CHOCTAW AS A WINDOW INTO THE CLITIC/AGREEMENT SPLIT*

Matthew Tyler

Abstract. The Choctaw verb hosts argument-referencing morphemes that could plausibly be analyzed as φ-agreement affixes or argument-doubling clitics. I argue that (almost) all the morphemes in question are clitics, on the basis of several state-of-the-art tests. The bulk of the argumentation comes from two of the morphemes’ properties in particular: firstly, they participate in clitic-climbing alternations, and secondly, they are able to license the extrinsic plural marker oklah, an element with the syntactic licensing conditions typical of floating quantifiers. Following much work proposing that clitics have the syntactic status of determiner heads in an A-movement chain with their DP associate, I show that the properties just outlined follow straightforwardly from a clitic analysis, but would not be predicted under a φ-agreement analysis.

1. Introduction

The form of a Choctaw verb varies with the φ-features of its subject and object, as partially illustrated in (1). There has been some disagreement, however, over whether argument-doubling morphemes like those bolded in (1) are agreement morphemes or argument-doubling clitics (Broadwell & Martin 1993, Woolford 2008, 2010).¹

(1) a. Tachi ii-pa-tok.
   corn 1PL.I-eat-PST
   ‘We ate corn.’

¹My sincere thanks go to the Choctaw speakers who shared their language with me, especially Patty Billie, Chris Chickaway, Shayla Chickaway, Ashton Isaac, Zonie Isaac, Renata Morris, Pam Smith, Buck Willis, Darlene Willis and Shavon Willis. I would also like to thank the Choctaw Language Program, the Tribal Council and the Office of the Chief at the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians for their support. Finally, thanks to Jim Wood and Aaron Broadwell for their helpful comments and suggestions, as well as audiences at Yale, SSILA 2017 and BLS 43. All errors are my own.

¹ I use the modified traditional orthography from Broadwell (2006): doubled vowels and doubled consonants are long, underlined vowels are nasalized, < > represents [ʔ] and <lh> represents [ɬ]. Short vowels are often made long by a process of *rhythmic lengthening* (see section 4.5), which is represented in the orthography. Pitch accent is word-final unless indicated with an accent, and I mark word-final glottal stops only where they perform a grammatical function (for instance, when marking the jussive morpheme). Word-final glottal stops are retained from other authors’ examples, however. The following non-transparent glosses are used for Choctaw. C: complementizer; COM: comitative (‘with X’); DS: different-subject switch-reference marker; IRR: irrealis; JUSS: jussive; LG: l-grade verb form (found with certain switch-reference markers); MOD: modal; NG: n-grade verb form (progressive aspect); SS: same-subject switch-reference marker; TNS: default tense, I, II and III are used to gloss Class I-III markers. When glossing examples from other languages, I faithfully reproduce their gloss unless otherwise indicated.
b. Alikchi-at chi-foloot-aach-i-h.
   doctor-NOM 2SG.II-visit-FUT-TNS
   ‘The doctor will visit you.’

In this paper I take up the issue once more, and use a mixture of old and new data to argue that all but one of the morphemes in question are in fact clitics, rather than agreement affixes. The bulk of the argumentation relies on a syntactic distinction that has emerged in recent literature between the two. On the one hand, clitics have the syntactic properties of pronominal arguments, both looking and behaving like determiners, and appear to count as copies of their argument during the syntactic derivation. Agreement morphemes, on the other hand, are merely the exponents of φ-features and are syntactically ‘inert’. By applying this theory, developed on the basis of a small set of languages, to a paradigm of argument-referencing morphemes in an understudied non-European language, the cross-linguistic robustness of theory is highlighted.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces Choctaw’s Class I-III markers—the morphemes whose clitic vs. agreement status is discussed in this paper. Section 3 then lays out some theoretical assumptions about the clitic/agreement split in grammar. Section 4 provides five theoretically-grounded pieces of evidence suggestive of a clitic analysis of (most of) the Class I-III markers. Section 5 fleshes out the details of how clitic-doubling and agreement work in Choctaw, and the following two sections, 6 and 7, look at two further pieces of evidence in more detail: firstly, I examine the availability of Romance-like clitic climbing alternations in two constructions, and secondly I look at when clitics are able or unable to license the extrinsic plural marker oklah—an element which, I argue, has the same syntactic licensing conditions as floating quantifiers.

2. The morphemes in question

In this section, I provide some brief background on Choctaw, and introduce the argument-referencing morphemes in question.

Choctaw is a Western Muskogean language spoken in Mississippi and Oklahoma. The 2010 census put the number of speakers at 10,400, and Broadwell (2006) estimated that there were between 9,000 and 11,000 speakers at the time of his writing. There are likely fewer today. All original data in this paper come from one-on-one elicitation sessions with several native speakers of Mississippi Choctaw, all of whom grew up and continue to live near Philadelphia, Mississippi.

In terms of its structural properties, Choctaw is a uniformly head-final language, with default SOV order and pervasive argument drop. The sentence-final verb may be inflected for aspect, and marked with suffixes
expressing mood, tense, negation, evidentiality and clause-type. A typical transitive sentence with no argument drop is shown in (2).

(2) Alikchi-at alla pisa-tok-o?
    doctor-NOM child see-PST-Q
    ‘Did the doctor see the child?’

The verb also hosts morphemes that cross-reference its arguments – these are the topic of this paper. They are shown in (3), with their theory-neutral labels ‘Class I’, ‘Class II’ and ‘Class III’ (Munro & Gordon 1982).2

(3) | Class I | Class II | Class III |
---|---|---|---|
1sg | -li | sa-/si- | (s)am- |
2sg | ish- | chi- | chim- |
1pl | ii-/il- | pi- | pim- |
1pl+ | ii-/il- | hapi- | hapim- |
2pl | hash- | hachi- | hachim- |
3/unmarked | – | – | im- |

These morphemes are distributed according to a split-S pattern, also known as a split-intransitive, *active-stative, active* or *semantic* alignment system (see Mithun 1991 for discussion of the proliferation of terminology in this area). What this means is that the choice of whether an argument is cross-referenced by a Class I, II or III form is determined, roughly, by the semantic role of the argument. I now give a broad-strokes classification of the kinds of argument that each form typically cross-references.

Class I markers tend to cross-reference agents, initiators or attitude-holders. A Class I argument will invariably be the subject of its clause, shown for intransitive and transitive verbs in (4).

(4) a. Ish-hilh-aahiina-h-o?
    2SG.I-dance-MOD-TNS-Q
    ‘Can you dance?’

b. Nani ii-hokli-tok.
    fish 1PL.I-catch-PST
    ‘We caught the fish.’

Class II markers tend to cross-reference non-agentive arguments, including patients, themes and experiencers. Note that they can cross-reference subjects (5a) and objects (5b).

(5) a. Chi-noktalha-h-o?
    2SG.II-jealous-TNS-Q
    ‘Are you jealous.’

2 The ‘1pl+’ forms mean something like ‘we/us all’.
Finally, Class III markers tend to cross-reference applied, indirect or otherwise ‘dative-like’ arguments. Like Class II markers, they can cross-reference both objects (6a) and subjects (6b).

(6) a. Bill-at nipi chi-hopőni-h.  
Bill-NOM meat 2sg.iii-cook.NG-TNS  
‘Bill is cooking meat for you.’

b. A-takoobi-h.  
1sg.iii-lazy-TNS  
‘I am lazy.’

It is not the aim of this article to provide an analysis of how an argument’s semantic properties correspond to the choice of Class I-III form it triggers—see Payne (1982), Munro & Gordon (1982), Broadwell (1988, 1990, 2006) and Tyler (2018) for discussion. Instead, I aim to provide a morphosyntactic characterization of the Class I-III forms themselves. To this end, I draw the reader’s attention to three issues.

Firstly, note that the 1 SG Class I marker -li is exceptional: unlike every other marker, it follows rather than precedes the verb stem. I follow a similar proposal by Broadwell & Martin (1993), and argue that the exceptionality of -li derives from its status as the lone agreement morpheme in a paradigm otherwise entirely composed of clitics. Evidence for its exceptionality is discussed at various stages in this article, in sections 4.5 and 6.2.

Secondly, note that the Class I and II paradigms are impoverished: they lack 3rd-person forms, and it appears as though only the Class III series has a 3rd-person form. Following an analysis in Ulrich (1986), Broadwell (1990, 2006) and Woolford (2008), among others, I do not treat the Class III forms as morphological primitives, and instead treat them as decomposable into Class II markers followed by an applicative morpheme or incorporated preposition im- (realized as nasalization on the preceding vowel in pre-consonantal contexts). This means that the apparent 3rd-person Class III form im- can be reanalyzed as a bare applicative morpheme or incorporated preposition, with no preceding Class II marker, and we can make the simplifying assumption that there really are no true 3rd-person forms in any paradigm. Support for the ‘unmarked’ status of im- comes from Ulrich (1986). He shows that for verbs that take Class III subjects, the form im- appears when the verb is used as an imperative, as in (7a), or when the subject is controlled PRO, as in (7b).
   what-NOM 2SG.II-hold.NG-C-DS let.go.LG-SS III-good-TNS  
   ‘Whatever is holding you back, let it go and be happy.’

b. [PRO i-takoobi-h] chi-banna-h.³  
   III-lazy-TNS 2SG.ABS-want-TNS  
   ‘You want to be lazy.’ (Ulrich 1986:242)

Accordingly, in this article I gloss *im-* as ‘III’ (rather than ‘3.III’).

Thirdly, a distinction is made in the clitic literature between argument-doubling clitics, which can (or must) co-occur with overt arguments, and clitic pronouns, which are in complementary distribution with their arguments. (8) shows that the Class I-III markers may indeed co-occur with overt arguments. This is most easily shown using focused pronouns, since 1st and 2nd-person arguments are generally omitted outside of focused contexts.

   you.FOC-NOM 2SG.I-run-PST  
   ‘It’s YOU who ran.’

b. Mary-at chishnak-o chi-písa-tok.  
   Mary-NOM you.FOC-ACC 2SG.II-see.NG-PST  
   ‘It’s YOU who Mary saw.’

c. Chishnak-oosh chi-takoobi-h.  
   you.FOC-NOM 2SG.III-lazy-TNS  
   ‘It’s YOU who’s lazy.’

Note that only argument-doubling clitics are ever liable to be mistaken for agreement forms—being in complementary distribution with overt arguments is a fairly airtight sign that the form in question is a clitic pronoun and not an agreement form.

The purpose of this article is to argue that all of the Class I-III morphemes in (3), except -li, are argument-doubling clitics rather than agreement forms. The next section lays out what this means in theoretical terms.

3 In Mississippi Choctaw, chi-banna would typically be realized as chinna.
The analysis that argument-doubling clitics are determiners has been formulated in a number of ways (e.g. Uriagereka 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Franks & Rudin 2005, Nevins 2011, Kramer 2014, Harizanov 2014, Coon 2017). The attraction of this analysis is that it captures several of their properties. Firstly, it captures the observation that in many languages, clitics formally resemble determiners and pronouns (on the assumption that pronouns are the same syntactic category as determiners). See Uriagereka 1995 and Anagnostopoulou 2006 for some discussion of this point. Secondly, it captures the finding that in many languages, they behave like pronouns too: for instance, they affect binding relations (Suñer 1988, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1997, Cuervo 2003, Kramer 2014, Harizanov 2014), and they may license floating quantifiers (Tsakali 2008, Rezac 2010, Harizanov 2014).

The second main component of these analyses, especially more recent ones, is that argument-doubling clitics do not project full syntactic phrases (DPs), but instead adjoin to some position in the clausal spine as non-projecting heads (Franks & Rudin 2005, Preminger 2009, Roberts 2010, Nevins 2011, Arregi & Nevins 2012, Kramer 2014, Coon 2017, Yuan 2017). This captures certain facts about their distribution: such as how they are susceptible to further head-movement of their host head. For instance, French weak object pronouns are clitics which adjoin to T₀ (Roberts 2010). When the auxiliary in T₀ undergoes T₀-to-C₀ movement, as in a question, the clitic moves with the verb:

(9) a. Tu l’as vu.
   You it.have seen
   ‘You have seen it.’

b. L’as-tu vu?
   it.have-you seen
   ‘Have you seen it?’

To sum up, then, I assume that an argument-doubling clitic is a determiner head adjoined to some clitic-hosting head on the clausal spine. The question remains of how it gets there—there are various theoretical options available to describe the relation between an argument and its associated clitic, but for concreteness I follow the school of thought that clitics are base-generated as D₀s adjoined to their DP arguments, and undergo subsequent movement to their clitic host head (Nevins 2011, Arregi & Nevins 2012, Kramer 2014). The basic schema of clitic-doubling is shown in (10): the argument DP is base-generated with an adjoined D₀—its clitic. This clitic undergoes long head

---

4 An alternative school (Harizanov 2014) holds that clitics are copies of their DP associates that have undergone some form of ‘reduction’ (e.g. by m-merger) which allows both copies to be spelled out. I believe that the data presented here is compatible with such a theory, but I leave the option aside for reasons of space.
movement to the specifier of the clitic-hosting head, Spec-HP, as shown in (10a). The clitic D₀ and the clitic-hosting head H₀ subsequently undergo $m$-merger, a postsyntactic rebracketing operation (Matushansky 2006), to become a complex head, as shown in (10b).

(10) a. 

\[ HP \rightarrow D₀^{\text{Clitic}} \rightarrow \langle H₀ \rangle \rightarrow DP \]

Turning to agreement, many authors have noted that agreement morphology does not seem to be ‘active’ in the syntax in the way that clitics are (Benmamoun et al. 2009, Arregi & Nevins 2012, Bhatt & Walkow 2013). For instance, Rezac (2010) notes that verbs bearing agreement morphology do not license floating quantifiers in the same way that clitics do. Another contrast of this sort comes from case-assignment: Bobaljik (2008) shows that agreement must be ordered after case-assignment, yet it is well-known that clitic-doubling affects the case-assignment properties of a clause (Jaeggli 1982 attributes to Richard Kayne the notion that clitics ‘absorb’ the case of their associated arguments; see Anagnostopoulou 2006 for discussion). Similarly, Myler (2017) finds that clitics are ‘visible’ to agreement probes—this contrasts with agreement morphology itself, which is not considered to be visible to subsequent agreement probes.

Agreement’s lack of syntactic activity can be encoded in two ways. One way is to put (part of) the agreement operation into the post-syntax. This kind of approach, argued for by Benmamoun et al. (2009), Arregi & Nevins (2012), Bhatt & Walkow (2013), Smith (2015), among others, holds that agreement features are copied onto their hosts at PF. The differences between agreement and clitic-doubling therefore derive from the presence vs. absence of $\varphi$-features on the agreement probe or clitic host during the syntactic derivation. An alternative account, such as that taken by Kramer (2014), is to assume that both agreement and clitic-movement are syntax-internal operations. But while clitic-doubling involves copying (via movement) of a determiner head, agreement involves copying (via Agree) of a bundle of $\varphi$-features. It is therefore the presence vs. absence of the determiner at the agreement probe/clitic host that leads to the syntactic differences between agreement and clitic-doubling. For concreteness, I adopt this latter approach to the syntax of agreement, schematized in (11).
The rest of this article is concerned with sorting out the agreement vs. clitic-doubling status of the Choctaw morphemes in (3). Section 4 discusses five properties of the markers that would lead us to suspect that they are clitics rather than agreement morphemes, based on the theory laid out here and on diagnostics identified in previous work. Section 5 then fleshes out the theoretical details of how agreement and clitic-doubling work in Choctaw, and sections 6 and 7 provide in-depth discussions of two further pieces of evidence for the clitichood of the markers.

4. Some suggestive facts

This section runs through five properties of the Class I-III markers that are suggestive of a clitic-doubling analysis. The first two sections discuss the shape of the morphemes: section 4.1 shows that the Class II and III markers lead double lives as possessive determiners and section 4.2 shows that the Class II and III markers are formally similar to unreduced pronouns. Both of these would follow from the markers’ being D0s.

Sections 4.3 and 4.4 discuss two tests for clitichood proposed in previous literature: that they are invariant with respect to tense morphology (based on a test proposed by Nevins 2011), and that multiple internal arguments may be cross-referenced on a single verb (based on a test proposed by Baker 2012). Finally, section 4.5 discusses some phonological properties of the markers, showing how they provide evidence for the clitichood of the Class I and III markers, specifically.

4.1. Class II and III markers as possessive determiners

Kramer (2014) notes that some Amharic object markers, which she argues to be clitic pronouns, bear a striking similarity to their equivalent possessive pronouns:

(12) | Object marker | Possessive pronoun |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-e</td>
<td>‘me’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-h</td>
<td>‘you.M’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-atʃʃʃin</td>
<td>‘us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bet-e</td>
<td>‘my house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bāk’lo-h</td>
<td>‘your.M house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tamari-yatʃʃin</td>
<td>‘our student’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She argues that this is to be expected if both clitic pronouns and possessive determiners are D°s that express φ-features, as in (13).

(13) $D^0_{[\phi]}$

This argument can be transferred practically wholesale to Choctaw: the Class II and III markers live double lives as markers of inalienable and alienable possession, respectively:

(14) **Class II: inalienable possession**

- sa- hohchifo ‘my name’
- chi- hohchifo ‘your.sg name’
- pi- hohchifo ‘our name’
- – hohchifo ‘his/her/their name’

(15) **Class III: alienable possession**

- am- ofi ‘my dog’
- chim- ofi ‘your.sg dog’
- pim- ofi ‘our dog’
- im- ofi ‘his/her/their dog’

This data in fact provides a much ‘cleaner’ illustration of Kramer’s argument than the Amharic data: only part of the Amharic object marker paradigm is shared with the possessive determiner paradigm, whereas in Choctaw the overlap is total. Note that this argument does not apply to the Class I markers, which do not (closely) resemble possessive determiners. I assume that Class I markers have a case feature which the Class II and III markers lack, which makes them subject to a different spellout rule—see Tyler (2018, forthcoming) for a proposal regarding the case features of Choctaw clitics.5

### 4.2. Class II markers as components of pronouns

The following tables highlight the formal similarity between the Class II/III markers and overt pronouns:

---

5 An anonymous reviewer questions how Class II/inalienable D°s are to be distinguished from Class III/alienable D°s. I am unsure at this stage, but recall from section 2 that Class III markers are likely bimorphemic, composed of a Class II D° and a functional head im- (an applicative morpheme or an incorporated preposition). There is also cross-linguistic evidence to suggest that DPs with alienable possessors contain functional structures lacking from DPs with inalienable possessors (Alexiadou 2003). It is possible that this extra functional element shows up both in Class III markers on verbs, and in alienably possessed DP structures, though I leave further investigation for future work.
Assuming that pronouns have the category of determiners (Postal 1969, Abney 1987), this data lends itself to an analysis in which full pronouns are composed of a $D^0$ expressing $\phi$-features, combined with an extra morpheme $-(sh)no$, the proper analysis of which I leave for future work.

4.3. Invariance with respect to tense

Nevins (2011) proposes that clitics should be invariant with respect to the tense expressed on the verb. This, he argues, follows from clitics’ status as $D^0$ pronouns. Agreement, by contrast, may vary with tense. All of the Choctaw Class I-III markers pass this test, though here I show only the 1st-person singular forms from each class:

(16) a. baliili -li { -h/-tok } run -1SG.I -TNS/-PST ‘I run/ran.’
    b. sa- chonna { -h/tok } 1SG.II- skinny -TNS/-PST ‘I am/was skinny.’
    c. a- takoobi { -h/-tok } 1SG.III- lazy -TNS/-PST ‘I am/was lazy.’

However, Nevins’s test is not supposed to identify clitics—rather, it identifies agreement morphemes: varying with tense implies that a particular morpheme is an agreement form; invariance with respect to tense means that the clitic vs. agreement status of the morpheme is undetermined. Therefore the usefulness of the test in this situation is limited.6

6 The theoretical underpinnings of this test have been challenged from various angles—for instance, Yuan (2017) notes that if clitics appear in a position linearly adjacent to tense morphology, what should stop them from exhibiting allomorphy? The problem is even starker if the clitics actually adjoin at $T^0$, and so the clitic and $T^0$ find themselves in an very local syntactic configuration.

Secondly, recent developments show that we need not consider subject agreement to be restricted to $T^0$: see Carstens (2003) and Haegeman & van Koppen (2012) for evidence that subject agreement can take place at $C^0$ as well as $T^0$, and Compton (forthcoming) for evidence that it can take place exclusively at $C^0$. Conversely, Hamilton (2017) presents evidence for subject agreement at $\nu^0$ in Mi’gmaq. Given this kind of variation, there is no reason for us to expect that it would always be tense marking that would show allomorphic variation with agreement. However, I include the test because it is, currently, fairly widely accepted.
4.4. Multiple Class II/III markers on one verb

Baker (2012) proposes a simple test for the clitic vs. agreement status of an object-referencing morpheme. The basic idea is that in the presence of multiple internal arguments (e.g. in a ditransitive construction), only one agreement morpheme should show up. By contrast, in the same environment it should be possible for multiple clitics to appear, each associated with one of the internal arguments. This can be derived from the properties of agreement and cliticization outlined in section 3: an agreeing head $H_{\text{Ag}}^0$ can ultimately only hold one set of $\phi$-features (however many arguments it agrees with) and therefore can only expone one set of $\phi$-features. By contrast, the $\phi$-features of clitics are hosted on the $D^0$s themselves, rather than the clitic-hosting head. As a result, a clitic host $H_{\text{Cl}}^0$ can host multiple clitics, each exponing different $\phi$-features, in the same way that a complex head can be composed of multiple heads. A clitic host with multiple clitics attached is shown in (17).

$$
\begin{array}{c}
H_{\text{Cl}}^0 \\
D_1^{0[\phi]} \\
D_2^{0[\phi]} \\
H_{\text{Cl}}^0
\end{array}
$$

The ‘one-$\phi$-set-only’ property of object agreement can be demonstrated by Nez Perce. In (18), we see that only one of the two internal arguments is represented by verbal agreement (Deal 2013 shows that it is the indirect object that controls agreement, although that is not crucial here).

```
'e-nees-pee\-wi-\-ye nukt 'imuu-ne
3OBJ-O.PL-steal-PERF-REM.PST meat 3PL-OBJ
'I stole meat from them'
```

(Nez Perce, Aoki 1994:530 in Deal 2013:396, reglossed)

This situation can be contrasted with what happens in a clitic-doubling language such as Greek. As shown in (19), both internal arguments of a ditransitive may be clitic-doubled (provided no Person Case Constraint violation is triggered):

```
(Tu) (to) edhosa tu Jani to vivlio.
CL.GEN CL.ACC I.gave the Janis.GEN the book.ACC
'I gave John the book.'
```

(Greek, Anagnostopoulou 2012:19)

That Choctaw is a Greek-type language rather than a Nez Perce-type language is hard to show with ditransitives: 3rd-person themes are not clitic doubled (see the table in (3)) while 1st- and 2nd-person themes run afoul of the Person Case Constraint. Fortunately, certain monotransitive
verbs cross-reference both of their arguments with Class II/III markers, and these verbs seem to be subject to a weaker version of the PCC than ditransitives (on which see Tyler 2018, forthcoming), which allows certain combinations of 1st- and 2nd-person clitics. We see that in such situations, it is possible for both arguments to be clitic-doubled:

(20) a. Chi- sa- nokshoopa-h.
   2SG.II- 1SG.II- scared-TNS
   ‘I’m scared of you.’

b. Chi- sa- nna-h.
   2SG.II- 1SG.II- want-TNS
   ‘I want you.’

c. %Chi- (s)am- ihaksi-tok.
   2SG.II- 1SG.III- forget-PST
   ‘I forgot you.’

If Baker’s test goes through, this seems to be evidence for the clitichood of the Class II and III forms, although the fact that we cannot apply the test to ditransitive verbs limits its conclusiveness.

4.5. Class I and III markers as phonological clitics

In the final part of this section, I first establish a novel test for agreement vs. clitic-doubling, based on the prosodic properties of the morpheme in question—namely, if an argument-referencing morpheme is a phonological clitic, it must be an argument-doubling clitic rather than an agreement form. I then use evidence from Broadwell (2006) to argue that Class I and III markers, with the exception of 1sg Class I marker -li, should be analyzed as argument-doubling clitics. The results of the test are inconclusive with respect to the Class II markers.

To clear up some terminological overlap, a phonological clitic is a prosodic unit whose prosodic category is lower on the prosodic hierarchy than a prosodic word (ω) (making it either a syllable (σ) or a foot (F)). It adjoins to an adjacent prosodic constituent (ω or a phonological phrase (φ)). Most English function words are good examples of phonological clitics, as they generally do not constitute phonological words of their own and adjoin to adjacent prosodic words. For instance, Ito & Mester (2009a), argue that English monosyllabic prepositions and auxiliaries form a recursive prosodic word with the lexical word to their right:

(21) a. Mary (ω [kən] (ω help)).

b. Bill looked (ω [fə] (ω Mary)).

This is one of three ways in which Selkirk (1996) argues that phonological clitics can be integrated into phonological structure, shown in (22) (where Cl is the clitic and Lex is an adjacent lexical item that projects a ω). The
English prepositions and auxiliaries in (21) are, according to Ito & Mester, (22b)-type clitics.7

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi & \quad \omega \\
Cl & \omega & Cl & \omega & Cl \text{ Lex} \\
Lex & \quad \quad & Lex
\end{align*}
\]

This phonological use of the term ‘clitic’ is different from ‘clitic’ as it has been used thus far in this paper, in the syntactic sense of ‘argument-doubling clitic’ or ‘clitic pronoun’. Argument-doubling clitics were defined in section 3 as pronoun-like elements (in theoretical terms: D0s) that occupy a higher structural position than the DP argument with which they are associated.

Regarding the relation between being an argument-doubling clitic and being a phonological clitic, the former generally implies the latter, but this tendency is by no means absolute. For instance, Monachesi (1994, 1998) notes that the infamous Italian 3PL dative pronoun _loro_ constitutes its own prosodic word, yet exhibits behavior characteristic of clitics in the language (e.g. it undergoes clitic-climbing, for more on which see section 6). Another clitic pronoun of this kind is the Tagalog 2nd-position clitic _tayo_ ‘we (dual)’ as described by Anderson (2005). Furthermore, even within one language, different argument-doubling clitics may have different prosodic properties. For instance, Haude (2009) shows that in Movima, an unclassified Amazonian language, clitics encoding the ‘obviate’ argument behave like (22a)-type clitics, while those encoding the ‘proximative’ argument behave like (22b)-type clitics.8

Here, an interesting distinction between argument-doubling clitics and agreement emerges. We have seen that argument-doubling clitics may vary in their prosodic status across languages and even within one language, yet I believe that agreement morphology is much less prosodically variable. To my knowledge, it has never been argued that an agreement form may be anything other than incorporated into the minimal prosodic word containing the verb stem (i.e. a (22c)-type

---

7 Selkirk (1996) calls the three types of clitic in (22) ‘free clitics’, ‘affixal clitics’ and ‘internal clitics’ respectively. I avoid these labels here so as not to introduce extra terminology.

8 Haude actually refers to the proximative clitics as being ‘internally’ cliticized, which in Selkirk’s terminology would correspond to the structure in (22c). However, in her description they seem to be more like Selkirk’s (22b)-type clitics (for Selkirk, ‘affixal’ clitics), as there are certain processes that as reserved for prosodic words only, such as lengthening of the penultimate syllable.
internal ‘clitic’). If this distinction between clitic-doubling and agreement holds true, and I believe that it does, we can reverse-engineer it into another test for clitic-doubling vs. agreement. It would work like this: if we find an argument-referencing morpheme that shares a minimal \( \omega \) with the verb stem, its clitic vs. agreement status is ambiguous; but if the morpheme is prosodically adjoined outside of the minimal \( \omega \) containing the stem, we have to conclude that it is an argument-doubling clitic. I now show that for the Choctaw Class I and III markers, there is indeed evidence that they are prosodically adjoined outside of the minimal \( \omega \) containing the stem, providing evidence that they are argument-doubling clitics.

A Choctaw prosodic word can be identified as the domain over which \textit{rhythmic lengthening} applies—a process by which even-numbered non-final syllables in a string of light syllables are lengthened (Nicklas 1974, Ulrich 1986). This is shown in (23).

\begin{align*}
\text{(23)} \quad /\text{salaha-tok}/ & \rightarrow [\text{sala}:\text{hatok}] \\
\text{slow-pst} & \quad \text{‘He was slow.’} \quad \text{(Broadwell 2006:21)}
\end{align*}

When Class III or prefixal Class I markers (i.e. all Class I markers except 1sg -\textit{li}) are attached to verbs that begin with a short vowel, rhythmic lengthening counts from the first syllable of the stem, and ignores the Class I/III marker, as shown in (24).

\begin{align*}
\text{(24)} \quad \text{a. } /\text{ish-achifa-tok}/ & \rightarrow [\text{ish-achi}:\text{fa-tok}] \\
\text{2sg.I-wash-pst} & \quad *[\text{ish-a}:\text{chifa-tok}] \\
& \quad \text{‘You washed it.’} \quad \text{(Broadwell 2006:22)} \\
\text{b. } /\text{im-achifa-tok}/ & \rightarrow [\text{im-achi}:\text{fa-tok}] \\
\text{III-wash-pst} & \quad *[\text{im-a}:\text{chifa-tok}] \\
& \quad \text{‘He washed it for her.’} \quad \text{(Broadwell 2006:22)}
\end{align*}

This constitutes evidence that the Class I and III markers are \textit{not} included in the minimal \( \omega \) containing the stem, and so, by the logic outlined above, should be analyzed as argument-doubling clitics in syntax.

Note that Class II markers behave differently. Unlike Class I and III markers, Class II markers do indeed trigger lengthening of a stem-initial light syllable:

\begin{align*}
\text{(25)} \quad /\text{sa-salaha-tok}/ & \rightarrow [\text{sa-sa}:\text{laha(:)-tok}] \\
\text{1sg.II-slow-pst} & \quad \text{‘I was slow.’} \quad \text{(Broadwell 2006:22)}
\end{align*}

We can tell from this that Class II markers are prosodically integrated into the prosodic domain over which \textit{rhythmic lengthening} applies—e.g. the minimal \( \omega \) containing the stem. Whatever the correct prosodic characterization, by the logic of the test, prosody offers us no clues as to
the clitic-doubling vs. agreement status of the Class II markers, but also does not commit us to an agreement analysis. As argued throughout the rest of this paper, there is a lot of other evidence to suggest that the Class II markers are argument-doubling clitics.

Before continuing, the 1SG Class I marker -li merits a mention. Broadwell & Martin (1993) show that unlike the other Class I markers, it is indeed included in the domain of rhythmic lengthening. This suggests it is an agreement form rather than a clitic pronoun, although since it is the only suffixal form in the paradigm, there is no good comparison as there is between Class I and II markers, so the usefulness of this test is limited here.

In this part of the section, we have seen that the prosodic properties of the Class I and III markers suggests that they are argument-doubling clitics rather than agreement forms. This was based on a novel test for agreement vs. clitic-doubling based on prosody. Note that I have not said anything about the theoretical underpinnings of this distinction between agreement and clitic-doubling. For now, I remain agnostic as to whether this distinction is an inevitable consequence of the clitic-to-agreement historical cline, or whether it is something that should be hardwired into theories of the syntax-phonology interface.

To sum up the section, we have seen five pieces of evidence that the Class I-III markers are clitic pronouns rather than agreement markers (except for the 1SG Class I marker -li). In the next section, I flesh out the details of the clitic-doubling analysis of the Choctaw Class I-III morphemes. Then, in sections 6 and 7, I present two further arguments for the clitichood of the forms, from clitic climbing and the licensing of the extrinsic plural marker oklah.

5. A clitic-doubling analysis of the Class I-III markers

We have seen several pieces of evidence suggesting that the Class I-III markers are argument-doubling clitics, except for -li. Here, I flesh out the analysis.

---

9 Broadwell & Martin (1993) report a possible further piece of evidence for the clitichood of Class I markers: they may be omitted in the presence of an overt pronoun, except 1sg -li, which cannot be omitted. They use this to support their claim, which I also adopt, that all Class I markers except -li are clitic pronouns. However, I was unable to replicate their consultants’ judgments, and for the speakers I asked, all Class I markers were obligatory regardless of the presence or absence of a corresponding overt pronoun. Nonetheless, the judgments reported by Broadwell & Martin, to the extent that they hold in contemporary Mississippi Choctaw, only strengthen the case that the Class I forms other than -li are clitics.

Interestingly, they also report that Class II markers that cross-reference objects are omissible, while those that cross-reference subjects are not. As with the data concerning Class I markers, the speakers I asked did not share the judgments, and it is likely we are reporting different dialects (or at least different generations of Choctaw speakers).
I propose that 1st and 2nd-person arguments are obligatorily base-generated with D$^0$ clitics adjoined. 3rd-person arguments, by contrast, are not base-generated with any adjoined clitics (see Arregi & Nevins 2012 for a similar proposal for Basque 3rd-person absolutive arguments, which are also generated without clitics). As for where in the clause the clitics adjoin, I argue in Tyler (2018) that Choctaw’s clitic-hosting heads are in the vicinity of vP. The evidence for this is that clitics can occur in structurally-truncated clauses, which otherwise reject tense and mood morphology. For instance, (26a) shows that clauses bearing the -cha same-subject switch-reference marker reject tense and mood marking, while (26b-c) show that they still happily accept Class I-III clitics.

(26) a. [Hattak alhiiha-t nipi hopóoni-(*tok/*ahiina)-cha] apa-(tok).
   [man PL-NOM meat cook.LG-(*PST)/MOD)-SS] eat-(PST)
   ‘The men cooked the meat and ate it.’

   [1PL.I-2SG.II-see.LG-SS] 1PL.I-leave-PST
   ‘We saw you and left.’

c. [Ishishko am-ittóola-chá] chalaka-li-tok.
   [glass 1SG.III-drop.LG-SS] scream-1SG.I-PST
   ‘I dropped the glass and I screamed.’

I therefore assume that internal arguments (those doubled by Class II/III clitics) are clitic-doubled at H$^0$—a functional head that sits directly below v$^0$—and external arguments (those doubled by Class I clitics) are clitic-doubled at v$^0$ itself. The relation between an internal argument and its clitic is schematized in (27a), and the same for an external argument is

---

10 An anonymous reviewer raises the possibility that 3rd-person arguments are clitic-doubled, but the clitics are phonologically null. This is hard to rule out completely, but the data from oklah-licensing in section 7.3 suggests that at least there are no 3rd-person Class II clitics. A possible further argument comes from the unavailability of particular clitic clusters. We know that certain clusters are banned where the initial (outer) clitic is a default (i.e. 3rd-person) Class III clitic, as in (i) (see Tyler 2018, forthcoming, for more information). Yet if we swap the verb in (i) with a verb that takes a Class II clitic for its object, as in (ii), the combination of arguments becomes acceptable.

(i) *1-chi-nokshoopa-h-g?
   iii-2SG.II-scared-tNS-Q
   (‘Are you scared of her?’)

(ii) Ø-chi-nna-h-g?
   3.II-2SG.II-want-tNS-Q
   ‘Do you want it?’

If we propose that there is a null 3rd-person Class II clitic, as represented in the gloss of (ii), this contrast is unexplained. However, the argument is confounded somewhat by the status of the Class III clitic im- as a default form (see section 2). I set the issue aside here, and propose that it is simpler to assume that there is no clitic than a null clitic.

11 Linker (1987) notes that clauses marked with the switch-reference marker -na, the different-subject counterpart of -cha, may in fact co-occur with the modal future marker aachi. It is possible, then, that -na-marked clauses have a ModP projection, while -cha-marked clauses are truncated below this projection.
shown in (27b). Both trees are drawn as head-final here, reflecting the actual constituent order of Choctaw, and for both structures, the intermediate step of head movement to the specifier of the host head prior to m-merger (see section 3) is not shown.\footnote{Note that the movement operation in (27b) involves an intermediate step, not shown, in which the D\textsuperscript{0} clitic adjoins to vP, before m-merger produces the structure shown. In this way, the movement does \textit{not} violate the condition that landing sites must c-command lower copies or traces.}

(27) a. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{HP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{V}^0 \\
\end{array}
\]

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{HP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{H}^0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Finally, I follow Broadwell & Martin (1993) in assuming that the 1st-person singular Class I form \textit{-li} is, uniquely, an agreement form rather than a clitic. Evidence for this claim comes from (a) the fact that it is the only form in the paradigm to follow rather than precede the verb stem, (b) the fact that it is included in the domain for rhythmic lengthening (section 4.5), and (c) the fact that it does not participate in clitic-climbing alternations (still to come, in section 6.2). I propose that the agreementhood of \textit{-li} should be syntactically formalized with a dedicated syntactic projection Author\textsuperscript{0}, akin to the dedicated Speaker\textsuperscript{0} projection of Poletto (2000). Author\textsuperscript{0} is equipped with a feature-relativized probe, in the sense of Béjar & Rezac (2009) or Preminger (2011, 2014). Specifically, Author\textsuperscript{0} is relativized to agree only with arguments bearing [author] (i.e. 1st-person) and [singular] features.\footnote{In order for a probe to be relativized to search for a particular \(\phi\)-feature, that feature must have an atomic syntactic representation. For instance, in order for 1st-person to be searchable, it cannot be the case that 1st-person arguments are specified as [+participant,-addressee]. Fortunately, having 1st-person encoded by a dedicated feature is a property of several feature geometries (e.g. Harley & Ritter 2002, Béjar & Rezac 2009) and seems largely uncontroversial. However, having ‘singular’ encoded by an atomic feature is more controversial: for instance, ‘singular’ in Harley & Ritter’s geometry is encoded by a lack of other number (or ‘individuation’) features. Harbour’s (2011) number feature geometry, on the other hand, requires a dedicated [+singular] feature. The precise feature-geometric representation of Choctaw arguments requires further investigation.} Note also that if Author\textsuperscript{0}’s probe fails to find an [author, singular]-bearing argument to agree with, the agreement operation simply fails and the derivation carries on untroubled (Preminger 2011,
2014). Author$^0$ sits somewhere north of v$^0$ (evidence for this is provided in section 6.2). (28) shows Author$^0$ agreeing with the external argument, and having its probe valued in the process.$^{14}$

(28)

In the next two sections, I discuss in detail two further arguments for the clitic status of the Class I-III markers.

6. Clitic climbing

In this section I show that all members of the Class I-III series (except the 1sc Class I form -li) participate in alternations that resemble Romance clitic-climbing alternations. Section 6.1 lays out the relevant properties of clitic-climbing, section 6.2 describes one construction in which we find it—the auxiliary-participle construction—and section 6.3 describes a second construction where it shows up—the clitic raising-to-object construction.

6.1. Clitic climbing cross-linguistically

In many languages that feature clitic-doubling or clitic pronouns, when two verbs are in a restructuring or ‘clause union’ configuration, an object clitic pronoun can show up in one of two places. In Italian, for instance, a clitic pronoun may be enclitic on the embedded infinitival verb, as in (29a), or it may be proclitic on the matrix verb, as in (29b).

$^{14}$ There are several loose ends concerning the analysis of -li. Among them are (a) how it is that Author$^0$ fails to agree with 1st-person singular internal arguments (they are clitic-doubled at H$^0$ as the Class II sa- marker instead), and (b) why it is that 1st-person singular external arguments do not also clitic-double at v$^0$. Regarding (a), a likely option is that Author$^0$ is relativized for an additional feature, which is the case feature distinguishing Class I from Class II arguments (in Tyler 2018, forthcoming, I argue that the feature in question is an ergative case feature). Regarding (b), the path forward is not clear at all. One possibility would be to formalize the idea that a single argument cannot simultaneously function as the trigger for agreement and clitic-doubling on two such proximal heads—a revised form of Chomsky’s (2001) Activity Condition—but I leave this as an unsolved technical problem for now.
(29) a. Volevo chiamar=la ieri.
   I.wanted to.call=her yesterday
b. La= volevo chiamare ieri.
   Her= I.wanted to.call yesterday
   ‘I wanted to call her yesterday.’ (Italian, Rooryck 1994:417)

One general characteristic of clitic climbing configurations is that although the clitic may show up in either position, it cannot show up in both positions simultaneously:  

(30) *La= volevo chimar-la ieri.
    her= I.wanted to.call-her yesterday

This property of clitic climbing can be explained if we adopt the analysis that clitic-doubling creates movement chains. If the clitic shows up on the lower verb, we can simply assume that there is a satisfactory clitic-hosting head on the lower verb complex (H_{Low}^0), the clitic moves no higher, and is pronounced in its highest position. This is schematized in (31a). If the clitic does ‘climb’ onto the higher verb, we can either assume that the lower position was unavailable, as in the analyses of (Strozer 1976, Napoli 1981, Rosen 1990, Roberts 1997), among others, or we can assume that the clitic moves through the lower position (H_{LowP}) to the higher position (H_{HighP}). This latter option, found in various forms in Kayne (1989, 1991), Roberts (1991, 2010), Rooryck (1994), Nevins (2011), among others, is given one potential schematization in (31b). However we deal with clitic climbing, the clitic is always pronounced in the highest position and in no other position, reflecting a general property movement chains.  

15 So-called clitic reduplication structures are in fact attested in some Romance varieties, such as Piedmontese (Parry 1995), but these structures are exceptional.

16 The summary here lumps together a vast range of theoretical approaches to clitic doubling. See Bok-Bennema (2006) for an overview of generative approaches to clitic-doubling.
This ‘one-or-the-other’ property of clitic-doubling is not true of agreement morphology. Where two agreement probes can agree with the same argument, even within the same clause, they happily do so, with both being spelled out. This is shown in (32a) with simultaneous agreement on Aux and V in Swahili, and in (32b) with simultaneous agreement on T and C in West Flemish.

(32) a. Juma a-li-kuwa a-me-pika chakula.
Juma SUBJ.AGR-PST-be SUBJ.AGR-PERF-cook food
‘Juma had cooked food.’ (Swahili, Carstens 2011:3, reglossed)

b. Kpeizen da-j gie morgen goa-t.
I.think that-2SG you tomorrow go-2SG
‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’
(West Flemish, Haegeman 1992)

This general property of agreement follows from the fact that different agreement morphemes in a clause, although they get their φ-features from the same argument, do not form movement chains, and therefore are not subject to the restriction that only the highest copy may be pronounced.
In the following two subsections, I provide two Choctaw constructions that show clitic climbing alternations—the *auxiliary-participle* construction and the *clitic raising-to-object* construction—each providing evidence that the Class I-III markers are indeed clitics.

6.2. Clitic climbing in the auxiliary-participle construction

There is a construction in Choctaw which I will refer to as the *auxiliary-participle* (AuxPart) construction, discussed in more detail in Broadwell & Martin (1993) and Broadwell (2006). In it, a participial verb is embedded under an auxiliary. Here, I follow Broadwell & Martin and use the auxiliary *tahli/taha* *finish*. An instance of this construction with no clitic pronouns is shown in (33) (using only 3rd-person arguments ensures that there are no clitic pronouns).

(33) Bill-at aanowa-t tahli-h.
    Bill-NOM walk-PART finish-TNS
    ‘Bill finished walking.’

When a verb that cross-references its subject with a Class I marker is embedded under the auxiliary, the clitic pronoun may show up on either the participle or the auxiliary, but not on both:

(34) a. Bashli-t *ish*-tahli-tok.
    cut-PART 2SG.I-finish-PST
    ‘You finished cutting it.’
    (Broadwell & Martin 1993:6)

b. *Ish*-bashli-t tahli-tok.
    2SG.I-cut-PART finish-PST
    ‘You finished cutting it.’
    (Broadwell & Martin 1993:6)

c. *Ish*-bashli-t *ish*-tahli-tok.
    2SG.I-cut-part 2SG.I-finish-pst
    ‘You finished cutting it.’

This looks like a straightforward clitic climbing alternation, providing evidence for the clitic analysis of Class I markers (except 1SG *li*, to be discussed momentarily).

Whether or not Class II markers can undergo clitic climbing in AuxPart constructions is a question with a complicated answer. The sentences in (35b-c), found in previous literature on Choctaw, feature object-referencing Class II markers ‘climbing’ onto the auxiliary.

(35) a. Sa-fammi-t tahli-tok.
    1SG.II-whip-PART finish-PST
    ‘He/she finished whipping me.’
    (Broadwell & Martin 1993:6)

b. Fammi-t *sa*-tahli-tok.
    whip-PART 1SG.II-finish-PST
    ‘He/she finished whipping me.’
    (Broadwell & Martin 1993:6)
c. Yohlhi-t  hapi-tahl-aach-i-h.
   make.run-PART 1PL.II-finish-FUT-TNS
   ‘They will run us all off.’

(Broadwell 2006:203)

My consultants did indeed accept sentences like (35b-c), but they seem to have different meanings to (35a)—something like ‘they wore me out, by whipping’ for (35b), or ‘they wore me out, by making me run’ for (35c). This situation can be contrasted with what we find in (34), where the two sentences have apparently identical meanings. I propose that the sentences in (35a-b) are not two sides of a clitic climbing alternation: rather, the sentence in (35a) is a standard AuxPart construction, while (35b) involves tahli in a non-auxiliary use, meaning ‘to wear someone out’, with an adjoined participle fammit ‘whipping’. This analysis is supported by the fact that speakers rejected sentences like (36), where the participial verb is pisa ‘see’—an activity which is much harder to envisage as a way of wearing someone out.

(36) *Pisa-t  sa-tahli-tok.
   see-PART 1SG.II-finish-PST
   (‘He finished watching me.’)

For this reason, I tentatively propose that contemporary Mississippi Choctaw in fact does not allow clitic-climbing of object-referencing Class II markers in AuxPart constructions, contra Broadwell & Martin (1993). It is also highly likely that the speakers I consulted in the late 2010s have a different grammar for this construction than those Broadwell & Martin consulted in the early 1990s.

What about Class II markers that cross-reference subjects? Broadwell & Martin note that clitic climbing with subject-referencing Class II markers in AuxPart constructions is marginal or dialectal/idiolectal, providing the sentences in (37). My own research supported this pattern, with 2 out of 6 speakers consistently permitting subject-referencing Class II forms to show up on the auxiliary.

(37) a. %Niya-t  sa-taaha-h.
   fat-PART 1SG.II-finish-TNS
   ‘I am completely fat.’

   (Broadwell & Martin 1993:7)

b. Sa-niiya-t  taha-h.
   1SG.II-fat-PART finish-TNS
   ‘I am completely fat.’

   (Broadwell & Martin 1993:7)

Finally, Class III markers, both those which cross-reference subjects and those which cross-reference objects, are barred from clitic climbing in AuxPart constructions, and must remain on the main verb:
(38) a. \textit{A-takoobi-t taha-h.}  \\
\textit{ISG.III-lazy-PART finish-TNS}  \\
‘I am totally lazy.’

b. \textit{*Takoobi-t a-taha-h.}  \\
\textit{lasy-PART ISG.III-finish-TNS}

(39) a. \textit{A-nokshoopa-t taha-h.}  \\
\textit{ISG.III-scared-PART finish-TNS}  \\
‘He/she is totally scared of me.’

b. \textit{*Nokshoopa-t a-taha-h.}  \\
\textit{scared-PART ISG.III-finish-TNS}

Clitic climbing possibilities in Choctaw AuxPart constructions are summed up in the table in (40).

(40) \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline
 & Class I & Class II & Class III \\ \hline
Subject & OK & \% & * \\ \hline
Object & N/A & * & * \\ \hline
\end{tabular}

I take this pattern to be good evidence that the Class I forms are argument-doubling clitics, and marginal evidence that the Class II forms are too. The table merits further discussion, however: I offer a phase-based explanation for why most speakers do not allow Class II and III markers to clitic-climb, and I speculate on the distinction that some speakers make between subject and object-referencing Class II markers.

Recall from section 5 that Choctaw internal argument (Class II/III) clitics are doubled at H^0, a functional head in the region of v^0. Compared with the standard position of clitic adjunction in languages where object clitics climb (e.g. Italian), which is somewhere in the auxiliary field (Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004), v^0 is comparatively low. One possibility is that this low adjunction site traps Class II/III clitics inside the vP phase associated with the lower verb (Chomsky 2001), and leaves them unable to move to the host on the higher verb.

Why then, do some speakers allow clitic climbing of Class II markers when they reference the subject? After all, both subject and object-referencing Class II markers are clitic-doubled at v^0. I tentatively propose that the difference arises from the fact that subject DPs undergo an extra step of movement, to the clausal subject position, while object arguments do not. Choctaw speakers then have two options: one option is for the clitic to jump ship from the argument when it is in its base-generated position, and adjoin at the low clitic host, deriving a clause without clitic climbing. This seems to be the favored option, and is generally available. The alternative option is for the clitic to cling onto its DP associate until it reaches a higher position and then jump ship onto the clitic host there, deriving a clause with clitic climbing. However, this proposal requires
further investigation, especially regarding why ‘clitic clinging’ is not available at all for Class III clitics, and I set the question aside here.

Before moving on, I provide a brief note on the exceptional 1st-person singular Class I marker -li. As noted by Broadwell & Martin (1993), -li exceptionally fails to participate in clitic climbing alternations in AuxPart constructions, and can only surface on the higher verb:

(41) a. Bashli-t tahli-li-tok.
    cut-PART finish-1SG.I-PST
    ‘I finished cutting it.’

b. *Bashli-li-t tahli-tok.
    cut-1SG.I-PART finish-PST

I propose that this is a consequence of the structurally truncated nature of participial clauses. Like the -cha clauses discussed in section 5, participial clauses are incompatible with tense and mood morphology (Tyler 2018). I propose that in addition to missing TP and ModP projections that would allow them to realize tense and mood, they also lack the Author0 projection which agrees with 1 SG subjects. This indicates that participial clauses are ‘beheaded’ somewhere between the vP and AuthorP projections, although I leave a more complete analysis of different clause types in Choctaw to future work.

Next, I discuss a second construction exhibiting a clitic-climbing-like alternation.

6.3. Clitic climbing in the clitic raising-to-object construction

I will term the configuration in question a clitic raising-to-object (CRtO) construction. In it, a verb in the jussive mood is embedded under the verb ahni (usually translated as ‘think’ but here meaning something closer to ‘want’). When the embedded verb is one that cross-references its subject with a Class II or III marker (e.g. chonna ‘be skinny’), that marker may optionally ‘climb’ onto ahni. Alternations with Class II and III markers are shown in (42–43).

(42) a. John-at [ik-sa-chonna-’] ahni-h.
    John-NOM [IRR-1SG.II-skinny-JUSS] think-TNS
    ‘John wants me to be skinny.’

b. John-at [ik-chonna-’] si-ahni-h.
    John-NOM [IRR-skinny-JUSS] 1SG.II-think-TNS.
    ‘John wants me to be skinny.’

17 Jussive mood is realized in Choctaw with the irrealis prefix ik-, a final glottal stop, and a pitch accent on the final syllable (not marked in my examples). Broadwell (2006:148) and Byington (1870:351) record the jussive verb with a final h, rather than a glottal stop. However, the speakers I consulted for the most part used a glottal stop.
(43) a. Mary-at [holisso alhiiha ik-\textit{hapi}-kaniiya-`] ahni-h.
   Mary-NOM [letter PL IRR-1PL.\text{III}-lose-JUSS] think-TNS
b. Mary-at [holisso alhiiha ik-kaniyiya-`] \textit{hapi}-ahni-h.
   Mary-NOM [letter PL IRR-lose-JUSS] 1PL.\text{III}-think-TNS

'Mary wants us to lose the letters.'

As with the clitic climbing alternations we've seen so far, the marker generally only shows up once, although the preference against reduplication of the marker is noticeably weaker than in the AuxPart construction:

   John-NOM [IRR-1SG.II-skinny-JUSS] 1SG.II-think-TNS
b. ?Mary-at [holisso alhiiha ik-\textit{hapi}-kaniyiya-`]
   1PL.III-think-TNS

This indicates that CRtO constructions, like AuxPart constructions, license clitic-climbing alternations, although I leave aside a full analysis here. For now, the existence of the alternations stands as evidence for the clitichood of the markers that participate in them.

As with clitic climbing in the AuxPart construction, clitic climbing in CRtO is restricted to subject-referencing clitics. Attempting to raise an object-referencing clitic onto \textit{ahni} results in ungrammaticality: 18

(45) a. [Noshkobooka-mat chishnak-o ik-\textit{chi}-atookoli-`]
   [captain-DET.NOM YOU.FOC-ACC IRR-2SG.II-pick-JUSS]
   ahni-li-h.
   think-1SG.I-TNS
   ‘I want the captain to pick YOU.’

b. *[noshkobooka-mat chishnak-o ik-(\textit{chi})-atookoli-`]
   [captain-DET.NOM YOU.FOC-ACC IRR-(2SG.II)-pick-JUSS]
   \textit{chi}-ahni-li-h
   2SG.II-think-1SG.I-TNS

However, unlike the AuxPart construction, the clitic climbing alternation in CRtO is available for Class II and III markers. For this reason I propose that the subject restriction in CRtO constructions does not derive from phasehood but from general locality restrictions on movement. The basic idea is that clitic-doubling, being a movement operation, is also subject to Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990): clitic-doubling of the object of the lower clause on the higher verb is blocked

\footnote{18 Note that the ungrammaticality of (45b) constitutes evidence against a \textit{prolepsis} analysis of CRtO constructions (Davies 2005), although I set this possibility aside here.}
because the subject of the lower clause is closer and, also being an element with category ‘D’ (a full DP), is of the right category to intervene. Rezac (2005) discusses similar intervention effects in clitic climbing in Czech.

CRtO with Class I subjects yields a strange result: when a verb that typically takes a Class I subject, such as baliili ‘run’, appears under ahni, a form of climbing is forced to take place, and no Class I morphology may appear on the embedded verb:

    doctor-NOM [IRR-run-JUSS] 2sg.II-think-TNS

‘The doctor wants you to run.’

In (46) the clitic that shows up on the verb is Class II, not Class I. There appears to be an interaction with case assignment here, with ahni assigning the clitic a special case that it would not otherwise have, but more research is required and I set these cases aside for now.

Clitic climbing possibilities in the CRtO construction are summed up in the table in (47).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(47)</th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining this information with that in (40), we have evidence that all three of the Class I-III series participate in some kind of clitic climbing alternation, providing further evidence that they all (with the exception of 1SG Class I marker -li) are clitics.

Note that we can quickly dispense with a potential alternative analysis too: given that CRtO constructions involve embedding a jussive clause—a clause type that in many languages is restricted to root clauses—we might think that CRtO really involves quotation of thought (e.g. John thinks “let him be skinny!”) rather than syntactic embedding. And indeed, quoted jussive clauses can happily be embedded under ahni:

(48) Michelle-at “Kánah-at aapisa ik-sa-kooli-’!” ahni-h.
    Michelle-NOM INDEF-NOM window IRR-1sg.III-break-JUSS think-TNS

‘Michelle thinks “May someone break my window!”’

However, we can show that not all embedded jussives can be treated as quotation. Firstly, while indexical expressions inside quotations, such as the 1st-person clitic in (48), are interpreted according to the embedding context, indexical expressions inside complement jussive clauses may also be interpreted according to the matrix context, and so refer to the speaker of the matrix utterance—for instance, the 1st-person clitics of (42a) and (43a). This precludes an analysis in which all embedded jussives involve
quotation. A further piece of evidence that CRtO does not necessarily involve quotation is that wh-extraction out of the embedded clause is possible—I assume that wh-extraction out of quotes is universally banned:

(49) Ná̃́tah-ō, John-at [t̪i ik-ikbi-’] hapi-ahni-h.
    ‘What does John want us to build?’

In the next section, I introduce one further argument for the clitichood of the Class I-IIl markers, which involves their ability to license the extrinsic plural marker oklah.

7. Licensing oklah

Broadwell (2006:239) describes oklah as a ‘preverb’ which is licensed by animate plural subjects.19 In section 7.1 I refine the distributional facts about oklah, showing that it can associate with objects too, provided that they are clitic-doubled. In section 7.2 I lay out its syntactic licensing conditions: it must be c-commanded either by its licenser DP or by the D0 clitic associated with its licenser DP, drawing parallels both with floating quantifiers cross-linguistically and with the Korean extrinsic plural marker -tul. Sections 7.3 and 7.4 then support the analysis with data from the AuxPart and CRtO constructions introduced in the previous section. The analysis crucially requires that the Class I-III markers be clitics, and would not work under an analysis in which they were agreement forms.

7.1. The distribution of oklah

Consistent with Broadwell’s description of the distribution of oklah—that it associates with animate plural subjects—we see that in (50a) oklah associates with a null 3rd-person plural subject, and in (50b) it associates with a null 1st-person plural subject that is doubled by a Class I clitic.20

(50) a. Tamaaha’ oklah iya-tok.
    town PL go-PST
    ‘They went to town.’

b. Oklhiili-km-ə okl= ii-taloow-aachj-h.
    dark-C-DS PL= 1PL.I-sing-FUT-TNS
    ‘When it gets dark, we’ll sing.’ (Broadwell 2006:239)

19 Oklah is also a noun meaning ‘people’, but preverb oklah has a different syntax and semantics (Broadwell 2006).

20 In casual speech, preverbal oklah is generally cliticized onto the verb as okl-, as shown in (50b). However, for consistency I represent it as a separate word in examples from my own fieldwork.
However, for the Mississippi Choctaw speakers I consulted, *oklah* seems to have a wider distribution than Broadwell describes. In addition to associating with all animate plural subjects, *oklah* can also associate with 1PL and 2PL objects, as in (51)—that is, it can associate with plural objects which are clitic-doubled.

(51) a. Oklah1 ak-*hachi*-píiso-tok.  
   PL 1SG.ERG.IRR-2PL.III-see.NEG-PST  
   ‘I didn’t see y’all.’

b. Bill-at oklah, *hapi*,-nokshoopa-h.  
   Bill-NOM PL 1PL.III-scared-TNS  
   ‘Bill is scared of us.’

*Oklah* cannot associate with 3PL objects, which are not clitic-doubled:

(52) Ofi1 (*oklah,*) ak-píiso-tok.  
   dog (*PL) 1SG.ERG.IRR-see.NEG-PST  
   ‘I didn’t see the dogs.’

Note that in all of the above examples, *oklah* immediately precedes the verb. Broadwell (2006) provides examples such as (53), showing that *oklah* can also appear before the object, although uses of this type are less frequent.

(53) Hattak-at oklah tachi at apa-tok.  
   man-NOM PL corn come.and eat-PST  
   ‘The man came and ate corn.’ (Broadwell 2006:240)

However, the speakers I consulted all found *oklah* most natural in the immediately preverbal position, and all generalizations in this section should be taken as describing the properties of *oklah* only when it appears in this position.  

7.2. *Oklah* must be c-commanded by its associate

I propose the following account of the distribution of *oklah*: *oklah* right-adjoins at VP, and must be c-commanded from an A-position by the animate plural DP argument with which it is associated, or by the D0 clitic associated with that argument. Firstly, this accounts for why all animate plural subjects, clitic-doubled or not, license *oklah*: the dedicated

---

21 There is evidence that pre-object *oklah* is different from preverbal *oklah*. In particular, while preverbal *oklah* tends to cliticize onto verbs that start with vowels, as in (50b), pre-object *oklah* cannot cliticize onto an object DP that starts with a vowel:

(i) Ohooyo-t  
   (¿)oklah/oklah= alla liyohli-tok.  
   woman-NOM PL child chase-PST  
   ‘The women chased the child.’
subject position (assumed to be Spec-SubjP) c-commands any adjunct to VP, as shown in (54).

(54) SubjP
    |____DP01
    |   vP
    |   Subj0
        |____HP
         |   v0
         |   VP
         |   H0
         |   VP
         |   oklah
         |   ...

Secondly, it accounts for why clitic-doubled objects license \textit{oklah}, but non-clitic-doubled objects do not. Essentially, \textit{in-situ} objects do not c-command \textit{oklah}, so cannot by default associate with it, as shown in (55a). However, their clitics, prior to m-merger with H0 (on which see section 5), \textit{do} c-command \textit{oklah}, so can associate with it. Doubling of an internal argument with a Class II/III clitic, which subsequently licenses \textit{oklah}, is shown in (55b).

(55) a. SubjP
    |____DP
    |   vP
    |   Subj0
        |____HP
         |   v0
         |   VP
         |   H0
         |   VP
         |   *oklah
         |   DP01
            |   V0

b. SubjP
    |____DP
    |   vP
    |   Subj0
        |____HP
         |   v0
         |   VP
         |   H0
         |   VP
         |   oklah
         |   DP01
            |   V0

Finally, it is necessary to include the condition that \textit{oklah} must be c-commanded specifically \emph{from an A-position} because we can show that c-command by a plural animate DP from an A’-position is not sufficient to license \textit{oklah}:
(56) Hattak alhiiha-ma, Mary-at (*oklah) ik-achokmáahno-h.
man PL-DEM.ACC Mary-NOM (*PL) IRR-like.NEG-TNS
‘Those men, Mary doesn’t like (them).’

Note that the attested order of object-oklah-verb is derived by standard roll-up head movement of the verb root to H⁰ (and possibly onwards):²²

(57)

Having established some core syntactic properties of oklah, we are in a position to make the main argument of the section: if the Class II markers in (51) really do function as arguments for the purposes of licensing oklah, then they must be clitics rather than agreement forms. This is because clitics, being of category D, function as arguments in the syntax, while agreement morphology does not have this property (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Rezac 2010, Kramer 2014, Harizanov 2014).

At this stage, the question arises of what kind of element oklah actually is. I will show that it has the same licensing conditions we find for floating quantifiers, as well as the Korean extrinsic plural marker -tul, while being semantically closer to the latter.

It was stated above that the licensing conditions on oklah are that it must be c-commanded by a DP or its D⁰ clitic from an A-position. These conditions are very similar, even identical, to those found on a certain class of floating quantifiers, such as French tous ‘all’: firstly, it has been known since Kayne (1981) and Belletti (1982) that floating quantifiers must be c-commanded by their associates; secondly, Tsakali (2008), Rezac (2010) and Harizanov (2014) show that clitic pronouns alone are sufficient to license floating quantifiers; and thirdly, Déprez (1989) showed that (clause-bounded) floating quantifiers can only be licensed from A-positions. To illustrate a particularly striking similarity, (58) shows that French tous ‘all’ may associate with object clitic pronouns, but not with full object DPs. And in French, as in Choctaw, object clitic pronouns occupy a higher syntactic position than full pronouns.

²² I assume that both right-adjunction and left-adjunction are possible outcomes of head-movement (Harley 2010, 2013), though I set aside the general question of how morpheme order within the Choctaw verb is derived.
(58) a. Je leur ai toutes piquées.
   ‘I asked them all.’ (French, De Cat 2000:2)

b. *Elles ont tous voulu manger les escargots.
   (‘They wanted to eat all the snails.’) (French, De Cat 2000:6)

Semantically, however, *oklah does not pattern like a floating quantifier. Unlike English ‘all’ or ‘each’, it does not force an exhaustive or distributive interpretation on its associate. This is shown by (59a), which is incompatible with distributive interpretation, and (59b), which is incompatible with an exhaustive interpretation.23

   now night-DEM.ACC PL 1PL.-RECIP-COM-eat-FUT-EMPH
   ‘Tonight we will eat together.’

b. Kániyohmi-k-at im-ill-ya oka hawashko oklah
   some-C-NOM their-food-ACC vinegar PL
   i-bäni-h.
   III-add-TNS
   ‘Some people add vinegar to their food.’

Are we forced to abandon the analysis? Fortunately not: there are elements other than floating quantifiers that have the same licensing conditions. In particular, I believe that a close cross-linguistic parallel, in terms of both its meaning and syntactic licensing conditions, is found in the Korean extrinsic plural marker ‘extrinsic -tul’ (also known as ‘non-nominal -tul’).24

Like *oklah, extrinsic -tul must be c-commanded by a plural argument, but appears externally to the argument itself (Choe 1988, Kim 1994, Yim 2003, Chung 2004, An 2007, Hwang & Lardiere 2013). (60) shows extrinsic -tul (in bold) associating with a plural subject with which it is not contiguous. Note that plural-marking inside the argument itself is also done with -tul, although ‘intrinsic’ instances of -tul are generally considered to be syntactically distinct (for instance, intrinsic -tul appears inside case-markers, while extrinsic -tul appears outside them).

23 Admittedly, we cannot be fully certain that *oklah lacks an exhaustive interpretation: *oklah in (59b) could be exhaustifying the set of individuals picked out by kániyohmi-kaat “some people”. However, given that the English sentences in (i-ii) are pragmatically odd, an exhaustification analysis seems unlikely.

(i) Some people all add vinegar to their food.
(ii) For some people, they all add vinegar to their food.

24 I thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing the similarities between *oklah and Korean -tul to my attention, and for pointing me to many of the references cited here.
Two students submitted a paper.  

\textit{tul} in fact has a much freer syntactic distribution than \textit{oklah}. While \textit{oklah} is limited to preverbal position (and sometimes pre-object position, as in (53)), \textit{tul} may adjoin to virtually any element within the sentence, provided that the basic licensing condition—that the plural DP c-commands \textit{tul}—is met:

\begin{equation}
\text{nohi kosigo}(-\textit{tul}) \text{ muot}(-\textit{tul}) \text{ hago}(-\textit{tul}) innungo-ni(-\textit{tul})? \\nonumber \\
\text{you.PL there}(-\textit{tul}) \text{ what}(-\textit{tul}) \text{ do}(-\textit{tul}) \text{ being-}Q(-\textit{tul}) \nonumber \\
\text{‘What you are you.PL doing there?’} \quad \text{(Korean, Yim 2003:149)} \nonumber
\end{equation}

As expected, \textit{-tul} can associate with objects so long as the c-command condition is met, as shown in (62).

\begin{equation}
\text{Swumi-ka ai-tul-ul kenkanghakey}(-\textit{tul}) \text{ khiwessta} \nonumber \\
\text{Swumi-NOM child-PL-ACC healthily-TUL} \text{ raised} \nonumber \\
\text{‘Swumi raised the children healthily.’} \quad \text{(Korean, An 2007:5)} \nonumber
\end{equation}

Because \textit{oklah} has a much more restricted syntactic distribution than \textit{tul}, the only way it can end up c-commanded by an object is if the object clitic-doubles at a higher position (as schematized in (55b)). This is consistent with \textit{oklah} and \textit{-tul} having the same syntactic licensing conditions, although since Korean does not have clitic pronouns or argument-doubling clitics it is impossible to give a fully like-for-like comparison.

In terms of its semantic contribution, extrinsic \textit{-tul} seems closer to floating quantifiers like French \textit{tous} ‘all’ than it does to Choctaw \textit{oklah}. Like \textit{oklah} and \textit{tous}, extrinsic \textit{-tul} does not impose a distributive interpretation on its associate, so (60) has both a collective and distributive interpretation. But like \textit{tous} and unlike \textit{oklah}, \textit{-tul} contributes an exhaustive or ‘maximizing’ effect to its associate (An 2007).

We have therefore seen that the distribution of \textit{oklah} can be accounted for under the assumptions (a) that \textit{oklah} has the same syntactic licensing conditions as a floating quantifier and the Korean extrinsic plural marker \textit{-tul}, and (b) that the Class II and III markers are clitics.

In sections 7.3–7.4, I show that clitic climbing in the AuxPart and CRtO constructions (as discussed in section 6) affects the distribution of \textit{oklah}, consistently with the status of the Class I-III markers as clitics and the licensing conditions on \textit{oklah} just stated.

7.3. \textit{Licensing oklah in the AuxPart construction}

\textit{Oklah} is typically happy to associate with subjects, clitic-doubled or not. However, in AuxPart constructions, which allow clitic climbing, the position of the Class I or II marker affects the positions in which \textit{oklah}...
can appear. The generalization is this: when the Class I/II marker adjoins to the matrix verb, *oklah* may immediately precede either the matrix or embedded verb. However, when the Class I/II marker adjoins to the embedded verb, *oklah* may only appear before the embedded verb, and not immediately before the matrix verb.

Let’s look first at Class I markers. When a plural Class I marker attaches to the matrix auxiliary, as in (63a), *oklah* may immediately precede either the matrix auxiliary, or the embedded participle. But when the Class I marker adjoins to the embedded participle, as in (63b), *oklah* is licensed only in the lower position, in the participial phrase.

(63) a. [Alla-maathonkla] (oklah) im-anopolitical] (oklah) iitahli-kmaticom... child-THAT.ACC(PL) III-talk-PART] (PL) IPL-I-finish-C-SS
    ‘When we’ve finished talking to that kid...’


The same holds for Class II markers. (64a) shows that when a Class II marker attaches to the matrix verb, *oklah* is permitted in either position—at least for those speakers who permit clitic climbing here with Class II markers (see section 6.2). But when a Class II marker attaches to the embedded verb, as in (64b), *oklah* is permitted only in the lower position.

(64) a. %[(Oklah) nokllehakcha-t] (oklah) hapi-taaha-h. [(PL) shocked-PART] (PL) IPL-II-finish-TNS ‘We are completely shocked.’

b. [(Oklah) hapi-noklhakcha-t] (*oklah) taha-h. [(PL) IPL-II-shocked-PART] (*PL) finish-TNS ‘We are completely shocked.’

Although a Class III marker may attach only to the embedded verb—they do not clitic climb in the AuxPart construction—it too will license *oklah* only in the lower position, in line with the patterns shown in (63b) and (64b):

(65) a. [(Oklah) hapi-takoobi-t] (*oklah) taha-h. [(PL) IPL-III-lazy-PART] (*PL) finish-TNS ‘We’re completely lazy.’


Given the licensing condition on *oklah* established in the previous section—it must be c-commanded by an animate plural DP or its associated D° clitic from an A-position—we can derive these patterns. First, I assume that AuxPart constructions have the basic structure
shown in (66). The tree shows the two potential clitic positions for Class II clitics (‘Clitic$_1$’ and ‘Clitic$_2$’) and both potential oklah positions (‘oklah$_1$’ and ‘oklah$_2$’). For reasons of space I have not shown the H$^0$ head for internal argument clitics, which sits immediately below the v$^0$ head, but the principle is the same.

\[(66)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{VP} (\text{Clitic}_1^+)v^0+V^0 \\
\text{VP} (\text{oklah}_1) \\
\text{VP} \text{...} \text{V}^0 \\
\text{SubjP} \\
\text{Subject} \\
\text{vP} \text{Subj}^0 \\
\text{VP} (\text{Clitic}_2^+)v^0+V^0 \\
\text{VP} (\text{oklah}_2)
\end{array}
\]

First we can derive the pattern in (63a) and (64a), where the subject is doubled by a clitic on the matrix verb, i.e. in position ‘Clitic$_1$’. In these cases, oklah is licensed in both positions, because Clitic$_1$ c-commands both positions. Second, we can derive the patterns in (63b), (64b) and (65), where the subject is doubled by a clitic pronoun on the embedded verb (position ‘Clitic$_2$’). From here, only oklah$_2$ is c-commanded by the clitic pronoun or the by the subject DP itself. There is no clitic or full pronoun c-commanding oklah$_1$, and therefore oklah is not licensed in that position.

A note is required on what happens to the null subject DP in these clauses when the matrix subject position is built. If it raises to the matrix subject position, then we might expect oklah$_1$ to be licensed, as it will now be c-commanded by a plural DP in an A-position. Indeed, we can see that when there is an overt plural subject, oklah is licensed in either position:

\[(67)\]

\[
\text{Alla-t} [(\text{oklah}) \text{ washooha-t}] (\text{oklah}) \text{ tahli-hm-at...} \\
\text{child-NOM } [(\text{PL}) \text{ play-PART}] (\text{PL}) \text{ finish-c-SS} \\
\text{‘When the children finished playing...’}
\]

However, the fact that oklah$_1$ is not licensed in (63b), (64b) and (65) suggests that the matrix subject position goes unfilled in these cases, or is filled by an expletive.\[^{25}\]

In summary, we have seen in this section that the Class I, II and III markers all affect the licensing possibilities of *oklah*, which I argue to have the same licensing conditions as a floating quantifier. This could only be the case if the Class I-III markers were clitics, rather than agreement morphemes.

7.4. Licensing *oklah* in the clitic raising-to-object construction

We saw that changing the position of the Class I/II marker in AuxPart constructions affects where *oklah* is licensed. Here we see that the same holds for CRtO constructions. First, note that if the subject of the embedded clause is 3rd-person, and so is not clitic-doubled, *oklah* can only appear in the embedded clause:

(68) [Alla alhiiha-yat (oklah) ik-baliili-’] (*oklah) ahni-li-h.  
[child PL-NOM (PL) IRR-run-JUSS] (*PL) think-1SG.I-TNS  
‘I want the kids to run.’

Now consider what happens if the subject of the embedded clause is doubled by a clitic. If the clitic appears on the matrix verb, *oklah* is now licensed in both the embedded clause and the matrix clause:

(69) Mary-at [(oklah) ik-hoofahya-’] (%oklah) hapi-ahni-h.  
Mary-NOM [(PL) IRR-ashamed-JUSS] (%PL) IPI.1I-think-TNS  
‘Mary wants us to be ashamed.’

And in line with the pattern in section 7.3, if the clitic appears on the lower verb, it is possible for *oklah* to show up only on the lower verb.

(70) Mary-at [(oklah) ik-hapi-hoofahya-’] (*oklah) ahni-h.  
Mary-NOM [(PL) IRR-IPI.1II-ashamed-JUSS] (*PL) think-TNS  
‘Mary wants us to be ashamed.’

In this way, we see the pattern we saw with AuxPart constructions in section 7.3 repeated with CRtO constructions, further supporting the clitic analysis of the Class II markers.

In this section, we have seen that the Class I-III markers function like arguments in their ability to license *oklah*, an element with a floating-quantifier-like syntactic distribution. This is behavior we would expect if they were clitics, but not if they were agreement morphemes.

8. Conclusion

There is evidence from several domains that the Class I-III markers (with the exception of the 1SG Class I marker -*li*) are clitic pronouns rather than agreement morphemes. We first examined five suggestive pieces of

---

26 All speakers generally preferred *oklah* to appear in the embedded clause even when the clitic was in the upper clause, but most allowed it in the higher clause too.
evidence: (a) that Class II and III markers lead double lives as possessive determiners, (b) that Class II markers form components of full pronouns, (c) that they are invariant with respect to tense, (d) that multiple internal argument (Class II/III) markers may cluster together on the same verb and (e) that the Class I and III markers fall outside the minimal phonological word containing the stem. We then considered two further pieces of evidence in more detail: firstly, the fact that the Class I-III markers all take part in clitic-climbing-like alternations, and secondly the fact that the extrinsic plural marker oklah can be licensed under c-command by a Class I-III marker.

Syntactically, these properties each provide support for a model in which the clitic vs. agreement distinction is encoded as a difference between ‘bare’ D0 heads, that function as the head of syntactic movement chains with their DP associates, and syntactically inert bundles of φ-features.
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