL clusters) are banned unless the inner clitic is 1SG.

- This is weird because it interacts with number, but also...
- It is best given a morphological rather than syntactic characterization.
  - So here is the syntactic characterization (for singulars only!):

54 EXP↓/THM→  1  2  3
1  NA  ✓  ✓
2  * NA *
3  ✓ ✓  NA

...and here are the documented flavors of the PCC (Nevins 2007, table from Graf 2014):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong PCC</th>
<th>Weak PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IO↓/DO→</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA * ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>* NA ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>* * NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ultra-strong PCC</th>
<th>‘Me-first’ PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IO↓/DO→ 1 2 3</td>
<td>IO↓/DO→ 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>* NA ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>* * NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Put simply, it doesn’t correspond to any of these four PCC types.
  → But it can be easily captured with the morphological characterization in (53).

• Morphological restriction, syntactic repair—should this worry us?
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Appendix A: Choctaw subject- and object-marking

- Is it case? It has a few hard-to-explain properties:
  - Subject-marking must be absent from elliptical answers:

  (56) Q: Kata-sh apa-tok?
  who-SUBJ eat-PST
  ‘Who ate it?’

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

  A’: John(*-at).
  John(*-SUBJ)

- 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:

  (57) a. Kaah sa-ma-h-aatokoo -sh, iskali
  car 1SG.ABS-want-TNS-because -SS, money
  ittahoblili-tok.
  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.’

  (58) a. Pisachokma-k -at ikaana-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.’

- If SUBJ/OBJ marking is Case-marking, Choctaw is a typologically unattested type: a language with NOM-ACC case morphology and ergative agreement (clitic) morphology (Anderson 1977, 1985; Comrie 1978; Moravcsik 1978; Wierzbicka 1981).

* Woolford (2008): languages with Case/agreement mismatches (e.g. Warlpiri), exhibit a fairly limited degree of independence between the systems.

---

15Schütze (1994), citing personal correspondence with Aaron Broadwell, shows that short answers corresponding to objects can have object-marking morphology. I have no account of this.
* The independence of the systems in Choctaw is much more ‘wholesale’ than expected.

Appendix B: PCC repairs in ditransitives

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

- **Basque:**

  (59) *Eur-ak su-ri **neu** presenta n -a
  They-ERG you-DAT me.ABS introduce.PRF CL.1SG.ABS -t
  -CL.2SG.DAT -CL.3PL.ERG
  (Arregi and Nevins 2012:65)

  (60) 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 2012:78)

- **Choctaw:**\(^{16}\)

  (61) *John-at a- ch- i pila -tok.
  John-SUBJ 1SG.APPL- 2SG.ABS- throw -PST
  Intended: ‘John threw you to me.’

  (62) John-at chishmaak-ä ch-ishi-cha iit
  John-SUBJ you.FOC-OBL 2SG.ABS-take-COMP.SS DIR
  si- o- pil -aachih.
  1SG.ABS- SUPER- throw FUT
  ‘John’s going pick you up and throw you at me.’

\(^{16}\)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.

Appendix C: ‘Spurious repair’

- Certain clusters of ABS clitics are grammatical:

  (63) {I- / Ch- } sa- nokshoopa-h.
  APPL- / 2SG.APPL- 1SG.ABS- be.scared-TNS
  ‘I am scared of you.’

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

  (64) {I- / Ch- } nokshoopa -li -h.
  APPL- / 2SG.APPL- be.scared -1SG.ERG -TNS
  ‘I am scared of you.’

- How to explain this?

  → Each option involves a different repair mechanism:

  * Doing Absolutive Promotion (64) means raising the highest Caseless DP.
  * Having an un-promoted clitic cluster (63) means generating a new clitic host.

  – The grammar has a choice of which to use.

Appendix D: More on ‘if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it’

- This is how we illustrated the principle for Basque—by trying to promote a non-PCC-violating configuration.

  (65) No PCC violation, no Absolutive Promotion
  Ni-ri Jon-Ø o-ndo jaus-ten ga -t. (gasta)
  me-DAT Jon-ABS well fall-IMPF C -CL.1SG.DAT
  ‘I like Jon.’
  (Arregi and Nevins 2012:70)
(66) Absolutive Promotion is ungrammatical
*Ni-ri Jon-(ek) ondo jaus-te do -t
me-DAT Jon-(ERG) well fall-IMPF C -CL.1SG.DAT
-O.
-CL.ERG.3SG
Intended: ‘I like Jon.’ (Arregi and Nevins 2012:70)

• And this is how we illustrated it for Choctaw—by trying to promote an experiencer in the absence of a theme.

(67) No PCC violation, no Absolutive Promotion
Chi- noklhaka-h-o?
2SG.ABS- be.shocked-TNS-Q
‘Are you shocked?’

(68) Absolutive Promotion is ungrammatical
*Ish- noklhaka-h-o?
2SG.ERG- be.shocked-TNS-Q
Intended: ‘Are you shocked?’

• Why couldn’t we test both languages in the same way?

→ Because each strategy is confounded in one of the languages:

– In Basque, none of the relevant verbs can appear intransitively, so there is no grammatical equivalent to (68).
– In Choctaw, the only possible configurations of internal-argument clitics are where the experiencer clitic is 1SG. But these forms permit ‘spurious repair’, see Appendix C.

• Therefore it’s (unfortunately) necessary to demonstrate the principle using a different test case for each language.

Appendix E: Clitic raising-to-object doesn’t involve quotation or prolepsis

• Against quotation: wh-words can move out of the embedded clause: