The syntax and morphology of Basque

1 The syntax of Agree in Basque

This chapter presents the fundamentals of first the syntax and then the morphology of agreement in Basque that will be relevant to this work. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 present the syntactic fundamentals. The former introduces Basque ergativity and the basic clause structure. The latter lays out the proposed syntax of φ-Agree in Basque within this structure, and then introduces the agreement displacements that are the topic of this work; and their proposed syntax. The remaining sections introduce various constructions that illustrate φ-Agree operating in successively larger domains, in order to sketch the kind of picture that an intrinsic characterization of the conditions on Agree expects. The constructions introduced also give arguments for some of the basic assumptions, like the structural nature of the ergative, and they will be frequently reused later. Section 2 turns to the morphology of the agreement complex.

Nowhere do I aim for exhaustivity in the discussion in these preliminaries; even among the references, only the starting points on the literature are given. For matters specifically discussed later, such as ergative displacement, references are given when their discussion is reached.

1.1 The fundamentals of Case and Agree

Basque finite constructions like (1) contain an *agreement complex* (*dizkizut, zitzaizkidan*) where agreement with various arguments is coded, as indicated by indices.

(1)   a.   Nik$_i$ zuri$_j$ eskutitzak$_k$ idatzi d-i-zki$_k$-zu$_j$-t$_i$ etxean.
            I.ERG   you.DAT   letters.D.ABS   written X-$\sqrt{3}$V-PL-2-1   home.D.at
            I wrote you letters at home.
      b.   Nik$_i$ zu$_j$ ikusi   z$_j$-a-it$_j$-u-t$_i$ /   *d-u-t$_i$
            I.ERG   you.ABS   seen   2-TM-PL-$\sqrt{2}$V-1   /   X-$\sqrt{2}$V-1
            I saw you. (Oyharçabal 1993: 327)
      c.   Eskutitzak$_i$ zuri$_j$ etorri   z-itzai-zki$_i$-zu$_j$-n.
            letters.D.ABS   you.DAT   come   X-$\sqrt{1}$V'-PL-2-PT
            The letters came to you.

The potential controllers of agreement morphology in the complex are as follows, setting aside until XN the special non-argumental allocutive agreement:

S: The internal argument of unaccusatives (*eskutitzak* in (1)c) or of detransitivised transitives transitives, that bears absolutive case.
O: The internal argument of transitives, that bears absolutive case; as necessary I distinguish O as O1 for simple transitives and O2 for the second object of applicative transitives (*eskutitzak* in (1)a is O2).
A: The external argument of transitives (*nik* in (1)a) and unergatives, bearing ergative ergative case.
O':   The applied object, added in the applicative construction to unaccusatives and simple transitives either optionally or obligatorily, and bearing dative case (*zuri* in (1)a, (1)c).

There are no effects of the semantics of a DP on agreement: in a context where a *pro*-dropped or definite referential argument can control agreement, the cross-linguistically most canonical agreement controllers, the same agreement can be controlled by a weak indefinite with the same φ-features, which is the least canonical agreement controller. All and only agreement controllers may be pro-dropped, but this does not depend on identification by overt agreement, for example in non-finite clauses: see Ortiz de Urbina (1989), Oyharçabal (BILAN), Duguine (2006) for discussion and proposals. DPs in other cases, such as the locative, allative, instrumental, or prolative, are not potential agreement controllers. On the other hand, a potential agreement controller must normally control agreement morphology if it can, as in (1)b; qualifications usually suppose a different structure, such as a non-applicative dative (cf. C3; see also Etxepare 2003:169-170).

Apart from agreement displacement, the system shows an absolutive alignment: S/O absolutive control the same morphology on the verb and bear the same case morphology, and A ergative controls a different agreement morphology and has a different case. O' dative controls a separate morphology of the same type as that controlled by A ergative. This at any rate is the superficial appearance, to be much modified in the course of the work. In the examples in this section, I will provide full indexing between controllers (including *pro*) and agreement morphology, since the complexity of the latter demands that it be exposed gradually, and that will come after the discussion of Basque agreement syntax.

The canonical absolutive alignment of Basque agreement and case does not correspond to the syntax, which is thoroughly accusative. The arguments are to be found in Ortiz de Urbina (1989) and Oyharçabal (1993), and amount to the following: on every diagnostic the differentiates between A/S - O (accusative) and A - S/O (absolutive) alignments as alignments in the syntax Case, Agree, and A-movement, Basque is as accusative as a canonically accusative language like English or French. Moreover, c-command among transitives is A > O, never O > A, for A-positions. I will not repeat these arguments here; the strongest are:

(i) Obligatory control structures (that are not restructuring) allow only A/S to be PRO.
(ii) Binding of reflexives and reciprocals, where A may be antecedent for an O anaphor, but not O, A regardless of word order.
(iii)Weak cross-over, where a quantifier A may bind a pronominal variable in O, but not vice versa, regardless of word order.

The theory of such systems that is adopted here, and indeed in most recent work on Basque, is developed in Bobaljik (1993) and Laka (1993), with significant analogues in Levin and Massam (1985). The theory posits two functional heads with respect to Case/Agree. It takes as its point of departure that the lower one is positioned below the base-generated position of A and above O/S, so that if it is active for Case/Agree, it is necessarily the latter that falls first into its search-space and must relate to it for Case/Agree: this is absolutive and accusative Case and agreement.[1]

I refer to this head as *v*; but *v* has many uses in the current theory, and what I mean by *v* is specifically the Case/Agree functional head lower than the base-generated site of A and higher than that of O/S. I will assume that *v* is always present, though it may or may not be active for Case/Agree. It is further a common position that A is normally base-generated in [Spec, *v*], under

---

[1] Putting this in terms of Agree and searchs-pace is somewhat anachronistic; in the original approaches, only O/S can get their Case by movement into [Spec, AgrOP], since A cannot lower to it.

selection by *v*, rather than by a distinct head higher than *v*. This is not important to the theoretical approach to syntactic ergativity, nor is it crucial to the present work. Yet providing a single locus for O/S Case/Agree and A selection has a number of advantages, for it allows dependencies between these properties, like Burzio's Generalization, to be stated over a single category, *v* (Chomsky 1995:00). I adopt the hypothesis, and address alternatives as they become relevant.

A requires a second Case/Agree head if it has structural Case: T. In accusative languages the T-assigned Case is nominative, and absolutive languages it is ergative. There are very strong grounds, discussed below, to analyse both absolutive and ergative in Basque as structural Cases, independent of selection and available for example for raising. Elsewhere A may certainly have inherent Case (Woolford 1997, 2006) or be Case licensed alternatively (Johns 1992) and so may be produced absolutive alignment or a three-way A-O-S split may also be produced; but this is not so in Basque.

The T-A, *v*-O/S pairings are indicated automatically by the locality of syntactic dependency formation if *v* has a φ-probe. The system must now be supplied with a device to differentiate between accusative and absolutive languages for Case/Agree, so that S relates to T rather than to *v* in the former. This is met by parametrizing whether *v* or T are obligatorily active in the Case/Agree system, as in (2).

(2) *Obligatory Case Parameter* (OCP): if a language is absolutive, *v* obligatorily bears a φ-probe, and T does only if *v* has one; if a language is accusative, T obligatorily bears a φ-probe, and *v* does only if T has one.

There is a profound intuition behind the OCP, that there is one obligatory Case/Agree locus, the *primary* Case/Agree locus, whose placement in the clausal architecture varies simply in being either above or below A. If it is below, O and S necessarily fall into its search-space first, and an absolutive system treating O/S the same results. If it is above, A and S are its first goals, and O is singled out. The remaining DP in each system must be licensed differently, and if it does not have inherent case, a *secondary* Case/Agree locus must be activated, one that cannot be activated independently. A further element of the OCP is that the location of the secondary head of each system corresponds to that of the primary head of the other, suggesting a more integral formulation to which I return in C5.

The OCP predicts that there will be no passive in a Basque-like language. To put this more precisely: when the A argument of *v* is severed or oblique, the primary locus of Case/Agree remains *v*, and O is not affected, unlike in an accusative language where this would eliminate *v* as a Case/Agree locus.[2]

The OCP faces up to the existence of unergative verbs, where there seems to be only a single argument that is licensed by the secondary locus.[3] For Basque, such verbs and locutions are discussed by G:4.1.4.1, 4.1.4.5, Oyharçabal (1993:334ff.). The morphosyntactic unergative - unaccusative split cannot be pinned down semantically, which is a point that Baker 1996:00 elaborately makes for Mohawk. There are verbs whose sole argument is either ergative or

---

[2] In Basque, fully severing A leads to the transitive/unaccusative (causative/inchoative) alternation, see G:4.1.4.2, and reassigning A not to be visible to the Case/Agree system creates detransitivizations interpreted transitives with an impersonal agent, reflexives, or reciprocals: see G:4.7.2, 4.9.1.3, 4.9.2.3, Albizu (2000), and for similar uses of *se* in Romance e.g. Burzio (1986), Cinque (1988).

[3] Accusative languages face the same challenge by the presence of constructions that lack a DP to relate to T, their primary locus, such as the anomalous unaccusatives and passives whose only argument is a PP or oblique DP (Irish, McCloskey 1996, Icelandic, Andrews 2001) or structural accusative (Slavic, Lavine and Freidin 2004).

absolutive in different dialects, like *jarraitu* 'follow' or *igo* 'rise'. Of these the most interesting are morphosyntactic unaccusatives that with undeniable agents and apparently incorporated objects, like *borrokatu* 'fight' < *borroka* 'fight (noun)' (see esp. Oyharçabal 1993:335 and Gómez and Sainz 1995:243); and morphosyntactic unergatives whose sole realizable argument is subject to few or none selectional restrictions, like *jardun* 'continue (doing)' and the raising-to-ergative verbs discussed in XN. I will adopt the common hypothesis that morphosyntactic unergatives do project their sole argument in [Spec, *v*P], here referred to as A, and that there is a typically null O for *v* to Agree with, e.g. *pro*, which satisfies the OCP (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin 1998).[4] Morphosyntactic unaccusatives have their sole argument in the scope of *v*, even if it has an agentive interpretation.

The Case/Agree system treats A and S/O differently in morphological absolutive languages. Yet there remain properties for which A and S pattern together as if they shared the same absolute structural position, especially the ability to be PRO and bind subject-oriented anaphora (the last absent in Basque). This special position is a designated T-related subject position, and it the elements in it can be spoken of heuristically as those that satisfy the EPP requirement of T (C5), though "EPP" (and "subject") have many other unrelated usages. Accordingly, Bobaljik (1993) proposes that both A and S move to establish a local relationship with T and satisfy its EPP in both absolutive and accusative languages. In transitive and unaccusative structures, A and S are the highest arguments respectively. However, this is an insufficient characterization of the A/S grouping, even if the diagnostics that group A/S against O could be formulated to refer to this notion; in applicative unaccusatives in languages like Spanish and Basque, O' is base-generated higher than S and both are visible to φ-Agree, but S moves over it to satisfy the EPP. Independent work emphasizes that the EPP may be satisfied by both XPs and by X^0 elements such as clitics (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998), and in more recent approaches the phrase structure the difference is not relevant at the narrow-syntactic level (cf. Ora 2006).[5]

The dative is also an agreement controller in Basque, and it is the topic of C3 here. Here a brief mention of the discussion there suffices: the agreeing dative is base-generated in an applicative construction below A and above O/S (Elordieta 2001); its case morphology is theta-related; and it is "quirky" in the specific sense that it only partly values a φ-probe; and the agreement morphology it controls is an X^0 "clitic" that doubles it. There are also two cases in Basque that are not theta-related but that do not bear on agreement or Agree. One is the partitive (G:4.5.4.4, de Rijk 1972, Ortiz de Urbina 1989:97ff.; cf. Kiparsky 2001 for a close Finnish

---

[4] A substantial class of "unergatives" wears this structure on its sleeve in Basque, being locutions of the type *lo egin* [sleep do], where *lo* is clearly an O visible to syntax in general and Case/Agree in particular, though anomalous in some respects such as the absence of a determiner; in some other locutions like *zor izan* 'debt have', the apparent O *zor* 'debt' is completely invisible to Case/Agree (see Baker 1996:356 for a similar duality in Hindi-Urdu; see Oyharçabal 2003 for recent discussion and references to earlier literature).

[5] The Bobaljik-Laka approach to Basque-like systems is only one of many alternatives found in the literature. Any approach must explain the syntactic A/S-O groupings, but the grouping A-S/O in both case and agreement morphology. Here, the relevant agreement and case morphology is ultimately due to φ-Agree, and the A/S-O grouping comes from the EPP. An alternative proposed for Basque by Ortiz de Urbina (1989), and recently discussed in by Albizu and Fernández (forthcoming), puts Case-driven movement roughly in the place where the EPP here. Case-driven movement is taken to relate A/S to T as in accusative languages. This requires two steps: divorcing Case (A/S-O) for what is responsible for agreement and case morphology (A-S/O); in the system they propose, the ergative of A is a marked case in the presence of O, so that S and O can both get absolutive as default (cf. Bobaljik, forthcoming). In this work I will be mainly concerned with φ-Agree, and to the extent one is willing to take φ-Agree as the source of the A-S/O grouping in agreement morphology, the reformulation would make little difference.

analogue); it appears only on S/O, gives it a quantified (amount) reading, and requires licensing by a polarity item such as negation, and perhaps is really the case of the complement of a null quantifier. The other is the genitive that appears only in non-finite contexts of the English gerund *John('s) seeing Kate* (e.g. Ortiz de Urbina 1989:19, 202n8).

I will not precisely situate the T and *v* Case/Agreement loci in the clausal architecture: see particularly Laka (1990), Artiagoitia (1995), Elordieta (2001), Haddican (2004), Irurtzun (2006). Elements of it that are relevant to agreement morphology are discussed in C1:2. For the examples in the remainder of this section, I anticipate in noting that most often in Basque the agreement complex, containing C, Tense, *v*, Appl, is separate from the lexical root and built around an auxiliary glossed √ or √2V, etc., as in (1).

In Basque there are finite clauses and several kinds of "complete" non-finite clauses, that is those that satisfy their selectional requirements internally, and are self-contained and opaque for external Case and Agree. I assume all are CPs, and that such self-containment defines CPs.[6] All have the same ergative, dative, and absolutive Case marking as in finite clauses. Yet agreement is limited to finite clauses; in Basque agreement and a full finite structure go together. This commonplace hides a startling fact that can be seen when comparison is made with the Romance languages. The latter have T-subject agreement that appears on the verb raising to T, and an additional clitic system for O/O' that also targets the T area (see Uriagereka 1995 for more precision). Basque non-subject agreement is often compared to Romance clitics in the descriptive literature. Yet Romance object clitic system is available in non-finite contexts, unlike subject agreement, and unlike all Basque agreement. The mystery goes together with the availability of *pro*-drop in non-finite clauses despite lack of overt agreement (Ortiz de Urbina 1989). An argument has been advanced that there is also no covert agreement, for Laka (1993:00) and Albizu (1997:00) observe that the Person Case Constraint does not hold, as in (3)a, as it does for example in French non-finite clauses, (3)b.

(3)   a. *pro*$_i$ gaizki iruditzen zai-t$_i$ [zuk   ni   harakinari saltzea].
           me.DAT   wrong seeming   √1V'-1 you.ERG me.ABS butcher.DAT selling
           Your selling me to the butcher seems wrong to me (Laka 1993:27)
       b. [PRO les/*me   lui   vendre] me   paraît injuste.

---

[6] In treating these structures are CPs, I do not mean to take a stand against treating them as the nominal equivalent of CPs, the proposal developed in Artiagoitia (1995): what matters to me is their internal Case/φ-structure. One kind is completely self-contained and finite-like, like English gerunds, (i) (G:4.10.1.2, 4.10.2.2, Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Ortiz de Urbina and Uribe-Etxebarria 1991, and Artiagoitia 1995). A second kind is more transparent for purposes like predicate-focus adjacency and typically the subject is PRO, but they are not transparent to Case/Agree, (ii) (G:4.10.1.2.2.2-3, 4.10.1.2.5, Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 1987, Artiagoitia 1995: 480ff., and Laka (1991, 2004, forthcoming). A third kind has its internal structure still more restricted: the subject must be PRO under obligatory control, (iii) (G:4.10.1.2.4, also 4.10.1.2.3; Ortiz de Urbina 1989:00). Ortiz de Urbina (1989:176) has proposed that those nominalizations allow overt subjects that themselves receive morphological case-marking; Artiagoitia (1995:406), those that have a determiner.
(i) (Komeni da) [haurrek   etxean   liburuak   sarri   irakur-tze-a / irakurr-i-a].
      suitable is   children.ERG   home.D.at   books.ABS   often   read-ing-D / read-ed-D
      It is suitable for the kids to read / to have often read the books at home. (cf. G:4.10.1.2.1.2; CHECK)
(ii) *pro*$_i$ [e$_i$ ogia   eros-te-n /   eros-te-ra]   n$_i$-oa   kalera.
      I.ABS   bread   buy-ing-in   buy-ing-to   1-√go   street.to
      I am going out to buy bread. (Bizkaian/EB; G:4.10.1.2.2.2.7)
(iii) Nik$_i$ ez   d-a-ki-t$_i$ [nori   PRO$_i$ gusta-tu].
      I.ERG   not   X-TM-√know-1   who.DAT   like-d
      'No se a quien gustarle // Che pas a qui plaire'.

them/*me.ACC   him.DAT to.seel   me.DAT   seems wrong
[To sell them/*me to him] seems wrong to me. (French; MJ.)

This constraint if often analysed as a problem that ensues because *v* cannot Agree for person across an intervening dative with the S/O, which it must for Case licensing (see C5). Yet there is good reason for caution. Some dialects have available a non-agreeing, non-applicative dative that evades the PCC (C3), and perhaps this is simply more common in non-finite clauses. At the same time, some datives systematically require agreement for all speakers, like experiencers of psych-verbs (C3), and these are fine in non-finite forms (C5). The ergative and absolutive also do not behave entirely as in finite clauses and may be licensed differently, as discussed by Oyharçabal (1993: 338ff., 327) respectively. So in the end there may be no PCC mystery; (some) of the cases that entail φ-Agree in finite clauses may be licensed otherwise in non-finite ones; and *pro*-drop in Basque is arguably not of the Romance kind that requires identification in the first place (Duguine 2006).

1.2   Agreement and the agreement displacements

Ground has now been laid to present the canonical agreement and the agreement displaces that are the subject of this work, as a brief synopsis.

The portion of the agreement complex that is focussed on here is that "canonically" controlled by S/O, the absolutive arguments. It comes in two parts, person agreement morphology called here "PX" at the very beginning and controlled by $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person arguments (1.SG glossed 1, 1.PL - 1', 2nd person - 2), and number agreement morphology glossed PL and controlled by plural arguments (the remaining glosses, discussed in C1:2, are not relevant here). These will reflect two φ-probes on *v*, one for the person side of the feature geometry, and one for the number/class side of it. Their separation means they can be controlled independently; their placement on *v* entails that both must be controlled by the closest internal argument that can provide them with a value.

(4) a. (hark$_i$)   gu$_j$ g$_j$-en-kar-zki$_j$-en
         he.ERG   we.ABS   1'-TM-√carry-PL-PT
         He carried us.
     b. hark$_A$ *v*   kar-$_V$ gu$_O$
             person————we
             number————plural

Eccentric control of the φ-probes of *v* occurs when S/O is not their closest valuer. This produces two agreement displacements: ergative and dative displacement.

Ergative displacement occurs when the person probe of *v* has no potential controller among the internal arguments. Unvalued, it can continue to wait around as material is added to the syntactic object containing it. Upon the addition of the external argument, A, it can Agree with it, if it is a potential controller, that is $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person. So its search space expands with the cyclic construction of the phrase marker. The search-space of the number probe never does expand in this way, arguably because being a number/class probe, any DP is always a match of it. The result is a split valuation of the φ-probes of *v* in contexts where O is 3rd person, person from A and number/class from O. Other questions that arise are interaction with a dative between A and

O, the potential for cyclic expansion higher than A say to the allocutive, the limitation of ergative displacement to certain Tenses, its loss, its recurrence cross-linguistically, and what happens to T-ergative Agree. These are the topic of C2.

(5)   a.   (guk$_i$)   (haiek$_j$/hura$_k$)   g$_i$-ene-kar-zki$_j$/$\varnothing_k$-en
           we.ERG   them/him.ABS 1'-TM-√carry-PL/$\varnothing$-PT
           We carried them/him.
     b.   guk$_A$ v kar-$_V$ haiek$_O$
           we————person————
           plural   number————plural

Normally applicative datives O', albeit higher than S/O, cannot control the person and number probes of v; they have quirky theta-related Case. In some dialects 1st/2nd person datives can; this produces *dative displacement*, (6). Remarkably, they remain theta-related dative, and do not become absolutive. The empirical domain of dative displacement is the principal data set on which this work is based, and being nearly exhaustive and of great wealth, it permits a study of the phenomenon in great detail. C3 develops the theory of theta-related case as a PP shell that normally hides the φ-features of the DP it contains, but that may transmit them to the outside through a φ-probe on P of modulable properties. This permits variation in the transparency of such PPs to external φ-Agree; features for which a dative is transparent will make it the closest goal to v. The proposal entails certain possible and impossible loci of parametric variation in dative displacement, so certain possible and impossible systematic patterns in the data and their interaction with arbitrary gaps. C3 examines these consequences, applying syntactic parameters and vocabulary item specifications differentially to the vast diversity of the dialectal data. Here too arise many questions to some of which interesting answers exist: the licensing of O2/S in such contexts, interaction with ergative displacement, the extent of PP transparency and opacity cross-linguistically, the nature of quirky case as a minimally transparent PP, to articulation and modularizability of φ-probes. Finally the nature of the relationship between structural and theta-related Case is addressed.

(6)   a.   *pro$_i$*   **geuri$_j$**   *pro$_k$*   emon   g$_j$-a-it$_j$-u$^{[dative\ displ.]}$ /   d-e-u-s-ku$_j$$^{[normal]}$.
           he.ERG   us.DAT   it.ABS given   1'-TM-PL-√   X-TM-√-DF-1'
           Nos lo ha dado a nosotros. (Azkue II:539/§770)
     b.   *pro$_A$* v [P   geuri$_{O'}$]   Appl   emon$_V$ *pro$_O$*
           person———— person——we
           number———— number—plural

C4 addresses morphological issues that will have arisen in the study of ED and DD, concentrating in two separate topics. First is the role of spell-out in creating arbitrary gaps to systems expected from the syntax, and particularly the role of null elements; for this the syntax-morphology mapping of DD, and its diachronic development, is examined. Second is the nature of certain morphology in the Basque verbs as X^0 heads doubling φ-probe controllers, or clitics, and the limitations on their combination with φ-probe spell-out through a highly variable ban on agreement doubling in the same morphological complex.

     The last kind of agreement displacement occurs in contexts where the configuration of arguments is such that the person φ-probe of v never reaches an S/O with person specification

across an intervening dative, causing a Case licensing crash. This is the Person Case Constraint, discussed in C5. If there is an A that T Agrees with, there is nothing to do. In unaccusatives however, the φ-probe of T, the secondary locus of Case/Agree in an absolutive language, is potentially available for person Agree, and some speakers make use of this option after independently raising the theme to [Spec, TP] for the EPP. This produces *absolutive displacement*: S in all and only Person Case Constraint contexts can Agree with T, optionally getting ergative rather than accusative and controlling the canonically ergative-controlled morphology underlined in (7), rather than the φ-probes of *v* glossed PX and PL. The proposal and the data are simple enough; a number of more or less technical issues arise in working it out. The phenomenon leads to the conclusion that a φ-probe can be added to T dynamically, depending on properties of the previous stages of the derivation; and that opens a window on a better understanding of the Obligatory Case Parameter, and in particular, of how secondary loci of φ-Agree are activated. It also has great value cross-linguistically, for it suggests that absolutive displacement happens invisibly in accusative languages, explaining why unaccusatives often seem to obviate the constraint.

(7) a. Gu_i/guk_i $berari_j$ gustatzen $*g$-a-tzai-zki-o/ d-i-o_j-$\underline{gu}_i$
        we.ABS/ERG he.DAT please 1'-TM-√-3 X-√-3-1'
        We please him (He likes us).

    b. $gu(k)_S$ T *v* $berari_{O'}$ Appl gusta-$_V$ gu_S
        we——————— person———3rd (local) we
        plural——— number——————————————————plural

    The approach to these agreement displacements follows the programme outlined in C0. The derivational construction of the phrase-marker and minimal search locality relativized to features are its building blocks. Parametrizable lexical properties of functional heads have repercussions in the syntax and sweeping patterns in the data. Properties of individual vocabulary item create most idiosyncratic anomalies. In the light of this programme, agreement displacements disappear as displacements, and become the expected consequences of the system. There is nothing privileged in the valuation of the φ-probe of *v* from S/O of the lexical verb associated with the *v*; S/O just happens normally to be the first goal that derivational syntax makes available to the probe. If there is no S/O, there might be a farther, sometimes a much farther, goal still in the c-command domain of *v*; the sections that follow fully illustrate such a possibility. If there is no goal at all in the c-command domain of *v*, search-space can expand to A (*ergative displacement*). If there is an applied object closer to *v* than S/O, it is this that is the goal, if it has any φ-features (*dative displacement*). If a goal moves from one position to another, it potentially falls into the scope of a different φ-probe higher up, thus later in its construction (*absolutive displacement*). Of course, this description is partly a-posteriori, and it is the agreement displacements that lead to such a picture in the first place.

    The three sections that ensue go through three of the most pertinent domains for the discussion of φ-Agree syntax in Basque outside the agreement displacements: restructuring, which shows non-coarguments controlling agreement; raising, which demonstrates that the ergative is a structural Case and long-distance cross-clausal agreement by *v* and T; and *v* agreement with moving Ā-elements. I will often refer to them in his work, but they may be consulted separately as the issues come up.

1.3   *Restructuring and the domain of *v*-Agree

In the derivational syntax of C0, all restrictions on the domain of φ-Agree arise from φ-intervention, unless stipulations are added. In a transitive clause for example, a probe on T does not see O because it stops at the closer A, if that is a potential controller for it. This predicts that there should be no arbitrary downward limits to φ-Agree, and in particular, there should be no limitation of agreement controllers to coarguments. One thus expects agreement complexes controllers of which belong to different predicates, as locality permits:

(i) Multiple predicates that entirely share their functional architecture: *restructuring*.
(ii) Multiple predicates separated by functional architecture lesser than a full clause, e.g. *ECM*.
(iii)Multiple predicates in separate complete CPs, that is *cross-clausal agreement*.

    Here I address restructuring, and return to cross-clausal Agree in XN. There are various diagnostics in Basque to determine whether two predicates share various pieces of their functional architecture. One is focus-verb adjacency (in eastern dialects also, focus-auxiliary): see Ortiz de Urbina (1989, 1993, 1995, 1999, 2003), Laka and Uriagereka (1987), Uriagereka (1999b), Arregi (2002), Irurtzun (2006), G:4.4. In the progressive construction for example, a martrx progressive auxiliary or predicate is combined with a locative nominalization, and either of these may count as the verb for focus-verb adjacency, indicating different structures. This kind of diagnostic appears to be independent of those of interest here: those that indicate transparency for Case/Agree and sharing of their loci.[7]
    Restructuring for Case/Agreement can be illustrated with the "semi-modal" constructions that involve the modal elements *behar* 'need', *nahi* 'want' + lexical verb in the form of a participle, (8), discussed in G:3.5.6.1. The whole is a single domain for selection and Agree/Case. All and only the arguments required by the lexical verb are projected. There is only a single agreement complex, and it obligatorily tracks the φ-features of all arguments that are potential agreement controllers, (8)a, (8)b.[8] However, the modal *behar/nahi* is not inert for section and Case/Agree: it forces the highest argument of the lexical verb (A, S) to receive ergative case and behave as an ergative agreement controller, (8)c.

(8)   a. *pro*$_i$ semeei$_j$ kotxe berriak$_k$ erosi   nahi/behar d-i-zki$_k$-e$_j$-t$_i$.
                I.ERG children.DAT cars new.ABS bought want/need X-√3 V-PL-3+PL'-1
                I want/need to buy my children some new cars. (G:3.5.6.1.2)
    b. *pro*$_i$ ni$_j$ ere   eraman   beharko   n$_j$-a-u-zu$_i$ / *d-u-zu$_j$ etxera.
                you.ERG me.ABS   also   bought   need.REL 1-TM-√-2   X-√2V-2 to.home
                You will also have to take me home. (G:3.5.6.1.2)
    c. *pro*$_i$ etxera   hurbildu   behar d-u-t$_i$.
                I.ERG to.home   approached   need   X-√2V-1
                I must get close to home. (G:3.5.6.1.2)

---

[7] See G:3.5.5.1 for an example of restructuring for focus-verb adjacency that do not seem to involve restructuring for Case/Agreement (the progressive), and G:3.5.6.1, 4.10.1.2.3 for an example of obligatory Case/Agree restructuring that does not involve necessary restructuring for focus-verb adjacency (the *behar* 'need', *nahi* 'want' semimodals, especially in northern dialects).
[8] No special restriction on the person of the lexical predicate's arguments arises; so there is no clausal boundary of the sort that gives rise to one in cross-clausal agreement, XN.

(9)　　a.　T_i [$_{vP}$ I.ERG$_i$ $v_{j,k}$ [$_{VP}$ need [$_{ApplP}$ sons.DAT$_j$ Appl [$_{VP}$ bought [cars.ABS]$_k$]]]]
　　　　b.　T_i [$_{vP}$ I.ERG$_i$ v [$_{VP}$ need [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ approach] to.home]]]

　　There is a very simple way to account for this in the approach to restructuring developed by Wurmbrand (2001), exploiting the insight that these constructions involve "reanalysis" (Ormazabal 1988, Goenaga 2003). This is shown in (9) for the sentences in (8)a, (8)c respectively. *Behar/nahi* are lexical verbs that select as their internal argument the embedded verb. They themselves are transtive verbs that project a transitive *v*P with an external argument. The lexical verb is a "bare VP": it projects its usual lexical structure, including applicative heads, but it does not project the Case/Agree locus *v* or higher material. This is supplied by *behar/nahi*, and in (9) the coindexing indicates the resulting Case/Agree relations. A meaning postulate that is part of the meaning of *behar/nahi* identifies the external argument of these verbs with the highest argument of the lexical verb (Chierchia 1984). The reassigned argument of the lexical verb, A/S, has no autonomous representation independent of the A of the semi-modal through which it is interpreted.[9]

　　This kind of restructuring shows one way in which multiple predicates can share the Case/Agree functional architecture of a single clause for their arguments. A different kind is also available in some dialects with *behar/nahi* + participle. Here, the whole continues to be a single domain for Case/Agree, but the presence of *behar/nahi* does not affect the projection of the lexical verb's arguments at all: in particular, the S of unaccusatives remains S. Thus, beside (8)c there is (10), where *n-a-iz* [1-TM-√1V] and *ni* [I.ABS] show absolutive agreement, Case, and corresponding auxiliary selection indicating lack of any ergative. Here *behar/nahi* seems to be simply an elements above the *v*P, e.g. a modal head of the Tense-Mood system (cf. Cinque's 1999 approach to restructuring). Progressive constructions in some dialects are another example of this kind of restructuring, though more typically they involve a locative Control nominalization (G:3.5.5.1, Laka forthcoming).

(10)　(*pro$_i$*)　etxera　　hurbildu　　behar　n$_i$-a-iz.
　　　I.ABS　to.home　approached　need　1-TM-√1V (G:3.5.6.1.2)

　　A closely related restructuring construction, one that is however not obligatorily restructuring and whose non-finite complement perhaps have more internal structure, has been extensively studied by Etxepare (2003). It has properties familiar from Romance clitic climbing (Aissen and Perlmutter 1983). It is an "all or nothing" phenomenon so that if a clause is restructuring it obligatorily is so for all agreement controllers, (11)a. It is potentially unbounded, so a restructuring clause may contain another one, (11)b. Finally, Etxepare also shows that arguments

---

[9] The kind of meaning postulate that identifies two arguments in a multiple-argument construction has been well explored. The upstairs predicate takes a V complement such and an *x* argument such that V holds of (*x, …*). An independent question arises here, and in all cases where an argument A selected by a predicate is thus "redirected" to an argument B introduced by another head in the same functional architecture, say the goal of *give* introduced by Appl: is A not projected and the selectional requirement satified through B; is A projected as an empty category (PRO in Diesing's 1992 approach to individual level predication); or is B a copy of A, sufficiently identical to delete through the copy-deletion mechanism though no acutal movement has taken place. In none of these cases is B an element that can enter into or that can need Case/Agree independently of A: Diesing's PRO, in [Spec, *v*P] with A in [Spec, TP], has no potential Case licenser, and the copy deletion algorithm is specifically blocked if two otherwise identical objects each have Case (Rezac 2004c, cf. Kitahara 2001).

of restructured predicates are dependent on Case assignment on the upstairs predicates, as in Wurmbrand's (2001) proposal for restructuring, because unaccusatives can only select a restructuring complement if they can switch to a transitive construction. This is indicated by (11)c, where *zen*, non-restructuring, is based on an auxiliary root choice that indicates only absolute Case assignment (to the matrix subject), whild *gintuen*, restructuring, on an auxiliary root that indicates ergative and absolute Case assignment (see SECTION).

(11) a. *pro*$_i$ [*e*$_j$ liburuak$_k$ itzultzen]   segitu   d-i-(*zki$_k$)-zu$_j$-e-gu$_i$
         we.ERG   ye.DAT   books.ABS returning.in   continued X-√3V-PL-2-PL'-1
         We continued returning the books. (Etxepare 2003: 201)

      b. *pro*$_i$ [[*e*$_j$ laguntzen]   segitzea]   pentsatu   d-i-zu$_j$-te$_i$
         they.ERG   you.DAT helping.in   continuing.D   thought   X-√3V-2-PL'
         They thought to continue helping you. (Etxepare 2003: 195)

      c. *pro*$_i$ [*e* gu$_j$ ezagutzen]   hasi   z-e-n   /   g$_j$-in-t$_j$-u-en
         they.ABS/ERG   you.ABS   bull.fighting   walked X-√1V-PT 1'-TM-PL-√2V-PT
         (He came out from a coma and straightway), he started to recognize you. (Etxepare 2003: 171)

These restructuring constructions all demonstrate the independence of Case and Agree in Basque, and the corresponding PX and PL agreement morphology, from co-argumenthood. The matrix and restructuring predicate form a single unique domain for agreement and Case, and agreement controllers are coded on the unique agreement complex in the same way they would be if they originated as coarguments of a single predicate with their corresponding φ-features and hierarchical relationships.[10]

Apparently related and of great interest, but problematic and unstudied, are constructions like (12). They involve the unaccusative verb *joan* 'go' + what is elsewhere an allative control nominalization, mentioned by Lafitte for some northern dialects of Basque; rare examples occur in the literature.[i] Here the embedded clause may be transparent for remote number agreement of its absolute O (and dative O'), as in (12).[11] The A of the embedded clause is interpreted through

---

[10] A different phenomenon appears in (i), studied in Etxepare (2003, 2004). Here the matrix predicate selects a gerund argument in the dative. The morpheme coding dative agreement with the gerund, *o*, seems to optionally be able to Agree for number (only) with the absolute argument within the dative gerund, *e*. This would be the only case where dative agreement can be controlled by a non-dative argument, something common otherwise for PX/PL morphology under e.g. long-distance Agree or ergative displacement. However, Etxepare (2004) convincingly shows that such constructions in fact involve the matrix predicate agreeing with the whole gerund only, not with any DP inside it. It is the gerund that is attracted towards the number (never person) of one of its internal arguments under certain conditions, such as there being no other arguments. For different possibilities for such "attraction" mechanisms, see Etxepare (2004) and Den Dikken (2001).
(i) *pro*$_i$ [PRO$_i$ horrelako   liburuak$_k$ argitaratzeari$_j$]   uko egin   d-i-o$_j$/e$_{j+k}$
      he.ERG   such   books.ABS printing.D.DAT   refusal made   X-√3V-3/3+PL
      He refused to print such books. (Etxepare 2003: 185)
[11] An apparent embedded dative may be cross-referenced on the matrix verb *joan* 'go' without transparency for plural agreement, and indeed with the embedded O in the genitive as is available to objects of infinitives in the dialect: see (i). However, dative agreement alone does not imply any restructuring and transparency, for the matrix dative is interpretable as an argument of *joan* (linked to an embedded dative), which can be an absolute - dative verb: see G:3.5.5.1 for this argument about progressive constructions, particularly strong since they are not a single domain for focus-verb adjacency. Similarly, one of the Bizkaian restructuring constructions of Arregi and Molina-Azaola (2003) resemble constructions with matrix unaccusative predicates that allow coding of embedded datives and not absolute plurality; here again I would take the dative as a matrix argument with no restructuring involved. For an

the argument introduced by the matrix absolutive S argument of *joan*. This leads to a remarkable state of affairs in terms of agreement and case. In the agreement combination in (12)a, (12)c, the matrix predicate's 1.SG S controls the person prefix *n*, and the embedded predicate's 3.PL O controls the plural morpheme *z*. The syntax-morphology mapping for these morphemes is such that each must have an absolutive O/S controller; but a single predicate never provides two absolutive agreement controllers, and a single agreement controller cannot have the feature specification 1.SG, PL. Only a non-coargument combination can give rise to the morphology assembled in *nindoazkon*, among which the PL *z* happens to be one of the most complicate morphemes in Basque (XN; APPENDIX BM), an interesting point for the productivity of the morphology (C1; cf. XN). However, the construction presents issues for which I know of no solution: first, there seem to be two absolutives (though *pro*-dropped), and second, in Basque a singular argument is never ordinarily "transparent" to number agreement in a way that allows number agreement with another argument (see C2:number). The validity of these points is indicated inter alia by the requirement of unaccusative restructuring predicates to switch to transitive ones, shown by Etxepare (2003) and exemplified in (11)c; that leaves (12) a profound mystery.

(12) a. pro_i etsaiari$_j$ harmak$_k$ hartzera   n$_i$-ind-oa-z$_k$-k-o$_j$-n
          I.ABS enemy.D.DAT   arms.ABS to.taking   1-TM-√-PL-DF-3.DAT-PAST
          I was going to take the arms to the enemy. (Lafitte 255f./§531)
      b. pro_i liburu hoik$_j$ oro   irakurtzerat   omen   d-oa-tza$_j$
          he.ABS   book   these   all.ABS   to.reading   apparently X-√-PL
          It seems that he is going to read all these books. (Lafitte 255f./§531)
      c. [(Iohan Apezaren eremuan diren uharte miresgarrienen)
          pro_j izenak$_k$ ematera]   n$_i$-oa-z$_k$-ki-zu$_j$ pro_i
          you.DAT   names.D.ABS   to.giving   1-√go-PL-DF-2
          I am going to give you the names (of the most wondrous islands that are in the wilderness of Iohan the Priest). (*Septentrio*, Aurelia Arkotxa, Alberdania 2001, p. 89)

1.4   *Seem* verbs: raising and cross-clausal agreement

Verbs meaning 'seem' are fascinating in Basque, for two independent reasons. First, they demonstrate beyond doubt that ergative case, and the agreement that ergative DPs control, are independent of theta-selection, so "structural". Second, they show that ergative-controlled, T, agreement can cross full CP boundaries, to be followed optionally by raising-to-ergative (probably both is true of absolutive-controlled, *v*, agreement too). Virtually all of these points, including their significance for the theory of ergativity, are demonstrated in Artiagoitia (2001ab), and I will extensively draw on this work here (cf. also G:4.10.1.1.9). My contribution is limited to the existence of long-distance Agree without raising-to-ergative, and a somewhat different theoretical implementation of the relationship to Obligatory Case Parameter.
    The verbs involved all mean 'seem'. They select either a declarative CP complement, of the type *It seems that Finist is bright*, or predicate a DP that bears no thematic relationship to the

---

explicit argument for this from lack of auxiliary choice sensitivity to the embedded clause, see C2:NUMBER.
(i) Harmen   hartzera   n-ind-oa-k-o-n
       arms.GEN   to.taking   1-TM-√go-DF-3-PT (Lafitte 255f./§531)

seem verb of a lower predicate, of the type *Finist seems bright*. I will speak of the non-thematic DP in the *seem*-verb's clause as the *pivot*, if there is one, and of proposition where it is interpreted as its predicate. The verbs are *irudi(tu)* (synthetic, see XN); *iduri ukan*, lit. 'have (*ukan*) image (*iduri*)'; and *eman* (analytic, see XN), which has an independent usage as ditransitive 'give' and its extensions, e.g. *give DP-DAT fear* 'frighten DP', *give DP-ABS as ADJ* 'consider DP ADJ'. Usage varies among dialects and periods; some speakers have none, some have several. The pivot is ergative for the purposes of agreement and of assigned Case if there is one, and no dative experiencer is possible, quite unexpectedly given the other usage of *eman* and the 'seem' verb discussed in the next paragraph; C3 provides an explanation.

There is a related 'seem' verb, *iruditu* 'seem' (analytic, XN; northern *iduritu*). It differs from the former: its pivot is absolutive, and it requires a dative experiencer like some other psych-verbs (cf. Artiagotia 2000:406f., Albizu 1998: note 16). The predicate may be a small clause, as in (13), or a full CP. The absolutive pivot probably raises from the small clause, but this is hardly unexpected, and such raising to absolutive the standard analysis of copular and similar constructions in Basque that predicate an absolutive of a small clause (Zabala 1993, cf. Artiagoitia 2000:136ff., G:4.2), as elsewhere (Stowell 1981). This verb can raise a DP to absolutive out of a finite CP or remotely Agree with the CP's subject without raising, as will be seen for raising-to-ergative *seem* verbs.[ii] From now, I concentrate on the latter.

(13)   non esperantzahunekin,   neguak$_i$ uda … iduritzen bai-tzai-zki$_i$-gu$_j$ *pro$_j$*.
        that hope   that.with   winters.ABS   summer seeming   that-√1V'-PL-1'   we.DAT
        that with that hope, winters seem to us summer …" (Axular, *Guero*, §319)

The basic facts relevant to the raising analysis of *seem* verbs are as follows. In the pivot + small copula construction, (14)a and (14)b, semantic restrictions on the pivot are entirely due to the small clause predicate, as in copular constructions; Artiagoitia presents a further battery of tests to confirm this lack of a matrix thematic status for the pivot. However, the pivot is ergative and triggers ergative agreement on the *seem*-verb's agreement complex, so that a transitive verb like *ikusi* 'see' with A for the pivot would take the same case the same agreement for corresponding A>3.SG combinations; this is impossible in copular constructions where the pivot must be absolutive (cf. Artiagoitia 2001b: ex. 33a). There is no absolutive alternative; in particular the pivot cannot stay within the small clause, as it cannot in English, because of the lack of an internal Case assignment mechanism.

(14)   a.   zuk   zintzoa   d-irudi-<u>zu</u> baina guk   ere zintzoak   d-irudi-<u>gu</u>
             you.ERG   honest.D   X-√seem-2 but   we.ERG   also honest.D.PL   X-√seem-1'
             You seem (to be) honest but we also seem (to be) honest. (Artiagoitia 2001a)
        b.   Baina zuk kaiola hartan horren   pozik eta zoriontsu   z-en-irudi-en
             but you.ERG cage that.in so   glad and happy   2-TM-√seem-PT
             But you seemed so glad and happy in that cage! (*16 ipuin amodiozko*, Xabier
             Mendiguren Elizegi, Susa, 2002, Ereduzko prosa gaur korpusean)[iii]

In the use where the *seem* verb takes no pivot and just a full CP predicate, the agreement complex of the *seem* verb assumes a form that clearly indicates the presence of a 3.SG ergative (from the choice of the auxiliary root, see XN), (15). It is relevant here that finite CPs cannot bear case morphology, and that arguably as a consequence, they are excluded from argument

positions that require the ergative (and dative, but not absolutive): see G:4.10.1.1.7, and cf. Bayer et al. (2001). An ergative expletive is thus indicated.[12] The expletive must be null (Artiagoitia 2001a:31, 2001b: ex. 66ab), for in Basque overt pronouns are emphatic. In English, the pro-CP expletive is *it*. This *it* differs from referential and quasi-argumental *it*, which can be controlled PRO as in English and Basque (16)a. The pro-CP *it* in English often cannot be one, and Artiagoitia demonstrates the same contrast for Basque, (16)b (Chomsky 1981:324, Chomsky 1995:327, but cf. Williams 1994:91).[13]

(15) Ematen   d-u   Jone   gaixorik   d-a-go-ela.
      seeming   X-√2V   Jon.ABS   ill   X-TM-√be-that
      It seem that Jon is ill. (Artiagoitia 2001b:ex. 7a)

(16) a. *pro*ᵢ   ezin   d-u   elurra   egin   [PROᵢ hotzik egin   gabe].
               unable   X-√2R   snow.D.ABS   done   cold   done   without
           Itᵢ cannot snow [PROᵢ without being cold]. (Artiagoitia 2001b:ex. 67a)
      b.. * *pro*ᵢ Jon   nekatuta   d-a-go-ela   ematen   d-u
               Jon.ABS   tired   X-TM-√be-that   seeming   X-√2V
           [PROᵢ [*pro* lan   handirik   egin   ez d-u-ela]   eman   arren]
                       work   great.PART   done   not X-√2V-that   seemed   despite
           Itᵢ seems that John is tired despite it/%PROᵢ seeming that he hasn't done much work.
           (Artiagoitia 2001a:ex. 40a)

The Case and agreement ergativity of the non-thematic pivot and the indication of an ergative expletive, strongly suggest that the ergative here must be structural, non-theta-related. By the Obligatory Case Principle, one would a *v*-absolutive relationship too, which would make the *seem* verb resemble the transitive copula of some languages (cf. Maling and Sprouse 1995). Yet, Artiagoitia (2001b: 17ff.) demonstrates that that there is no absolutive case or agreement relationship with the predicate or the pivot. Case morphology for the absolutive is unmarked and of little help; but one strong argument comes from the fact that the pivot, and the predicate the agrees with it for number, cannot control absolutive-controlled person and number agreement morphology (underlined) in (17). Artiagoitia's proposal is that the lexical root of *seem* verbs is specified with [-ABS], which prevents it (or here, *v*) from having a Case/Agree φ-probe, and that

---

[12] Etxepare (2003:203n1) and Albizu and Fernández (forthcoming) present an independent argument for the existence of an ergative expletive on the basis of (di)transitive verbs like *balio izan* 'be worth', with a sentential argument that may but need not bear ergative case, without affecting the transitivity of the construction; when it bears the absolutive, an ergative explative must be assumed to explain the choice of the auxiliary. Thanks to Pablo Albizu (p.c.) for pointing this out to me; the result has consequences for the proper analysis of CP extraposition more generally.
(i) Ez d-u   balio   goizegi   ateratze-a/ak
     not X-2V   worth   early.too   leaving-D.ABS/D.ERG
     [To leave too early]-ERG is not worth it / It-ERG is not not worth it [to leave too early]-ABS (Albizu and Fernández forthcoming, ex. 31a, except for last line)

[13] One way of introducing this special pro-CP *it* is to treat it as a D element doubling and sharing features with the CP, [DP D CP], that gets realized as *it* when separated from CP by movement (Rosenbaum 1967: chapter 1, 2, Stroik 1996, Moro 1997:173ff., Anagnostopoulou 2003:187, 334n68, Rezac 2004b; cf. Lasnik 1999:136). Curiously, to explain the ungrammaticality of the example it must be supposed that the equivalent of the English version with *it* for PRO is not available in Basque, although non-finite clauses generally allow *pro*-drop.

in the presence of such a feature the Obligatory Case Parameter mechanism activates the secondary Case/Agree locus T to provide a Case licenser.

(17) a. Jonek eta Mirenek$_i$ bertsolariak$_j$ ematen   d-u-te$_i$ /   *d-$\underline{it}_j$-u-z$_j$-te$_i$.
          J.ERG and M.ERG   poets.D.PL   seeming   X-$\sqrt{}$2V-PL'   X-PL-$\sqrt{}$2V-PL-PL'
          J. and M. seem (to be) poets (bertsolaris). (Artiagoitia 2001b:ex. 37ab)
     b. *Erretratu honetan   Jonek$_i$ ni$_j$ ematen   ?d-u   /   *$\underline{n}_j$-a-u.
          portrait   this.in   J.ERG me seeming   X-$\sqrt{}$2V   1-TM-$\sqrt{}$2V
          In this portrait J. seems to be me. (Artiagoitia 2001b:ex. 37d, and nt. 11)

I suggest tentatively a somewhat different structure: it can be viewed on the one hand an implementation of [-ABS], on the other hand a way of thinking about the structure that makes salient to oddity of these verbs. For they are odd: they seem to violate the OCP, activating the secondary locus of Case/Agree without the primary one, and for no good reason since there are analogoues raising-to-absolutive verbs. Ideally, the raising-to-ergative verbs would project their structure in such a way that all these things fall out. To this it must be added that in the present framework, where absolutive Case comes from the φ-probe of v, it cannot just be said that the φ-probe of v is deactivated with these verbs. The pivot is indeed ergative, but it behaves exactly like a regular ergative, and so in contexts where the φ-probe of v could Agree with an ergative pivot, it does so for *seem* verbs as well. This is the ergative displacement context; for transitive in the non-present tense in 1/2>3 combinations, the person probe of v is valued from A when its search-space expands to it, and this is equally so for *seem* verbs when the pivot is 1st/2nd person, (14)b. The Obligatory Case Parameter also requires the presence of the φ-probes of v as it stands.

The alternative structure is in (18), contrasting raising-to-ergative with raising to absolutive. The proposal has two components. First, it does give raising-to-ergative verbs an internal argument, a goal for the φ-probe of v, so no OCP violation arises, and a goal that is 3.SG, so agreement with it is undetectable and the φ-probe is free to undergo ergative displacement. This internal argument G is incorporated into v, perhaps by first incorporating into V. G must be distinct from the *pro* theme of unergatives for reasons discussed in C3. I argue there that applicative datives depend on the φ-probe of v passing across them to Agree with a goal; this is fine with unergatives so there are unergative + dative verbs, but not with *seem* verbs. G is closer to v than any other object; its φ-features will match the person and number probes of v and block further search downwards, including within ApplP/VP selected by v, though the person probe of v is not fully valued from it in ED contexts and can search upwards (see C2, C5 on the mechanics). The role of G particularly for the OCP resembles the role played by the incorporated D of antipassives in Baker (1988, 1996), Bittner and Hale (1996ab).

The second innovation of the proposal consists in putting the prepositional argument of the raising verb in [Spec, vP], now that G is the projected complement of V.[14] This is odd, but perhaps exactly as odd as raising-to-ergative. What it does is remove the pivot from the search-space of the probe of v, except in ergative displacement contexts, and put it instead into the

---

[14] There are no restrictions like agentivity on [Spec, vP] in Basque that would exclude propositions. Aside from transitive psychological predicates whose ergative is a proposition, like *harritu* 'surprise', there are many pure transitives that may take a propositional ergative subject in the form of nominalization, as in English e.g. *hitz bera erabiltzeak hasieran nahaste bat eragiten du* "(In distinguishing Graeco-Roman and present historians), [using the same word]-ERG causes confusion in the beginning." (Tacitus, *Analak eta historiak*, Hitzaurrea, sections 3.0).

search-space of T.[15] That is why these are raising-to-ergative verbs, not raising-to-absolutive (+ perhaps an ergative expletive) ones.[16]

(18) a. $T_{\varphi\text{-ERG}}$ [$_{\nu P}$ [$_{SC}$ they$_{3.pl}$ clever] $\nu_{\varphi\text{-ABS}}$+[V+G$_{3.sg}$] [$_{VP}$ t_V t_G]]   (raising to erg. *seem*)
      b. T   [$_{\nu P}$ $\nu_{\varphi\text{-ABS}}$+V [$_{VP}$ [$_{SC}$ they$_{3.pl}$ clever]]]   (raising to abs. *seem*)

So much for the common use of raising-to-ergative *seem*-verbs. Some speakers have a further option: a finite CP argument, *plus* an ergative pivot. These constructions have very much the same range of possibilities as the so-called copy-raising constructions of English, investigated in Rogers (1971, 1972, 1974ab), Heycock (1994:272ff.), Potsdam and Runner (2001), Rezac (2004a: chapter 3, 2004b) (cf. for other languages e.g. Grosu and Horvath 1984, Massam 1985, Ura 1996, Moore 1998). The Basque version is the focus of Artiagoitia (2001ab).

First, a few speakers allow a truly bivalent use of *seem*, where the ergative pivot and the CP are both thematic arguments of *seem*, as in (19)a (Salaburu 1987ab). Another minority of speakers require a pronominal link to the pivot in the CP, but the pronoun need not be the A/S subject of the CP: it may equally be a dative or absolutive, (19)b. I would put these speakers with those that have the thematic use; for judgments on the felicity of *seem* + thematic pivot + CP are very context-dependent in English, and a pronominal link helps.[17] Finally, most speakers that

---

[15] A theoretical object to the proposed structure for *seem* verbs is that [Spec, *v*P] should be a (strong/CED) island, Agree into which and movement out of which is banned by the Left Branch Condition (subject condition, Chomsky 1973, studied for Ā-movement only). Yet, not to speak of the variable status of extraction out of datives and out of subjects of ECM infinitives, even within English extraction out of all types of subjects is known to be sometimes possible: see Erteshik-Shir (1981:154), Chomsky (1977:131n54, 1986:26, forthcoming), Sauerland and Elbourne (2002:304f.). For other languages, Stepanov (2001: chapter 2) provides a review; for German for example, he claims it is impossible only if the subject moves. In English in particular, infinitival sentential subjects have been noted to be sometimes open to extraction, *This is something which [[for you to understand ___] would be futile]* (Kuno and Takami 1973). The question comes down to what creates left branch islands. In the approach of Uriagereka (1999a) for example, a complex left branch Merging with a complex right branch must linearize; but in the case at hand the right branch contains virtually no material, that is no it is a sequence of simplex head-complement sequences with no specifiers, and furthermore nothing prevents the right branch from linearizing instead. In the approach of Davies and Dubinsky (2003:32ff.), a subject is opaque to extraction in English because it must be a DP rather than an NP (including when it seems a PPs, etc.) but this could be obviously adapted to exclude the *seem* structures under consideration.

[16] A way to think about the proposed structure is to paraphrase raising-to-ergative *John seems (to be) honest* as (pseudo-English) *[John being honest] has/gives appearance*, suggestive as one of the *seem* verbs also (normally) means 'give' and another originates in a locution 'have image', *iduri ukan*. Yet *iduri* 'image' here is not G: pushing this way of thinking about things, its D would be. *Iduri* seems to belong to a class of invisible noun-like objects in locutions like *atsegin ukan/izan* 'have pleasure, like' (transitive or unaccusative psych-verb, see G:4.1.4.6.4) or *zor ukan* 'have debt, owe' (ditransitive), where the noun-like *atsegin* 'pleasure', *zor* 'debt' are completely transparent to absolutive Case/Agree by *v*, and to applicativity, so there is necessarily a true absolutive O/S in addition to them.

[17] Amelioration by a pronominal link between the subject and the predicate is shared by other predicational constructions, e.g. experiencer *have* in English (Belvin and Den Dikken 2001), *Kate has mosquitoes buzzing around her/%the head*, and some Basque implicatives (Ortiz de Urbina and Uribe Etxebarria 1991:00 note 00).
    One could pursue an alternative: speakers who require a pronominal link do not have a thematic use of *seem*, but unlike speakers who only allow a subject link, they have as a possibility for CP arguments of *seem* that are headed by an operator identifying (λ-binding) an internal open variable, either a pronoun or the operator trace. The matrix ergative pivot is equally copy-raised from such CPs, as below for subject-linked CR, with the sole difference being that the operator, in the CP system, is the closest goal for *seem*-verb's φ-Agree. Such constructions are simply *tough*-movement constructions; indeed except for selection of operator-headed clauses, *tough* predicates have the same properties as *seem* predicates, and the same elements come into play as with CR. See Rezac (2006). Since such a possibility adds nothing to the theoretical gammut under discussion, I leave it aside.

allow ergative pivot + CP with *seem* verbs require that the ergative pivot be linked to a pronominal subject of the CP, A (ergative) or S (absolutive), as in (20). As for pivot + small clause, Artiagoitia demonstrates that the ergative pivot is in a non-thematic position here: it cannot be made a causee, a restriction known for derived A-positions like the subjects of raising verbs (Kayne 1975:254-260 for French; French and Basque have the same causativization pattern, cf. C3).[18] This construction, where a non-thematic pivot of *seem* links to a pronoun in a full CP rather than a gap in a small clause, is known as *copy-raising*, and is found in English as well as the translations indicate.

(19)   a. Zeru horrek   iduri   d-u   Bilbo sutan   d-a-go-ela.
             sky that.ERG   seeming   X-√2V Bilbo fire.in   X-TM-√rest-that
             That sky seems like Bilbo is on fire. (Artiagoitia 2001b:x79, Salaburu 1987b:125)
      b. Jonek$_i$ ematen du   norbaitek *pro*$_i$ min egin   d-i-o$_i$-la.
             J.ERG seeming X-√2V   someone.ERG pain done X-√3V-3-that
             Jon seems like someone is causing him pain. (Artiagoitia 2001b:ex. 72a)

(20)   a. (espainolek$_i$) iduri d-u-te$_i$ [*pro*$_i$ ez   d-a-ki-te$_i$-la
             Spaniards.ERG seeming X-√have-PL' they.ERG not X-TM-√know-PL'-that
             [PRO$_i$ borrokatzen   [PRO$_i$ elgar$_i$ sangratu   gabe]]].
                  fighting   each.other.ABS   bled   without
             The Spaniards seem like they do not know to fight without bleeding each other.
             (Artiagoitia 2001b: ex. 61b, citing J. Hiriart Urruty 10)
      b. [*pro*$_i$ [*pro*$_i$ cerbait d-ira$_i$-de$_i$-la]   irudi   d-u-te$_i$-n]-ataric
             they.ERG they.ABS something X-PL+√be-PL-that seeming   X-√have-PL'-that-
             D.PART
             of those who seem like they are something (Liçarrague, Gal 2:6, cf. Lafon p. 361)

    I will assume the theory of copy-raising proposed in Rezac (2004a: chapter 3, 2004b, 2006), which closely follows the insights on the one hand of Heycock (1994) and on the other of Potsdam and Runner (2001). First, there is an Agree relation between the relevant head in the matrix clause, T in Basque, and the closest goal; for copy-raising the closest goal happens to be the highest DP in the CP argument of the *seem* verb, just as for raising it is that of a small clause argument. This step alone results in the English example (21)a. As it demonstrates independently of copy-raising, the CP in these constructions is evidently transparent to φ-Agree, and indeed arguably the more common opacity of CPs to φ-Agree comes simply because they are headed by a 3.SG intervener like a null version of the pro-CP pronoun/D *it* (NOTE; cf. C1). Second, the goal of Agree is Merged in the matrix [Spec, TP]. The same Agree + Merge steps occur in regular raising and other movement, but there the copy-deletion algorithm leads to the deletion Δ of the original goal. In copy-raising, the original goal is embedded within a CP, and thus it may

---

[18] There is one possible challenge to viewing the pivot as non-thematic: it cannot be an idiom chunk in Basque, as Artiagoitia (2001b) mentions. This is simply a property of copy-raising in general, that arises for an unknown reasons: even those moveable in passives do not easily survive it. There are are English speakers who do allow them, and there is a clear contrast between attempting to copy-raise a subject and a non-subject idiom chunk, e.g. *%The shoe seems like it's one the other foot*, **The other foot seems like the shoe is on it* (see Rogers' work cited above).

both be an independent pronoun (that is, there are Binding Theory Condition B, C), and it is too far from the higher copy for copy-deletion Δ to apply: contrast (21)b, (21)c.

(21) a. There seem(PL)$_i$ like [$_{CP}$ there are(PL)$_i$ two books$_i$ on the table].
      b. Two books$_i$ seem like [$_{CP}$ they$_i$ / *$^{[\Delta]}$two books$_i$ / *$^{[C]}$two books$_i$ are on the table].
      c. Two books$_i$ seem [$_{TP}$ *$^{[B]}$they$_i$ / $^{[\Delta]}$two books$_i$ / *$^{[C]}$two books$_i$ are to be on the table.]

The option found in English (21)a also occurs in Basque: pure long-distance T agreement, without movement (copy-raising) of the controller, in (22). The matrix agreement morphology, *te*, elsewhere requires an ergative controller; arguably it takes this form because it is the spell-out of number Agree on T. Here the controller is an absolutive that stays in an embedded finite CP, where it triggers the regular agreement an absolutive would; an ergative is impossible in this position. Note that there is no possibility of analyzing the controller of plural agreement in the matrix clause as being a separate thematic argument in the matrix clause, a 3.pl *pro*, because its coreference with *liburuak* would create a Condition C violation.[iv]

(22) [Hizkuntzalari honi   liburuak$_i$/*liburuek$_i$ gustatzen zai-zki$_i$-o-la]   ematen d-u-te$_i$.
      linguist.DAT that.DAT books.ABS/*ERG liking   √1V-PL-3-that seeming X-√2V-PL'
      The books seem like they please to that linguist. (AI)

The long-distance Agree in (22) where the controller stays in-situ is the best candidate in Basque for testing an issue discussed in C1, whether the agreement involved as LF consequences, implicating some movement (e.g. *te* clitic doubling the controller), or not, entailing pure φ-probe valuation. Independently, it turns out to be impossible to run the most secure of such tests, anaphora binding (for lack of matrix experiencer, level clash reasons, etc.). Control of a PRO in a matrix adjunct to the *seem*-verb remains a possible though more dangerous test.[19] [No results presently -MR]

(23) a. [judgment unknown] Hizkuntzalari honi liburu berriak gustatzen zaizkiola ematen dute / dirudite argitaratzerakoan.
          Upon being printed, there seem like there appeal new books to this linguist.
      b. [judgment unknown] Liburu berriek hizkuntzalari honi gustatzen zaizkiola ematen dute / dirudite argitaratzerakoan.
          Upon being printed, new books seem like they appeal to this linguist.

A consequence of the theory of copy-raising adopted is that there is no reconstruction. This is because the lexical content of the pivot of copy-raising is base-generated in the matrix [Spec,

---

[19] The tests are on the order of complexity of the English translations. Great caution is in order since it control of PRO in adjuncts is the most ill-understood and historically the most mis-used test in the question whether Agree entails movement or not (Rezac 2004a:222ff.). Arguing that Agree alone suffices to control PRO in an adjunct, Chomsky (1995:272ff.) and Cardinaletti (1997) gave data for French and Italian that are in full conflict with those in Legendre (1989, 1990) and Perlmutter (1983:143-150) respectively, and for English data that Lasnik (1999:187) showed to be very partial. The examples, of the type *there entered three men [without PRO identifying themselves]*, seem to involve true control by *three men*, and its position lower than a matrix adjunct is irrelevant, as is the case for non-obligatory control elsewhere. These examples, modelled on Artiagoitia (2001a), put a full CP boundary between an unraised and unraised controller, and the rightward positioning of the PRO-controlling adjunct requires it to go with the matrix verb.

TP], and its goal, identified by φ-Agree, is a pronoun in the embedded clause: for English, see Potsdam and Runner (2001), Rezac (2004a: chapter 3, 2004b, 2006). This is also true of Basque, (24). A *lami* is a mythological creature, something like a dryad. Its whose existence in the real world w_0 is not entailed in (24)a where it stays in its CP, since the modal quantifier over possible worlds in *seem* takes scope over it. It is entailed in the copy-raising construction (24)b, since the lexical content of *lami* is only present in the matrix [Spec, TP] and thus cannot be interpreted below *seem*. In simple raising where an actual copy of the matrix pivot occurs in a position below *seem*, the lower copy may be interpreted, so that (24)c has the same reading as (24)a.[20]

(24) a. Lami batzuk$_i$ zulo hartan   bizi   d-ire$_i$-la   ematen   d-u.
          lami some.ERG   hole this.in   living X-be+PL-that seeming   X-√2V
          It seems that some lami live in this hole. (*l.* need not exist, in Engl. and Basque) (AI)
      b. Lami batzuk$_i$ zulo hartan   bizi   d-ire$_i$-la   ematen   d-u-te$_i$.
          lami some.ERG   hole this.in   living X-be+PL-that seeming   X-√2V
          Some lami seem like they live in this hole. (*l.* must exist, in English and Basque) (AI)
      c. Some lami (dryads) seem to live in this hole. (*lami* need not exist).

A final issue in copy-raising and remote Agree across a CP boundary is a restriction to 3rd person. Artiagoitia (2001b) shows that 1st/2nd person pivots are not acceptable at all for many speakers, for others only under certain conditions, particularly strong focus on the pronoun. If a speaker accepts a non-subject link in for the ergative pivot, that is a thematic use as mentioned above, (s)he also accepts a 1st/2nd person pronoun subject-linked pivot; and my superficial inquiries suggest that the use of a focussed pronoun renders acceptable both 1st/2nd person subject pivots and non-subject pivots. Beyond that, the data seem to me too unclear to make much of. The restriction does no apply for pivots in small clauses, (14). Richards (2005), discussing the issue for Basque as well as other languages, argues that the restriction arises whenever a φ-probe crosses a clausal boundary (cf. Chomsky 2000:128, 148n88), comparing the Person Case Constraint.

1.5   *Ā-Agree

So far, Agree in Basque has been seen to extend its domain indefinitely downwards, agreeing with arguments of other predicates, across small clause boundaries, and across finite CPs. The

---

[20] Artiagoitia (2001b:41-2) does claim that there is reconstruction occur in copy-raising, in that an indefinite can assume two interpretations in the Basque version of sentence *In this group, someone seems like he is angry with me*: *someone* can be either a specific *someone* known to the speaker or not, so followed by *Let the one who is angry with me get up, and explain*, or by *Let every who is angry with me get up, and explain*. Yet the two interpretations are not distinguished in the theory of indefinites by scope. Indeed, Artiagoitia (2001a: section 4) puts matters somewhat differently: the copy-raising sentence rather makes the specific interpretation *available*, and the (default) interpretation without copy-raising is the non-specific. This is certainly not a matter of scope, since the reading where there is only one individual, and known, is not logically blocked for an indefinite in the embedded CP. There is a great number of factors, and it seems different mechanisms that play in the interpretation of indefinites as specific / known or not: see Fodor and Sag 1983, Diesing 1992, Abusch 1994, Reinhart 1997, Kratzer 1998, Farkas 2000. Reconstruction into the embedded complement of *seem* verbs can be shown by reconstruction below the intensional quantifier of *seem* (*de re / de dicto* contrast, as in the text); reconstruction below the matrix [Spec, TP], though not necessarily below *seem*, can be shown by various diagnostics that mostly derive from reconstruction below existential closure in Diesing's (1992), such as non-presuppositional readings of weak quantifiers like *no one*, an existential interpretation of bare NPs, etc.: see Rezac (2004a: chapter 3, 2004b).

picture is the one that a minimalist approach expects: a probe is halted simply and only by the closest matching goal. The same lack of stipulated bounds has been found in other languages, such as Tsez and English across full CPs or English and Icelandic agreement across multiple ECP TPs (C1). One expected configuration for φ-Agree is when a goal that is normally too far, screened from a probe by an intervener, is brought by independent means past the intervener, provided such independent means exist. C5 studies one such situation. There also seems to occur another in Basque: Agree by the number probe of v with a goal brought into its range by Ā-movement. I explore it here briefly, only to complete the theoretical picture designed by the derivational syntax of C1 and provide support for the productivity of Basque morphology. For Basque, I draw almost entirely on the discussion of the phenomenon by Oyharçabal (2004) and the generalizations he establishes.

Before venturing into that territory though, it bears noting that it is not unusual, cross-linguistically, for a moving *wh*-word to "eccentrically" control φ-probes that it crosses. Long known in generative literature have been English dialectal data like (25)a, where the plural *who* over-rides the singular agreement on *think* and *believe* that should be agreeing with their subject *Tom* and *Dick* (Kimball and Aissen 1971, Kayne 1989, 1995). Bruening (2001:00) discusses what seems very similar for the Algonquian language Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001: chapter 4, section 3), where a moving Ā-element (operator, focus, etc.) can optionally trigger φ-agreement (underlined) for obviation and plurality on the clauses it crosses. Less clearly related is the φ-feature agreement between *wh*-words and C in the Bantu languages (Rizzi 1990:00, Kinyalolo 1991, Schneider-Zioga 2000, 2006, Carstens 2005).[21]

(25) a. Where are the boys who Tom think(s) Dick believe(s) Harry expect(s) to be late. (Kimball and Aissen 1971:246)
      b. N-musal-a [NP wot   skitab [CP Piyel   ito-k-(<u>il</u>)
          1-like-Dir   this.Anman   P.   say-3Conj-(PartObv)
          [CP elitahasi-t/<u>c-il</u>   [CP kisi-komutonom-iht/<u>c-il</u>]]]].
             IC.think-3Conj-(PartObv) Perf-rob-3ConjInv-(PartObv)
          I like [NP the man that Piel said he thought robbed him.] (Bruening 2001:208 ex. 517)

The Basque incarnation is in (26). In (26)a, the relative clause operator corresponding to *faltak* triggers PL agreement not only on the agreement complex of the most embedded clause of which it is the complement (a full finite CP), but also on the upstairs agreement complex in the clause containing its landing site; the relevant morphology and controllers are underlined. The downstairs agreement is canonical, reflecting the number probe of v, the upstairs one is eccentric and impossible without Ā-movement, as in (26)b. Oyharçabal also shows that PF adjacency between the upstairs agreement complex and the relative clause head is not relevant. Speakers vary and often lack sharp judgments regarding the acceptability of such agreement, but many strongly prefer it, and examples have been common in the literature since its beginnings in sixteenth century.

(26) a. [*pro*i [*pro*i *e*j segurki egin d-<u>it</u>j-u-gui-la]   d-a-ki-<u>zki</u>j-gui-n]   <u>faltak</u>j
             we   we   surely   made X-PL-√2V-1'-that X-TM-√know-PL-1'-REL errors.ABS

---

[21] Very different is French participial agreement, which is not restricted to *wh*-movement, occurs only on the participle of which the gap is an argument, and has interpretive effects (Déprez 1998) that recall those of "shadow" pronouns (cf. Postal 1998), like the clitics that also trigger it.

the errors that we know that we have surely made.

b. Ba-d-a-ki-(*zki$_j$)-gu$_i$ *pro*$_i$ [*pro*$_i$ faltak$_j$ egin   d-it$_j$-u-gu$_i$-la].
FOC-X-TM-√know-(*PL)-1'   we   we   errors.ABS made   X-PL-√-1'-that
We know that we have made errors. (Oyharçabal 2004: ex. 4c, 7ab).

Before venturing into the syntax of the phenomenon, there is an important point to be learned here about Basque morphology that I would emphasize. The eccentric plural agreement is expressed using the PL morphology that would canonically express Agree of the φ-probe of *v* with a plural O/S. The PL allomorphs found in the examples in this section are *zki*, *tza*, and *it*, and each is has the form and shape that O/S plural agreement would taken in the context, for example post-root *zki* with the verb *jakin* 'know'. This contrasts with what happens when new plural morphology is created in diachronic change in Basque, studied in C4:DLM, where such contextual allomorphy and placement is not respected. It seems then that the phenomenon does not involve the abstraction and deployment of new plural morphology reflecting perhaps C-operator φ-Agree, but the regular spell-out of the φ-probe of *v*.

In this lies an important clue to the syntactic analysis of the phenomenon. But first the promised morphological point: as with restructuring, PL agreement with an operator can give rise to combinations of agreement morphology that have no coargumental analogues. This is shown in (27)a, with the structure in (27)b. The upstairs agreement complex crossed by operator is *nenbiltzanak*, built on the synthetic verb *ibili* 'walk'. It contains morphology that no combination of its coarguments can simultaneously trigger, for it would require an impossible 1.SG + PL absolutive S: 1 *n*, due to 1.SG S, and PL *tza* coming from the Ā-element: cf. *n-en-bil-en* [1-TM-√-PT] 'I walked', *z-e-bil-tza-n* [X-TM-√-PL-PT] 'they walked'.[22]

(27)   a.   Nik$_i$ ez   d-it$_j$-u-t$_i$ gehienbat aurkitu [e$_i$ bila   n-en-bil-tza-n]-ak.
             I.ERG not X-PL-√2V-1   particularly found   in.search.of   1-TM-√walk-PL-REL-those.ABS
             I have particularly not found what I was seeking (las que andaban buscando). (Oyharçabal 2004: ex. 14)

       b.   [$_{CP}$ ____   bila   [[n-en-bil-tza]-n $_{CP}$]-ak
           [$_{CP}$ ____$_i$ in.search.of   [[1-CL-√walk-PL]-C$_{OP-i}$ $_{CP}$]-the.PL.ABS
           the things$_i$ [OP$_i$ (that) I$_j$ walked.about-1.SG$_j$-PL.ABS$_i$ [in.search.of __$_i$]]

(28)   [To what people$_i$]$_k$ do$_i$/does$_j$ Muttonhead$_j$ address his words t$_k$? (Kimbass and Aissen 1971: 245)

Returning to the syntax, this particular example also illustrates that the operator controlling anomalous number agreement need not itself be an agreement controller in its clause; its gap here is the genitive complement of the postposition *bila*. Even if it is an agreement controller in its clause, it may be ergative or dative, which do not control PL (Oyharçabal 2004: section 5). Both English, (28), and Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001:207), are parallel to Basque in this respect.

---

[22] G:4.10.3.1.6.3 notes that the expample "sounds better to many people" than one without anomalous number agreement, *nenbilen*. Indeed, its author, the Basque linguist Koldo Mitxelena, "added a note explaining that, although *nenbiltzan* was a true freak from the point of view of verbal morphology, he didn't want to correct it, because, as a speaker, he didn't find it so bad." (ibid).

I will sketch how PL agreement with an operator might enter into the theory developed here, following Rezac (2004a: 194-8) for Algonquian. The configuration prior to movement of the operator across the v with the number probe is in (29). The agreement complex that hosts such anomalous agreement must not have a canonical controller α for PL, that is absolutive S/O, just a clausal complement (cf. Oyharçabal 2004: note 13). This follows from locality and cyclicity if the Agree involved is as argued the number probe of v, since such an α would necessarily be the first goal for it (see Rezac 2004a:00, 2004c, forthcoming, for the same restriction on agreement with Ā elements elsewhere). If there is no α, v Agrees with OP_i at the edge of the next lower CP; at the same time, OP can undergo successive-cyclic Ā-movement to [Spec, v]. In Basque, v Agree with a lower Ā-element is not available if it is in its criterial position. This can be captured by making the criterial position lower than the CP barrier to φ-Agree (3.SG C, see XN), and the successive-cyclic landing site higher.[23]

(29) v [number-]$_i$ …   (*α.ABS)   …   [$_{CP}$ OP$_i$ C […]]

2   The morphology of clausal φ-agreement in Basque

2.1   The agreement complex

Agreeing clauses in Basque contain all agreement on a single object, the *agreement complex*. The agreement complex also contains Tense, in a sense to be made precise in XN, that enters into conditioning various agreement phenomena like agreement displacement and default agreement morphology. Morphology that belongs to the left peripheral C-system is attached to the outside the agreement complex, and it seems completely inert for agreement. Thus, in the clausal architecture there is an upper boundary that I will speak of as the boundary between the T and C systems; to the T system belongs all that enters into agreement (special consideration of allocutive agreement being left until C2).

Travelling downwards, the agreement complex also contains v as the locus of absolutive agreement, and probably also Appl. In *synthetic constructions* the lexical verbal root itself raises to the agreement complex, as *du* in (30)b. In *analytic* (or *periphrastic*) *constructions* where the

---

[23] This proposal does not square with two of Oyharçabal's generalizations that have so far gone unmentioned. First, only relative operators, not say *wh*-words, that control such anomalous agreement. Second, it is only the maximal clause hosting the operator, and of course the initial clause, that can have such anomalous agreement, not intermediate clauses, (i). One might formulate the required distinctions in terms of the fact that maximal clause is distinguished by hosting the final landing site of the Ā-element, and/or has an Ā-probe that is valued from the Ā-element to such values as [+rel] or [+wh] while intermediate probes are not so valued. v-OP Agree in (29) might in fact be impossible because of the CP boundary, and it takes a criterial probe, perhaps on v in Basque (cf. Arregi 2002) to get OP to [Spec, vP] where the number probe of v can see it (or the same after v-to-C raising); perhaps intermediate landing-sites are not visible. Yet it is premature to venture down this road. The restriction to operators actually varies with speakers (Oyharçabal 2004: note 10); on my preliminary probes, within speakers it varies with choice of *wh*-word (*zein giltzak* 'which keys' vs. *ze giltza* 'what keys). Lack of intermediate agreement, though again not exceptionless in my probes, is robust. In English and Algonquian (27), intermediate agreement is fine, and Kimball and Aissen (1971) show that in English the anomalous agreement is found in throughout different Ā-movement constructions.
(i)   [[[e_i etorriko   d-ire$_i$-la]   uste   d-(*it$_i$)-u-zu$_j$-la]   erran d-i-zki$_i$-da-zu$_j$-n]   lagunak$_i$.
        come.FUT   X-be+PL-that belief   X-PL-√2V-2-that said   X-√3V-PL-1-2-that   friends.D.ABS
        The friends that you told-PL me that you believe(*-PL) would-PL come. (Oyharçabal 2004, ex. 10ab)

lexical root + Aspect is separate from the auxiliary, as in (30)a (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Laka 1990, 1993). In analytic constructions the material in the agreement complex such as Tense is attached to one of small number of roots known as *auxiliaries*, discussed in XN. The distribution of these roots is determined by formal properties of the agreement complex, such as Tense and Agree, and it is tempting to base-generate them to support the material in the agreement complex; in the glosses they will appear as √ or as √1V, √1V', √2V, √3V for reasons discussed there.

Most roots can only appear in the analytic construction. Some aspectual interpretations, such as the habitual, also require the analytic construction, for all roots (G:3.5.4.1). I will speak of the lower boundary in synthetic constructions as located at Asp (cf. Laka 2000, 2004, forthcoming). Since certain aspectual interpretations like the habitual are unavailable to synthetic constructions, the presence of contentful Asp seems to block verb root raising.[24] When the verb root does raise, it does count as part of the agreement complex for conditioning its morphology. The aspects it differentiates in-situ are the participle (*i-kus-i*, glossed "seen") and the radical (*i-kus-*, "see"), the prospective (*e-torr-i-ko*, "see.REL"), and the progressive (*e-tor-tze-n*, "seeing") (see esp. Trask 1995, Artiagoitia 1995: chapter 4).

There are different ways to conceptualise the assembly of the agreement complex, depending on the presence of such mechanisms as syntactic head movement. The inertness of C-system morphology suggests that it is attached by a different process from the process that assembles the agreement complex: morphophonological Merger vs. morphosyntactic Merger / head movement, for example (cf. Hale 2001).

The syntactic objects that can control agreement morphology are the following: absolutive S/O1/O2; ergative A; applicative dative O'; allocutive, coding of the status of the addressee by an otherwise null X^0 high in the clausal architecture. (30) illustrates the coding of these agreement controllers for an analytic and a synthetic verbal construction respectively.

(30) a. [*Analytic* 1.P>3.S+>3.P [M]]
    (pro_l) (Gu-k_i) (hari$_j$) (haiek$_k$) eman g$_i$-in$_i$-i-o$_j$-z$_k$-ke-ia$_l$-n.
      we.ERG he.DAT them.ABS given 1'-TM-√3V-3-PL-POT-M-PT
   We$_i$ would have given them$_k$ to him$_j$ (masc. addressee$_l$). (cf. Lafitte 302/§583-4)
  b. [*Synthetic* 3.S>1.P+>3.S [M]]
   … (pro_l) (nik$_i$) (zue$_j$) zeren bihotzean bait-z$_j$-a-du-tza$_j$-te$_j$-t$_i$.
      I.ERG ye.ABS because heart.in that-2-TM-√hold-PL-PL'-1
   Because I hold ye in my heart. (Leizarraga, Lafon 1943:211)

There are two fundamental systems of agreement expressed in the Basque verb. One is the prefixal system, underlined in (30), including separate agreement for person coded by the morpheme PX and number by PL; it will be analysed as valuation of the φ-probes of *v*. The other is a system of suffixes, SX, doubly underlined in (30), that will be analysed as the cliticization of X^0's of various sources using the clitic morphemes SX. (There is also strong evidence for a φ-probe of T, but it is less evident in the morphology, and I defer it until C2). Elementary mono-predicate constructions illustrate the basic occurring combinations of the case and hierarchical

---

[24] The aspectual interpretations denied to a synthetic formation are not necessarily those that an analytic formation distinguishes by the form of root + aspect however: synthetic *nator* has only the continuous, not habitual reading 'I am coming', but the analytic *etortzen naiz* that has both does not distinguish them formally. There are further limits, of unclear provenance, on what synthetic forms can express (G:4.7.2).

relationship of agreement controllers and these agreement systems. The available patterns are in TABLE; to any, the allocutive may be added. The four case-argument combinations of simple predicates form the four paradigms of traditional Basque description named using *wh*-pronoun 'who' in corresponding cases, but I will use different abbreviations: respectively the *nor* (absolutive), which I designate 1V, *nor-nori* (absolutive-dative) my 1V', *nork-nor* (ergative-absolutive) my 2V, and *nork-nori-nori* (ergative-absolutive-dative) my 3V. The table is for reference; I will turn to individual aspects of it below.

TABLE: Agreement controller -- agreement morphology pairings

NB: Divergences from the canonical pattern are in bold.

Pdgm	Controllers	Patterns			
		Canonical	ED (conditions:)	DD (conditions:)	AD (conditions:)
			1/2.ERG A	1/2.DAT O'	1/2.ABS+ERG S
			3.ABS O/O'	3.ABS O/O'	O'
			no DD	no ED	ED or DD fine
1V	S.ABS	S→PX, PL			
1V'	O'.DAT +	S→PL		S→**PL2**	**ABS S behaves like**
	S.ABS	O'→SX		O'→**PX, PL**, (SX)	**ERG A of A+O' unerg.**
2V	A.ERG +	O1→PX, PL	O1→PL		
	(O1.ABS)	A→SX	A→**PX**, (SX)		
3V	A.ERG +	O2→PL	O2→PL	O2→**PL2**	
	O'.DAT +	A→SX	A→**PX**, (SX)	A→SX	
	(O2.ABS)	O'→SX	O'→SX	O'→**PX, PL**, (SX)	

TABLE puts things from the perspective of prefixal and suffixal agreement. For prefixal agreement, the main topic of this work, there is no correlation between control, argument type, and case: virtually any instantiated argument type - case pairing may control PX, except that A never controls PL. For suffixal agreement, there is a correlation with case though not with argument type: only dative and ergative may control suffixal agreement.

TABLE: Agreement type - Controller correlations

Agreement type	Context	Argument	Case
Prefixal	canonical	S, O1, O2	ABS
Prefixal	DD	O'	DAT
Prefixal, except PL	ED	A	ERG
Suffixal	canonical	A	ERG
		O'	DAT
Suffixal	AD	S	(ABS+)ERG

There are elements other than PX, PL, SX in the agreement complex; TABLE lists them. I turn to them as discussion progresses. Some are fixed, forming a cross-dialectally stable scaffold; others are more or less mobile, inter or intra dialectally. They may be all arranged in a grid as in

TABLE, where X's represent the possible (attested) positions of the mobile elements with respect to the columns defined by the fixed elements.

TABLE: Pieces of the Basque agreement complex

Gloss	Name	Syntax	Morphology
PX	Prefix	[participant] probe of v Valuer: ABS, DAT (DD), ERG (ED)	Unique, obligatory position of exponence. Default realization when not valued.
TM	Theme marker		Secondary exponent of any TP-internal property.
√	Root		
SX, SX'	Suffix	Clitics (X^0's) controlled by $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person DAT, ERG, ALLOC.	At most two, because only one of 1st, 2nd person can be coded. Normal order DAT > ALLOC > ERG, much variation.
PL	Plural	[number/class] probe of v Valuer: ABS, DAT (DD)	The most varied element in form and position inter- and intra-dialectally. Frequent multiple exponence. Great deal of allomorphy for other properties.
DF	Dative flag	$Appl^0$	Variation in form and position; may have multiple exponence.
AF	Allocutive flag	F^0 between C^0 and T^0	
M, F	Gender	Controlled by any 2.SG.F agreement controller.	Varies in position and form; only one as there may be only one 2 argument.
PL'	Plural	See XN PL'.	Varies in position and form; there may be several from different sources.
PT	Tense	[past] T^0, realized as n	Fixed position and form.
POT	Potential	Contains ke of potential mood.	Great range of positions, fixed form.

(31)   Basque agreement complex schema (ignores secondary exponence)

Scaffold	PX	(TM)	√	(SX)	(SX)	(PT)
PL	X	X	X	X	X	
DF	X		X			
AF	X					
gender				X	X	
PL'				X	X	
POT			X	X	X	

   Because of the mobile elements, and (less) because of various contextual realizations and morphophonological readjustments, a seemingly amount of variation occurs.[v] I indicate the extent of the variation found in the Y corpus in TABLE for a single form. In such a selection, the variation is truly impressive; one is hard-pressed to see the link between *ziniozkateten* and

tzsuiesan, between *seuntziesan* and *zendezkirion*. Yet there is great stability to the system. The glosses in TABLE, determined through analyses of the paradigms of each dialect, show that the forms play with the same pieces at the morphosyntactic level, and that they respect the overall scaffold of TABLE in their placement. The stabilities are both absolute, so that one does not find Tense within the agreement complex or PL' before the root, and relative, so that if 2R A controls PX the tense is (virtually always) present, it will never control PL, and typically but not always one can look for following TM.

Mostly the variation that occurs will not be too important; sometimes aspects of it will be. APPENDIX BM has a detailed discussion of the morphology of the agreement complex to which reference will be made as needed. The rest of this chapter keeps to the minimum needed for this work. The glosses of each form silently fill in the morphological analysis. As an example, the the dative flag *tz* and following SX *gu* [1'] has historically given rise to combinations such as *s-ku* in some dialects, *ku* in others; internally to a particular dialect, these contrast with SX that does not follow the dative flag, which surfaces as *gu*, on the one hand, and form a paradigm with other dative flag and SX combinations on the other; I gloss *sku* as [DF-1'] and *ku* as [DF+1']. By and large the analysis is uncontroversial with respect to Basque philological tradition, to which APPENDIX BM gives references.[25]

TABLE: 3 V past 2.P>3.P+>3.P cross-dialectally

NB: X glossed A+B indicates X is exponent of both A and B, though only partial indications of this are given, e.g. √ and PL in most of the above cases are also secondary exponent of DF.

Dialect	Form	Phenomena
L-S-S:D	z-in-i-o-<u>zka</u>-te-te-n 2-TM-√-3-PL-PL'-PL'-PT	No PL'…PL' > PL'
B-B-wA:A	s-e-u-n-tz-i-e-<u>s</u>-an 2-TM-√-TM-DF-3+PL'-PL'-PL-PT	No PL'…PL' > PL' 3+PL'
EB	z-en-i-<u>zki</u>-e-zte-n 2-TM-√-PL-3+PL'-PL+PL'-PT	3+PL'
HNn-Ir-RF	z-en-i-<u>zki</u>-yo-te-n 2-TM-√-PL-3-PL'-PT	
HNn-Ir-pO	z-i-<u>zki</u>-o-n-te-n 2-√-PL-3-TM-PL'-PT	TM migration
HNn-Ir-p:Br	z-en-<u>itt</u>-i-o-te-n 2-TM-PL-√-3-PL'-PT	
L-L-sB:S/L-E-pAz:A	z-en-i-o-<u>zka</u>/<u>z</u>-te-n 2-TM-√-3-PL-PL'-PT	
G-Bu-O:I	z-end-e-<u>zki</u>-r-o-i-n 2-TM-?-√-PL-?-3-PL'-PT	
G-EA-p:I	z-en-oo-<u>tza</u>-bie-n 2-TM-√+3-PL-PL'-PT	3+√

---

[25] Among contextual readjustments are various epenthetic vowels, such as after the last consonant of synthetic verbs, for some dialects (Lafitte, p. 243, 288; Azkue II:547/§779), and before the initial consonant of Tense and complementizer suffixes (see Azkue II:553/§787, 605f./§842-3 for some notes). In some dialects this vowel is not epenthetic but significant: see C2.

HNn-Ir-RZE	z-en-i-<u>zka</u>-<u>z</u>te-n	No 3
	2-TM-√-PL-(PL+)PL'-PT	
L-L-sH:A	z-iñ-i-o-<u>zka</u>-tzu-te-n	PX doubling
	2-TM-√-3-PL-2-PL'-PT	
EpGarMC	z-ina-b-<u>ez</u>-te-tzu-e-n	No 3,
	2-TM-√-PL-PL'-2-PL'-PT	PX doubling
B-B-wA:O	tz-a-su-ie-<u>s</u>-an	ED, TM loss
	DF-3-2-PL'-PL-PT	

2.2 Person and number

2.2.1 Agreement types and agreement controllers

The concern of this section is person agreement in Basque. After presenting the basic agreement morphology and its controllers, I will discuss three issues: the formal properties of morphosyntactic features; the relationship of person and number in 1st and 2nd person; and the notion of 3rd person. TABLE indicates the PX/SX morphology that the different person-number combinations of agreement controllers trigger, according to whether the controller participates in prefixal or suffixal agreement as determined by the syntax. The table gives as well the PL, PL', and gender morphology that will be principally discussed later.

TABLE: Typical agreement morphology

Note: presence of material in brackets is subject to dialectal variation; -- means not possible.

	Pronoun ABS, ERG, DAT	Prefixal PX	+PL	+PL'	+gender	Suffixal SX	+PL'	+other
1.S	ni, nik, neri	N				*DA*		
2F.M	*hi, hik, hiri*	*H*			(*KA*)			KA
2F.F					(*NA*)			NA
1.P	*gu, guk, guri*	G	(PL)			GU		
2R	*zu, zuk, zuri*	Z	(PL)			ZU		
2.P	*zue, zuek, zuei*	Z	(PL)	PL'		ZU	PL'	
3.S.DAT	-, -, *hari*	--	--	--	--	O		
3.P.DAT	-, -, *haiei*	--	--	--	--	O	PL'	
3.S	*hura, hark, -*							
3.P	*haiek, haiek, -*		PL					

Some common variants: *H*: *h, Ø, y*; *DA*: *da, -t*; *KA*: *ka, ia, a, -k*; *NA*: *na, -n.*
NB: For the different PX controllers, appearance of gender need not correlate within any particular dialect, e.g. A under ED may trigger gender, O1 as well, but S not, etc.

This work will be mainly concerned with the oscillations in the control of prefixal agreement (C2, C3). The following hypotheses are made about prefixal agreement:

(i) *v* has a person probe, richer (more articulated) in ED contexts than in non-ED contexts: $[\pi]$ (non-ED) vs. $[\pi\text{-participant}]$ (ED) in terms of the feature geometry to be elaborated.
(ii) *v* has a separate number/class probe, [individuation] on the feature geometry in C0.
(iii)PX spells out the value of [participant] on *v*.
(iv)PL spells out the value of [group] (i.e. plural) dependant of [individuation] on *v*.

In contrast to this, I will posit that suffixal agreement reflects clitics, that is X^{0}'s displaced from their corresponding DPs. The X^{0} status of suffixal agreement, different from the valuation of a φ-probes, is something that will be motivated only gradually. The first step is taken in C3, where DPs that do not value a φ-probe turn out to rise to SX agreement, and it is elaborated in C4:DBL. For the discussion of agreement displacement, it will not be crucial. Of other agreement morphology, gender and PL', less clear, are discussed below, and the intricate spell-out of the φ-probe of T using theme markers must await C2.

2.2.2   Morphosyntactic features and interpretation

The first observation about the table is that morphological features do not correlate with interpretation in the 2nd person respectuous, 2R. In most dialects it controls PL, including those where there is no 2nd person familiar, 2F (B-Lekeitio). Yet interpretively, 2R is singular. Mismatches of this kind between morphological features and interpretation are cross-linguistically familiar, but not less striking for that. They pose a problem for an assumption I share with other work, that there is a single alphabet for φ-features shared by the morphosyntax and interpretation, not two separate ones (Noyer 1992: 145ff., Harley and Ritter 2001)?
The point can be independently demonstrated in French (cf. Comrie 1975, Kayne 2000: chapters 10, 11). TABLE shows the forms for French *il était loyale, lui le linguiste* 'he was loyal, him the linguist'. Mismatches of form and interpretation occur for the colloquial 1st person plural that uses a morphologically *3rd person singular* verbal agreement (and pronoun), and 2nd person singular respectuous that uses a morphologically 2nd person *plural* verbal agreement. At the same time, the secondary predicate *loyal* shows no mismatches, being plural and singular respectively; neither does a modifier of a strong form of the pronoun, nor would say a floating quantifier. Basque behaves in this matter like French (32); secondary predicates and modifiers respect semantic number.

TABLE: French verbal paradigm (masculine gender)

NB: pronunciation for BE indicated in []; *loyal* is [lwajal], *loyaux* [lwajo], *le* [lə], *les* [le].

Interpretation	Pronoun	BE imperfect	'loyal'	Modified strong pronoun
1.SG 'I'	je	étais [etE] SG	loyal SG	moi le linguiste SG
1.PL formal 'we'	nous	étions [etiÕ] 1.PL	loyaux PL	nous les linguistes PL
1.PL colloq. 'we'	on	était [etE] SG	loyaux PL	nous les linguisties PL
impersonal 'one'	on	était [etE] SG	loyal SG	--
2.SG famil. 'thou'	tu	étais [etE] SG	loyal SG	toi le linguiste SG
2.SG resp. 'you'	vous	étiez [etie] 2.PL	loyal SG	vous le linguiste SG
2.PL 'ye'	vous	étiez [etie] 2.PL	loyaux PL	vous les linguistes PL
3.SG.M/F 'he, it'	il	était [etE] SG	loyal SG	lui le linguiste SG

3.PL.M/F 'they' ils étaient [etE] PL loyaux PL eux les linguistes PL

(32) Zu gizona/gaztea/zahartua z-ara
      You.ABS man.D.ABS/young.D.ABS/aged.D.ABS.SG 2-√be+PL
      Vous êtes (un) homme / jeune / vieilli. (Rebuschi 1983: 678n3)

Secondary predicates and modifiers here reflect interpreted φ-features (cf. Durie 1986, discussed in XN). This includes the interpretive guises in which human language sees certain objects, for example arbitrary gender and the plurality of *scissors* (and French *ciseaux*), features that are respected by secondary predicates, modifiers, and cross-clausal anaphora (Rezac 2005). The plurality of *vous* and singularity of *on* in French are different; they are genuinely not visible to such systems, and a mechanism must eliminate or convert them in the syntax to semantics mapping. One could get around this conclusion by positing more complicated features to spell-out mappings, so that 2nd person singular respectuous is morphosyntactically [2, singular, respectuous], and morphology always translates the combination [(singular,) respectuous] into [plural]. However, such evidence as there from diachrony is belies this proposal. For example, when [plural] specification is lost in the Basque dialects for 1st/2nd person (see XN), so that they no longer trigger PL morphology on the verb, 2R loses it as well; an unexpected and arbitrary loss if it did not have [plural] to begin with.

I will therefore suppose that 2R is morphosyntactically [2, plural], sharing its [plural] with 1.PL, 2.PL, 3.PL, and its [2] with 2F, 2.PL, whatever the exact choice of features and values, and independently of whether 2R is also [singular] in the morphosyntax or whether this is something that semantics sees independently. In Basque morphology, the existence of the [plural] class is evident from the control of PL agreement. The existence of a class [2] however is not, nor is that of [1]. This brings me to the second point, the notion of person in Basque, and the relationship of person and number where there is no semantic mismatch.

2.2.3 *1st/2nd person: number as person*

The 1st/2nd personal pronouns of Basque syncretically express person and number, in terms of interpretation: 1.PL *gu* does not contain the morpheme for 1.SG *ni*, and 2R/PL *zu/zue* does not contain 2F *hi* (I return to the 2F/2R - 2.PL relationship in XN). This is a familiar situation, as in French in TABLE. There are languages where such a relationship does exist, for example Chinook: from the singular 1st person exclusive *naika* is constructed the dual *ntaika,* plural *ntcaika* by adding regular exponents of these number features to the person base (Harley and Ritter 2002:493). One could treat Basque and French as simply obscuring this in spell-out.

Alternatively, for some languages there is evidence that contrasts available in the person geometry serve the role of both person and number elsewhere. Interpretively, it makes as much sense to make 1.PL the plural of 1.SG as not, for example, since *we* is not normally a multitude of *I's*, but as *I + you (+ x)* or *I + x (+ x)* (Azkue 1905-6, vol. II, p. 467, Benvéniste 1966:233, both cited in Rebuschi 1984:484). Such is the treatment of Kwakiutl in Ritter and Rosen (2002:502): [participant-addressee] gives 2nd person, [participant-speaker, addressee] gives the inherently non-singular 1st person exclusive, and the contrast between 1st person singular and 1st person plural exclusive is coded by bare [participant] vs. [participant-speaker], without the use of number. The considerations that Harley and Ritter adduce on behalf of their Kwikiutl analysis do not obtain in Basque or French: here number is a generally available feature, and the logical

space of person/number contrasts is what one expects of singular vs. plural number cross-classifying each of the persons. Yet one could still treat them in this fashion, as shown in TABLE (to be gradually explained below), accepting the interpretation - morphosyntax mismatch that [participant - speaker, addressee] need not include [addressee], but be 1st person plural regardless of whether the non-speaker referents are 3rd person or the addressee or both:

TABLE: Coding of 1st/2nd person + number contrasts by person only (for Basque)

Interpretation	Possible person feature geometry	Shorthand
1st person singular (1.SG)	[participant-speaker]	1
1st person plural (1.PL)	[participant-speaker, addresee]	1'
2nd person fam. (2F(.SG))	[participant(-addressee?), masc./fam.]	2F
2nd person resp./plural (2R/2.PL)	[participant-addresee]	2

The issue arises in an acute form for Basque because of the separation of "person" and "number" by verbal morphology in the prefixal system. If an internal argument controls the prefix system, it controls both to the extent it can: PX if it is 1st/2nd person, PL if it is plural. However, if an ergative A controls the prefix system under ED, it does not control PL, only PX. One way of understanding this is to take PX as exponent of person agreement only, not of number agreement, as most work on ED does (see C2). This is furthermore appealing as PX can only be controlled by 1st/2nd person, while PL is controlled by a morphologically plural argument irrespective of person. The crux of the problem, pointed out by Albizu and Eguren (2000:5), is that PX nevertheless continues to make the full set of person-number distinctions for 1st/2nd person, that is 1.SG *n* vs. 1.PL *g*, etc. Here it becomes important to decide whether the four-way 1st/2nd-singular/plural distinction is due to fused expression of person and number, or to a four-way distinction in whatever feature system represents person as in TABLE.

There is intriguing evidence in Basque dialects for the second approach. In most dialects 1st/2nd person plural internal arguments necessarily control PL if they control PX. Some, like those of B-Salinas and the neighbouring B-Vergara-Oñate, reserve PL control for 3rd person plural, and 1st/2nd person control only PX.[26] TABLE shows this; the dialect contrasts minimally with B-Vergara-pr-Anguiózar (Y-B-I-384) that differs in this paradigm only in that the stems of 1.PL, 2R, and 2.PL absolutive are *gaittu-, saittu-, saittue-* for *gau-, sau-, saue-* in TABLE, clearly showing PL *itt* just like 3.PL absolutive. Here it seems like plural 1st/2nd person do not have a [plural] specification to control PL, yet they continue to distinguish 1.SG from 1.PL and 2F from 2R/2.PL in PX.

TABLE: 2V present in B-V-O:A

ABS ERG	3.SG	3.PL	1.SG	1.PL	2F.M	2R	2.PL
3.SG	dau	daue	dot	do(g)u	dok	dosu	dosue
3.PL	dittu	dittue	dittut	dittugu	dittuk	dittusu	dittusue
1.SG	nau	naue	-	-	nauk	naisu	naisue
1.PL	gau	gaue	-	-	gauk	gaisu	gaisue

---

26 The 1V, 1V' paradigms provide no evidence here, since the forms are lexicalized (e.g. B-V-O:A 1VPt 3.S *san*, 3.P *sian*, 1.S *ni(n)tzan*, 1.P *gintzan/giñan*, 2R *sintzan/siñan*, 2.P *sintzain/siñaten*), and 3V lacks 1/2 PL controllers by the PCC.

2F.M	au	aue	aut	augu	-	-	-
2R	sau	saue	saut	saugu	-	-	-
2.PL	saue	sauei?	sauet	sauegu	-	-	-

This argument can be strengthened from cases where the ergative controls PX under ED (in 1/2>3 combinations in non-present). The ergative never controls PL; yet the plurality of the ergative does condition allomorphy of the theme marker. TABLE shows this for EB (typical of many dialects), where ergative PX controllers are followed by a $\varnothing$ theme marker when singular, but by *en* when plural (notice the PL *it* is independent of this). This matter is treated in C2; I uphold the hypothesis of Fernández and Albizu (2001) that the theme marker reflects T-ergative agreement. The importance here is only that in dialects like B-V-O:A, where $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person cannot control PL, they cannot control this independent exponence of [plural] either: the two come and go together (see C2). So there are two independent pieces of evidence for lack of $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person [plural] in these dialects that make nevertheless the relevant PX contrasts. I conclude that these contrasts must be made independently of it.

TABLE: 2V past in B-V-O:A vs. EB

ABS	ERG	Dialect	3.SG	3.PL	1.SG	2F.M	1.PL	2R	2.PL
3.SG		B-V-O:A	eben	euéiñ	*neben*	*eian*	*geben*	*seben*	*seueiñ*
		EB	zuen	zuten	*nuen*	*huen*	*genuen*	*zenuen*	*zenuten*
3.PL		B-V-O:A	sittuan	sittuen	*nittuan*	*ittuan*	*gittuan*	*sittuan*	*sittuaiñ*
		EB	zituen	zituzten	*nituen*	*hituen*	*genituen*	*zenituen*	*zenituzten*

This conclusion is more important in this work than the specific feature articulations used to represent the distinctions in questions in TABLE; often it will suffice to keep in mind that [1], [1'], [2], [2'], are person distinctions and all share [participant]. In most dialects, the $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person plural pronouns have [plural] featuring as an enhancement of morphosyntactic distinctions that exist anyway; in dialects like B-V-O:A, they lack it, and only 3rd person uses it. The table provides for a privileged relationship between 1 - 1' to the exclusion of 2, 2'. There is evidence, arguably diachronic, that this is link correct, from forms that (re-)build 1.PL on 1.SG stems; I review it in APPENDIX BM. Such phenomena do not occur between 2F and 2R/2.PL, and TABLE attributes this link no privileged relationship. Regarding the specification of 2F, it has a highly marked status in the Basque dialects with respect to 2R (see XN ALLOC), it is absent in some. Accordingly I attribute it a more marked status than 2R, using a feature that Basque only distinguishes for 2F (and only in verbal agreement): gender.

2.2.4 3rd person and non-person

3rd person absolutives and ergatives never control any overt person morphology, only number. This morphological property correlates with other indicators of the lack of person or [participant]: 3rd person absolutive O, S are not subject to the Person Case Constraint (C5); 3rd person ergatives show no sign of undergo ED in 3>3 combinations where a default controls PX. I adopt Laka's (1993) proposal that 3rd person lacks person features in Basque, though it bears number features (C2).[27]

---

27 It is possible that 3rd person ergatives do bear a person feature that makes them in some way more marked in

The dative differs from ergative and absolutive in that 3rd person is overtly marked, by SX *o* that I gloss [3]. In many dialects 3.PL dative is clearly *o* + plural *te* [PL'], leaving *o* as a person marker (others have a fused expression as *e*, etc.: see APPENDIX BM). This marked personhood of datives is not an odd fact about Basque; the same asymmetry in overt 3rd person morphology is found in Itelmen and Georgian, as discussed in C3. I encode this three-way split by introducing the feature [local], one of the options considered by Anagnostopoulou (2003: 271); it corresponds to the [point-of-view] of Boeckx (1999: 366) and [participant] of Adger and Harbour (2003), contrasting for all these authors with a feature grouping 1st/2nd person alone, here [participant]. *O* is the spell-out of [local]. The relationship of [local] to [participant] will become more evident in C2, where [3] is not a sufficient valuer for a [participant] probe; the idea is elaborated in C3. The resulting "person" side of the φ-feature geometry looks as in TABLE.

TABLE: Coding of 1st/2nd person + number contrasts by person only

Interpretation	φ-geometry on the π-side	Shorthand
1st person singular	[π-local-part-spkr]	1
1st person plural	[π-local-part-spkr, addr]	1'
2nd person singular	[π-local-part(-addr?), masc./fam.]	2F
2nd person plural	[π-local-part-addr]	2
3rd person dative	[π-local]	3
3rd person non-dative	[π]	π

2.3   The SX series

PX and PL is unique, and so each can have only one controller. In the displacements, as different targets are established for the φ-probes of *v* that PX and PL spell-out, virtually any case DP can be a controller of either, and its case or syntactic position is not differentiated by PX/PL form, as one would expect of a φ-probe. SX is different: it is restricted to dative and ergative control, differentiated by the normal position of dative SX to the left of ergative SX, and there is no displacement to SX control independent of change of case (in AD). There may also be a 2R SX controlled by the allocutive to the right of the ergative SX, an element that never enters into PX/PL agreement. These differences must be accounted for.

The proposal in this work is that SX morphemes are X^0's, either base-generated (allocutive) or moved from their corresponding controllers through φ-Agree, which does not necessarily entail (full) valuation of the corresponding probe. The landing site is T, for X^0's from the ergative, and *v*+Appl, for the dative. Their mutual hierarchical position T > *v*, and the concomitant ordering of operations *v* > T, translates into the dative > ergative SX order. The X^0's

---

terms of personhood than absolutives. Such a contrast is proposed by Adger and Harbour (2003) for Kiowa, who mark 3.A with [+control]. It is familiar from the discussion of person hierarchies that in some languages 3rd person A's outrank 3rd person O's, and Béjar and Rezac (2004) accordingly contrast the higher featural articulation of A with respect to O for Nishnaabemwin, Mohawk, and Kashmiri. There are complications in this matter, and other factors such as animacy play a role I address the possibility for Basque in section 00 [ED cyclic expansion in 3>3], but it does not seem very motivated. At any rate, it is not reflected in the morphology.

The last statement needs some qualifications. De Rijk (1981:220ff.) develops a fascinating and tempting, but indirect, argument that there originally was a system indicating 3.SG ergative by the same markers as the dative, and that this can still be detected in the Erronkari dialect in relativized forms (which have all the same possible alternative analyses). I do not know whether I am convinced; similar morphology will be raised in C2.

are spelled out as SX by specifying this morphology, e.g. *da* [1], to spell out X^0's of corresponding φ-features, rather than say probes. A striking homologue of Basque in these two properties is Abaza, differentiating further like Basque the internal dative > ergative from the absolutive S/O controlled prefix to the agreement complex. (O'Herin 2001, 2002).

This position and the reasons for it will only be developed gradually, starting in C3 and particularly in C4:DBL. C4:DBL adduces numerous cross-linguistic parallels, such as (8), that seem to instantiate the valuation of the φ-probe of a locus, here C (*n*), moved X^0 (*k*) attached to the same locus, and independent controller (*ik*). The motive forces, landing sites, and conditions on controllers (such as absence of absolutives) of X^0-movement in Basque, giving the SX series, are addressed in C4:DBL. Also addressed there is the correct prediction that when a dative or ergative controls PX (PL), under DD and ED respectively, it can continue to control SX. This creates in Basque a PX-SX doubling parallel to that between *n* and *k* in (33), subject, along with its many cross-linguistic parallels, to a preference for reduction to single spell-out demonstrably operating on the surface morphophonological form.

(33)   da-n_i-k_i ik_i komm-en$_i$
        that-1.SG-I(clitic) I.NOM   come-1.SG (West Flemish; Zwart 1997: 138)

The dative > ergative SX ordering is not always respected, and they may even be separated by other morphemes (gender, potential *ke*). There are haphazard, idiosyncratic exceptions, determined by specific vocabulary items for SX in specific morphophonological contexts, in a number of dialects. APPENDIX BM provides an overview; Heap (2005) discusses similar dialectal variation with Spanish clitics. The form of dative and ergative controlled SX may also differ in some dialects, sometimes systematically: thus SX [1] may be uniformly *da*, but also dative *ta* and ergative *da*. This calls for differentiation by case of controller or cliticization site (T vs. *v*+Appl) or the spell-out of the latter. I will adopt, as a synchronic state of affairs, the diachronic hypothesis of Lafon (1961) that the differences are the result of the dative flag morphology, whether or not it is realized independently. Specifically, I take such differences to be contextual realization (allomorphy or readjustment rules) of SX in the local context of the dative flag that spells out Appl: thus the dative-controlled SX *da*, attached to *v*+Appl, receives the realization *ta* in some dialects, whether Appl is spelled out as the dative flag *s* (frequent in B) to give *sta*, as ∅ to give *ta*, or otherwise and elsewhere in the agreement complex. APPENDIX BM reviews the state of affairs.

2.4   <u>PL</u>

The details of PL control have been indicated in TABLE. Basque PL spells out number agreement and PX person; and moreover under ED the two have separate controllers, A for PX but an internal argument for PL. The proposal of most approaches since Laka (1993) is that PX and PL correspond to two separate probes (syntactic agreement relations) that are canonically controlled by S/O. PL also gets a controller separate from PX in such contexts as restructuring and *wh*-agreement discussed in XN. The morphology of PL is the most complicated aspect of the Basque agreement complex: it has a vast range of placement, form, and secondary exponence, sensitive to the presence of numerous other material such as dative and allocutive flags and choice of verb root. It is treated at some length in APPENDIX BM.

As mentioned, Basque can attribute PX and PL morphology separate controllers. Cross-linguistically this is not uncommon; a very Basque like system, that of Itelmen suffix agreement, is discussed in C2, and Béjar (2003) discusses a number of other agreement systems split along the person-number lines, such as Georgian. More familiar languages provide examples of number agreement when person agreement is blocked, such as in the Person Case Context environments discussed in C5.

For Basque, I take over two separate φ-probes on v, one for person and one for number, from earlier work on ED in Basque and ED-like phenomena elsewhere that is reviewed in C2. The probes are specifically [π] ([π-(local)-participant] in ED contexts) and [individuation], respectively, with reference to the φ-feature geometry discussed in C0.

The placement of the probes on v, the same locus as PX, correctly identifies an internal argument as the controller of either if it has the appropriate features, as discussed in C2. The separation of the probes is complete: they are fully autonomous. The reasons for this, rather than viewing them as autonomous segments of a larger φ-feature geometry, are discussed in C5, based on evidence from the Person Case Constraint for which a separate line of investigation has led to the hypothesis of split person and number probes generally.[28] The choice of [individuation] in the φ-feature geometry is also not haphazard. PL is only overtly controlled by plural arguments, and so one could suppose that the [group] dependant of [individuation] would be a better choice, since [individuation] is an organizing node for class/gender and number and a property of every DP. Precisely this property makes the number probe of v behave properly in ED, however, if it is construed as [individuation], as discussed in C2.

It ought to be verified that number agreement in Basque really is number Agree. Durie (1986) and Hale et al. (1991), argue persuasively that what looks like plural marking can sometimes be rather a selectional concord between a predicate and an argument (cf. also e.g. Harris 1981 for an extensive use of such number suppletion in Georgian, and generally Mithun 1988:214, Collins 2001:471-3). The relation would be of the same type as that which requires a plural theme for *gather* (transitive and unaccusative), plural agent for *coauthor* or *collide*, relations that hold of meaning, not of specific argument positions: so *We/*I collided* but *I collided with Kate*. Among number morphologies of this type discussed by these authors, often indicated by stem suppletion but sometimes by affixes, the controller is most commonly O/S to the exclusion of A, so "absolutive", and this is the pattern Basque PL shows in ED where A can obtain PX but not PL control.

Basque PL does not fit the properties of such selectional concord discussed by these authors. Unlike them, it is not preserved in non-agreeing contexts (infinitives, participles, nominalizations). Second, selectional number concord is sensitive to semantic notions such as "theme", independently of whether there is a higher applied object with structural Case that controls other canonically O1 agreement (Durie 1986: example 2 for Huichol, Allen et al. 1990: 351-3 for Southern Tiwa), and of whether the theme receives a non-canonical case realization (Choctaw 1986: 114ff. for accusative / dative theme alternation vs. dative applied objects). In Basque, when an applied object comes to control PX by being transparent to φ-Agree in some dialects, it comes to control PL as well; and PL can be controlled by non-coarguments in restructuring and *wh*-agreement. Finally, selectional number concord is for semantic plurality, so

---

[28] There remain "bundling effects" where number agreement depends on person agreement, that remain to be explained: see (Harris 1981: chapter 14) on Georgian plural agreement with O, Brandi and Cordin (1989) on agreement with S of unaccusatives in the inversion construction in Fiorentino and Trentino, and the typical non-agreement with 1st/2nd in number when agreement in person is blocked, discussed in C5. See C3.

that in Georgian for example 2R, which is morphologically 2.PL for other agreement, is treated by it as singular (Durie 1986, below example 5); Basque PL is sensitive to morphosyntactic plurality in such cases (see XN). I conclude then that Basque PL is an exponent of number Agree, not of selectional number concord or similar phenomena.

2.5   *PL', and 2.PL

The morpheme I label PL' is difficult. On the one hand there ought to be a uniform analysis, since, across the dialects, all the instances of the morpheme tend to be identical, though the form of the morpheme itself varies. On the other, the relationship of PL' to all its controllers is not as straightforward as that of other morphemes, partly because of the special status of 2.PL in Basque. The correct analysis of PL' plays only one role of importance in this work: as the potential spell-out of T-ergative φ-Agree, particularly in the cross-clausal Agree constructions in XN. This is an agreed-on aspect of the analysis of PL' (Fernández and Albizu 2000, Rezac 2003, for example), and that is why this here otherwise mostly irrelevant corner of Basque morphology must be addressed, but it is not straightforward. As for other morphology, I treat the morphology and variation of PL' that is not directly pertinent to here in APPENDIX BM.

    TABLE gives the typical distribution of PL' and PL morphology for [plural] arguments. Italicised morphemes are all SX, except the underlined ones which are PX; under ED and DD the same controller can control both in some dialects (C4:DBL: so 3.S>1.P>3.P *g-a-it-u-zki-(gu)* [1'-TM-PL-√-PL2-1']). PL is in () because in some dialects it is restricted to 3.PL (XN).

TABLE: Distribution of PL' and PL for [plural] arguments

Pronoun	Agreement ABS	ERG	DAT	ERG ED	DAT DD
3.P *haiek*	PL	PL'	O + PL'	--	--
1.P *gu*	*g* (+ PL)	*gu*	*gu*	*g* (+ *gu*)	*g* (+ PL) (+ *gu*)
2R *zu*	*z* (+ PL)	*zu*	*zu*	*z* (+ *zu*)	*z* (+ PL) (+ *zu*)
2.P *zue*	*z* (+ PL) + PL'	*zu* + PL'	*zu* + PL'	*z* + PL' (+ *zu* + PL')	*z* (+ PL) + PL' (+ *zu* + PL')

    The problem can be stated as follows. On the one hand, considering 3.PL, PL and PL' are in complementary distribution, and it seems from it that the [plural] feature expressed by PL when 3.PL is absolutive corresponds to PL' when 3.PL is ergative. So PL' would express the [plural] of T Agree with ergative 3.PL. In that case something has to be said for 1.PL, 2R which control PL but not PL'. On the other hand, looking at 2.PL, PL' is independent of PL: it is compatible with independent expression of PL when 2.PL controls PL, and in dialects where it does not, PL' remains, so B-V-O:A 3.S>2R, 2.P *s-a-u* [2-TM-√], *s-a-u-e* [2-TM-√-PL']. The behaviour of 1.PL, 2R fits into this independence of PL, PL', since they never control PL' but do control PL.

    The diachronic cause of the problem is well known (see Rebuschi 1983:486-7, Alberdi 1995:278ff. for synopses). Originally the system behaved according to the first proposal. When the old 2.PL = modern 2R came to be used as respectuous singular, a plural was created by adding the affix PL' in its function as 2.PL. This created the pattern of the second proposal, now contrasting with the first, and making it difficult to deal with PL' in a single fashion; and perhaps it should not be. Yet the change is not ancient; Alberdi (1995:279) cites 19th-century Bizkaian authors using 2R agreement with 2.PL pronouns, and in the early 20th century Azkue

(II:554/§789) reports encountering septuagenarians possessing the same system (for both prefixal and suffixal agreement, though not the same speakers). This means that there was a state of Basque that was not different in terms of agreement from the present one but that clearly behaved according to the first proposal, where PL' and PL seem to be controlled by the same feature, [plural].

I will adopt the first approach, with the idea that there is something special about 2.PL, discussed below, that makes it trigger PL' in addition to PL. 3.PL now behaves as expected: if it Agrees with the number probe of v it contributes [plural] as PL and not as PL'; and when it is X^0-cliticized as SX, its [plural] component is spelled out as PL'. PL' is the default spell-out of [plural] when not on v; independent evidence for this status of PL' is noted in C4:DLM, but the productivity of PL' as pluralizer is generally agreed on for Basque. When 1.PL and 2R, both [plural], Agree with the number probe of v, they too contribute PL. When they are brought into the agreement complex as SX X^0's, PL' does not appear. A simple way of coding this difference between 3.PL and 1.PL, 2R is by specifying the SX gu, zu for [plural] as well as person, so they block insertion of PL' by discharging the feature it spells out and by being more specific in vocabulary insertion. There are different ways of viewing what happens in the case of T-ergative Agree, where 3.PL controls PL' and 1.PL, 2.PL do not but generally control SX, and I see no evidence to aid in deciding between them.[29]

This proposal departs from the idea that there is a special extra component to zue. It has been called "sur-plural", and in the simplest version of this idea, it is just a complex pronoun that combines two terminals, namely [2, plural] or in some dialects [2] (= 2R), with an additional adjoined head containing [plural]. This is morphologically transparent in the pronoun: zue = 2R zu + e [PL']. When it is brought into the agreement complex as X^0, it receives spell-out by SX zu, discharging [2, plural], and by PL', discharging the remaining [plural]. When it controls the number probe on v and does not control SX, it still triggers [plural]. It may be supposed that the head hosting the second [plural] feature must undergo X^0 movement into the agreement complex independent of SX formation, as seems to happen for gender (see XN).

The alternative second proposal mentioned above would start from the hypothesis that there is no difference between *haiek* and *zue*, both equally triggering PL', with a feature or constituent different from PL, and that *gu* and *zu* are never potential PL' triggers. It requires however an understanding of why does *haiek* not trigger PL' if it already controls PL, unlike 2.PL which controls both: 3.S>3.P *d-it-u* [X-PL-√], **d-it-u-(z-)te* [X-PL-√-(PL-)PL'], but 3.S>2.P *z-a-it-u-z-te* [2-TM-PL-√-PL-PL']. There is a ban on multiple exponence of the same feature in an agreement complex, particularly if adjacent, discussed in C4:DBL. This could be the culprit, although its other instantiations across the Basque dialects are never categorical, and the distance between PL and PL' should permit both to surface. Yet forms like *dituzte* simply do not exist.

Choice between these options must be decided on the basis of the fine-grained behaviour of PL' in each dialect. Some guidelines to the relevant phenomena are provided in APPENDIX BM, but the matter lies largely beyond my scope.

---

[29] If PL' spells out T-3.PL Agree, there arises the question of whether T-Agree with 1.PL, 2R should not surface as PL', from Agree, and *gu*, *zu*, from the cliticization that always ensues in this case. The reflex of T-Agree for [plural] in the theme marker, studied in C2, does show exactly this behavior (under ED + ERG doubling). However, C4:DBL also studies the strong tendency, in Basque and generally, to eliminate multiple exponence of the same feature type when "too close", and PL' on T might always be pre-empted by the T-attached SX *gu*, *zu*, for example by "Kinyalolo's Constraint" that is ment to apply in such structures (for which C4:DBL). PL' and SX are adjacent, while PL' and the theme marker are widely seprated in the agreement complex.

2.6   *Gender and 2F

Gender markers in TABLE are always contributed by some 2F argument. Generally, they are viewed as a part of the SX series, like 1.P *gu*, 2R *zu*, etc., and controlled by the same set of controllers: dative, ergative, and allocutive (e.g. Lafitte, Lafon 1943, 1954, 1955, Laka 1993, Gómez and Sainz 1995, Albizu 2002). In APPENDIX BM I argue that this is unsupportable: it is simply a matter fact that in many B and G dialects they are controlled by (S, O) absolutes. The proposal made is that 2F SX is simply $\varnothing$ (2F PX is *h/$\varnothing$/y*, as is standard), and gender markers are a separate system. This is supported by (well-known) anomalous placement of gender with respect to the other SX morphemes.

There are various options for analysing gender morphology, suggested in APPENDIX BM. Here an analysis will not be important; only a general awareness that there is gender morphology, and that it somehow comes from any 2F agreement controller.

2.7   Other agreement-related morphology

2.7.1   Theme markers

The TM or theme marker is a morpheme occurring between PX and the root. They have been the subject of much discussion (particulary by Azkue, Lafon, Gómez). In calling them theme markers I modify Albizu (2005:5) appelation "class markers", since their use to "classify Basque verbs into conjugation groups" is very marginal, but as Albizu points out they are indeed otherwise parallel to what is called the theme morphology of Romance and Indo-European.

Taking the synthetic verb *eduki* one has e.g. *a* between PX *n* and root *u* in present 3.S>1.S *n-a-uka* [1-TM-√] and 1.S>3.S *d-a-uka-t* [X-TM-√-1], *in* in past 3.S>1.S *n-ind-uka-n* [1-TM-√-PT], *e* in 1.S>3.S *n-e-uka-n* [1-TM-√-PT], *en* in 1.P>3.S *g-ene-uka-n* [1-TM-√-PT]. Generally then, they occur after PX and before the root; anomalies are mentioned in APPENDIX BM. Into realization of the theme marker enter such factors as Tense/Mood, application of ED, and plurality of ED'd PX-controlling ergative A. These and other conditions, and the TM in general, will be studied at great length in C2 and associated APPENDIX TM; I defer the discussion until then. The principal conclusion that bears on agreement is that TM reflects the valuation of the φ-probe of T from the number of the ergative under ED, where it controls the [participant] but not [number/class] probe of *v*. This hypothesis, due to Fernández and Albizu (2001), adds a new agreement morpheme to the agreement complex, and allows some important conclusion about the details of ED.

2.7.2   Dative flags

Verbs containing suffixal agreement morphology controlled by a dative argument may also contain an additional morpheme, the dative flag or DF (the term is due to L. Trask: see Albizu 2002:00n00). Typically, there is only one, and typically, if an root of the auxiliary assumes a special form in such contexts where a dative controls suffixal agreement, that is in the 1V' or 3V paradigms with respect to 1V, 2V, there is no DF. Neither statement is however entirely accurate: there are forms like 3.S+>1.S *n-a-i-a-tor-k-o* [1-TM-AF-TM-√come-DF-3] which contain two DFs, *i* and *k(i)* (Azkue II:596/§832n1). Equally, there are forms like *g-en-i-ki-o-n* [1'-TM-√3V-DF-3-PT] (=EB *genion*) that combine the 3V root *i* and DF *ki* (Rebuschi 1983:619);

such forms show 3V root + DF without begging any questions, but the combination is probably shown more generally in 1V' forms built on stem *(t)za-i/k(i)-* = 1V' √*tza* + DF *i, k(i)*, and 3V forms with PL built on stem *i-z-ki* = 3V *i* + *z* PL + DF *ki* (Rebuschi 1983:618ff.). The complex morphology of DF is treated in APPENDIX BM.

The synchronic morphosyntax of DF is insightfully treated in Rebuschi (1983:618ff.). Elordieta (2001:62) and Arregi (2001:103) tentatively suggest that DF realizes the applicative head Appl present in constructions with an agreeing dative, and this is the hypothesis I will equally tentatively adopt. Arregi (op. cit.) raises some issues that such a hypothesis must face. Put in reverse, some suggest the presence of Appl in certain constructions: unergative + dative verbs like *jarraitu* 'follow' (Trask 1995:230), and the "leismo" construction of transitives discussed in C3). The remaining issue is that Appl appears only in the agreement complex, not in non-finite forms (except as diachronic relic, Trask 1995:227-231), and arguably this too bears as evidence on construing the agreement complex as everything above Appl, and non-finite forms as everything below (specifically AspP as suggested in XN).

2.7.3   Auxiliary root allomorphy

Most verbs, and all verbs to expresses some aspects, occur in synthetic constructions where the agreement complex is built around an auxiliary root. The auxiliary uses several roots differentiated on the one hand by the agreement and case of agreement controller, and on tense and mood. Brief, lucid descriptions are Gómez and Sainz (1995:239-241), G:3.5.2.2, 3.5.2.3.

The system is not uniform across the dialects, and it will suffice to consider the details as they come up later; here I will illustrate using the EB system. For the 1V, 1V' paradigm (absolutive and absolutive + dative) is used the auxiliary root that appears in participle form as *izan* for some "tenses" (see XN), **edin* for others (* marks reconstructed participles of roots not extant in non-finite form). Here the degree of lexicalization is such that the relationship of root material among forms is hardly recoverable (e.g. Lafon, p. 429) e: in *nintzan* 'I was' the root is *za*, in *ginen* 'we were' it is ∅, in *gara* 'we are' it is the second *a*. For 2V paradigm (ergative + absolutive), the roots are **edun* and **ezan* in corresponding tenses. For 3V paradigm (ergative + absolutive + dative), the roots are **-i-*, analyzable as **edun* in the context of a dative flag, and **ezan* plus an independent dative flag. Some of the verbs used as auxiliaries, like *izan*, **edun* also occurs as main verbs in EB, 'be', 'have'; others, like **ezan*, do not. This varies from dialect to dialect: for example, some use **edun* has the 2V/3V auxiliary but not as the main verb 'have'; some use other auxiliaries, sometimes with independent lexical use, e.g. B *egin* 'do' for **ezan*. The conditions for auxiliary choice also differ somewhat from dialect to dialect; so some L dialects use **edun* for (some forms of) 3V and 1V' as well as 2V. Some indication in the range of cross-dialectal variation for 3V roots can be had from TABLE Y in APPENDIX BM.

Root contexts may be much more sensitive than the 1V-1V'-2V-3V distinctions. TABLE illustrates a dialect that uses the root *i* in the 3V paradigm in the presence of 3.SG datives, and ∅ (or perhaps *a*, historically the theme marker) elsewhere, with an arbitrary gap at 1.S>3.P+>3.S expected *dio(te)t* beside *daet*.

TABLE: 3VS present in EpLecPia

DAT ERG	3.SG	3.PL	1.SG	1.PL	2R	2.PL
3.SG	dio	diote	diot	diogu	diozu	diozue

3.PL	dae/diote	daete/diote	daet	daegu/diogu	daezu/diozu	daezue/diozue
1.SG	dat, ∅	datate, ∅	-	-	datazu, ∅	datazue, ∅
1.PL	daku, ∅	dakute, ∅	-	-	dakuzu, ∅	dakuzue, ∅
2R	datzu, ∅	datzute, ∅	datzut, ∅	datzugu, ∅	-	-
2.PL	datzue, ∅	datzue, ∅	datzuet, ∅	datzuegu, ∅	-	-

There is no fixed relationship between independent synthetic verbs and their use as auxiliary roots, if any.[30] Rebuschi (1983:619ff.), in his study of the effect that allocutive agreement has on auxiliary root selection (see section ALLOC), comes to an important conclusion: the selection of particular auxiliary roots bears no relationship to the lexical use of the same root, if there is one. 1V and 2V contexts select *izan* and **edun* respectively not because 1V is built around the lexical verb 'be' and 2V 'have', but because the +ergative context triggers the appearance of **edun*. He develops his analysis in terms of the values ±ergative, ±dative, and ±allocutive of the controller of corresponding agreement morphology in the agreement complex (p. 625ff.). Albizu (2001, 2002) develops a related proposal where auxiliary choice also depends on the case properties of the controller of agreement. The role played by case in these proposals is entirely recoverable from the distribution of φ-probes and Appl: +ergative is a φ-probe on T and +dative implies Appl (for allocutive, see XN on the head F that introduces it).[vi]

I will assume that the vocabulary entries of auxiliary roots are specific for their context in this manner. In glossing auxiliary roots where reference to context is needed, I will use glosses such as √1V, √1V', √2V, √3V, and √2V/3V that refer to the case-agreement regimes that triggers the auxiliary in the dialect at hand; when the matter is not important, I keep to √ for auxiliary roots. The choice of root is of particular importance for 3.SG ergatives, which do not trigger overt agreement morphology, yet which are recoverable from the choice of root: thus present 3.S *d-a* [X-√1V], 3.S>3.S *d-u* [X-√2V]. It also bears crucially on the proper analysis of ED in C2, and on understanding the origin of DD, in C4:DLM.

It is consonant with this line of research to treat auxiliary roots as material base-generated somewhere in the agreement complex, presumably in *v* (cf. Embick and Noyer 2001 for this analysis of *do*-support in English), to support the inflectional morphology. This is the analysis of Ortiz de Urbina (1989); see Artiagoitia (1995:464) for the view that precisely those auxiliaries that are homophonous with independent verbs are indeed lexical verbs.

2.8 Default PX, Tense, Mood, and the upper limit of the agreement complex

The controller of PX can only be $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person, that is [participant]. If there is no such controller, for example in 3>3 combinations, PX is filled by default morphology conditioned by tense and mood (Laka 1993: 46ff, 60; see Gómez 1994, Gómez and Sainz 1995: 253-6, Azkarate and Altuna 2001: 204-206 for the history of the idea). For example, the PX *z* occurs whenever PX lacks a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person controller in the past non-irrealis, the same context as the Tense suffix *n*, but the latter also occurs when there is a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person PX controller. The implementation of the proposal in DM, essentially that of Laka (1993), is to take default PX as elsewhere allomorphs of the person probe of *v* differentiated by the contextual sensitivity to Tense. As Albizu and Eguren (2000:7) point out, the unique need of PX to resort to default morphology

---

30 I do not know to what extent, if there is a relationship, lexical and auxiliary roots have the same form in the same context. In many dialects auxiliary forms are phonologically reduced in some contexts, e.g. after the participle.

resembles obligatory positions of exponence in Noyer's (1992) Autonomous Morphological Structure, perhaps associated with *v* or T. C2 discusses closely related phenomena in different languages and their analyses, particularly that of Phillips (1993) for Yimas.[31] APPENDIX BM discusses other conditioning factors of the default PX, particularly φ-features and the presence of Appl, and morphophological readjustment that affects it.

The most common defaults in Basque dialects are *d* in present, *z* (B ∅) in past, *l* in the irrealis (the imperative, with different properties, is discussed in C2). Present, past, and irrealis are formal morphosyntactic properties; I speak of them as Tenses.[32] TABLE below shows the relevance of these formal concepts. There are important correlations between defaults, ED, and theme markers, as well as with the tense marker: the *z* and *l* defaults are limited to a subset of the contexts where ED occurs and where theme markers systematically take a particular form distinct from the form they take in the present; moreover, the *z* default is limited to a subset of the contexts where the past tense marker *n* occurs. These correlations predict the non-existence of certain forms. For example, in dialects where ED has not been losing ground there are no 1/2>(X+>)3 combinations with default *z, l*, for ED will always apply: **l-u-ke-t* [X-√-POT-1] beside ED *n-u-ke* [1-√-POT]; no **z-u-da-n* [X-√-1-PT] beside *n-u-en* [1-√-PT]. Similarly, there are no forms that have the default *z* and lack past tense *n*, except for some dialectal contexts of final *n* loss (Azkue II:584f/§822, Gómez and Sainz 1995:247n16), and no forms with final *n* and default *d*. These correlations indicate the usefulness of the Tense categories that they deploy, strengthened by the expect appearance of such forms for example when ED is lost (see APPENDIX ED-LOSS).[vii]

TABLE: Default - ED - theme marker correlations in EB

		Default	ED	Theme markers	Tense
Present		*d*	no	*a*	∅
Non-present	Past	*z*	yes	∅, *en, ind, e*	*n*
	Irrealis	*l*	yes	∅, *en, ind, e*	∅

There is no other Tense morphology other than that indicated in TABLE. The Tenses cross-classify with morphology of the C-system like subordinators, and with the potential mood marker *ke*, as exemplified in TABLE. The details of form-function correspondence are not fixed in usage across the dialects and periods, and contexts such as the hypothetical past apodosis vary considerably; see G:3.5.3-4, Lafitte (chapters 31, 32).

TABLE

---

[31] A partial parallel to the tense allomorphy of a position class when its potential controller(s) are 3rd person is found in Georgian for the suffixes traditionally associated with 3rd person; see Boeder (1979:449-450), Harris (1981:29), Hewitt (1995:128), Béjar (2003:125-6). Curiously, when its potential controller is 1st/2nd person it controls a prefix, not the suffix, and in that case no default occurs. It might be supposed that either there is some property that only a 3rd person argument can control that the suffix in fact spells out: perhaps number, that a 1st/2nd person sometimes cannot control separately of person agreement; perhaps class; or perhaps there is "covert" control of the suffix by 1st/2nd person as in the Basque imperative discussed in XN.

[32] I have arranged things in such a way that the basic split is present - non-present (Gómez and Sainz 1995:260, Lafon's premiere vs. deuxieme groupes of forms); within the latter the non-present, the past - irrealis distinction is made. There are alternative arrangements though, such as that of Laka (1993: 46-7); the relevance here will only be for conditions on ED, discussed in C2.

NB: *n* of subjunctive C erases the distinct past morpheme *n*.

	Present	Past	Irrealis
Root *edun* 'have', prefix *ba-* 'if'	*ba-d-u*	*ba-z-u-en*	*ba-l-u*
Root *ezan* 'have', potential *ke*	*d-e-za-ke*	*z-e-za-ke-en*	*l-e-za-ke*
Root *ezan* 'have', subjunctive *-n*	*d-e-za-n*	*z-e-za-n*	*l-e-za-n*

The remaining morphology in the agreement complex comes in two groups: the potential mood marker *ke* (*te, teke*) glossed POT, and the outer C-system (see Azkarate and Altuna 2001:217ff. for an overview of its complex history). The potential does not seem to condition defaults, theme marker, or agreement displacement like the Tenses, not independently of the Tense distinctions. In this it behaves like the C-system. Yet it is not peripheral to the agreement complex. Its placement varies greatly in forms and dialects. It occurs between DF/root and DAT, after DF + DAT (see APPENDIX BM:DF); between root and ERG or after ERG (Lafitte, p. 307); between SX and PL', gender markers, or after these; it may even for example precede dative-controlled 1.S but not 1.P SX (see section APPENDIX BM:SX). These phenomena suggest local inversion of *ke* with the relevant morphology, e.g. through morphological Merger. It provides an important tool for differentiating various morphemes and positions, but it is not otherwise pertinent to the discussion of the agreement complex.[33]

Beyond, peripheral to the agreement complex there occur various suffixes and prefixes of the C-system, like the declarative complementizer *-(e)la*, the relative and interrogative complementizer *-(e)n*, the prefix *ba-* 'if', a morphosyntactically and semantically different verbal focus prefix *ba-*, subordinator and 'because' prefix *bait-*, etc. The resulting complex word is in turn flanked by various closely connected particles like negation *ez-*, interrogative *-a*, etc. This material does not seem to affect agreement, and it will not be discussed here. A very lucid exposition of these systems, peripheral to the agreement complex, is found in G: see G:4.10 on subordinating complementizers, G:4.5 on negation and related G:4.4 on focus and focus particles, G:3.5.7 on other particles closely linked to the C + agreement complex like the interrogative, with many references to the relevant literature. Lafon (1943: I-chapter 3, II-chapter 3; Lafitte, chapters 12, 13) are also particularly helpful.

2.9   *Allocutive agreement

2.9.1   Introduction and 2*nd* person familiar

Allocutive agreement is not the simplest topic to treat; the interested reader must refer to the Lafon (1959), Rebuschi (1983: chapter 8, 9), and Oyharçabal (1993) for the morphology, syntax, and semantics, to Alberdi (1995) for introduction to its history, and to Azkue, Y-D2-306ff. for

---

[33] Ultimately, one would like to know where *ke* is in terms of clausal architecture, and why it wanders around so much. There is a phenomenon that resembles it in a far-distant language, Abaza. Into a basic structure that resembles that of the Basque agreement complex, $A_{O/S}$-B_O-B_A-√ where A is one agreement series and B another controlled as indicated (cf. PX, SX), the potential mood marker *z* is added at a certain point close to the left and attracts A-controlled agreement to switch its position around the rest and yield structures such as $A_{O/S}$-B_A-*z*-B_O-√. O'Herin (2002: chapter 5) in discussing this "derived inversion" shows that the hierarchical position of A is not changed, and works out an analysis where *z* is an auxiliary agreeing with A. Lafitte (p. 296/§543n) suggests *ke* is to be related to *gai, kai* 'able', allowing an exploration in terms of auxiliary origin.

some indications of the range of dialectal variation in form. It will not be a target of investigation in this work; yet it will prove useful in examining the implications of certain hypotheses, such as whether it is susceptible to agreement displacement. I will first introduce the essentials here.

It is necessary to first address a few words on the status of 2nd person singular familiar, 2F, in the Basque dialects. This was historically the regular 2nd person singular, but restricted to familiar by the old 2nd person plural turned singular respectuous; to this system a new, re-pluralized form was added to serve as the plural of both (see XN). 2F in Basque implies a far greater degree of intimacy than the familiar 2nd person of languages like Spanish and French; in many dialects it had disappeared altogether (e.g. B-Lek:HEE). Formally, it is unique in two ways: (i) it codes gender; (ii) its use to a discourse participant triggers allocutive agreement on verbs that do not already agree with the addressee, as will be described below.

All this combines to create a register that sets apart forms containing 2F, argumental or allocutive. The separation of registers shows up in the morphology in many ways that are not limited to affecting the morphology controlled by the 2F addressee: ordering anomalies among other agreement affixes (e.g. Etxaberri 1991:210), loss of past tense *n*, palatalizations (cf. Rebuschi 1983:519ff.), disappearance of dative flag *ki*, etc., ED loss (see Gómez and Sainz 1995:247 and Azkue, passim, on such observations). This 2F register may be as different as another closely related dialect. I have excluded all 2F forms from the Y-corpus. At various points, they have been reintroduced when referring to 2F could be useful.

2.9.2   Allocutive syntax and form

Allocutive agreement consists of adding agreement morphology that references the addressee to an agreement complex that does not already code the addressee by agreement. Agreement complexes without allocutive agreement are termed neutral forms. Under an idealization, the distribution of allocutive and neutral forms is fully determined by context and syntax. The basic context that triggers allocutivity is as soon as the addressee is accorded the status that makes it an *allocutivity trigger*. In all dialects, this is at least the 2F treatment, as in (34). LN adds 2R, and the neutral form implies a still more respectuous status accorded to the addressee. Sou also has 2F and 2R triggers, but there is no non-trigger status for the addressee, so there always is allocutive when the syntax allows it. Allocutivity behaves inconsistently when there are multiple addressees; even if each would individually be an allocutive trigger, neutral form tends to be used (Rebuschi 1983: 505-531).

(34)   a. ni_i etorri n_i-a-iz,   baina zu_j joan z_j-a-ra /   ??hi_j joan h_j-a-iz.
            I   come   1-TM-√   but   2R   gone   2-TM-√+PL   thou.ABS   gone 2-TM-√
            I came but you left / *thou leftst.

       b.   ni etorri n-a-u-k,   baina *zu   joan   zara / ^{ok}hi   joan haiz
                       1-TM-√-M
            I came-ALLOC, but *you left / $^{(ok)}$thou leftst

       c.   ni etorri naiz/nauk, baina $zuek_j$ joan z_j-a-re-te_j.
                                       ye   2-TM-√+PL
            I came(-ALLOC), but ye left. (Rebuschi 1983:499)

Allocutivity is only possible in what are essentially matrix declarative contexts (affirmative, negative, wide or narrow focus). In embedded and matrix non-declarative contexts, for example

embedded and matrix interrogatives, neutral forms must be used. This characterization admits of some limited variation. This matter is discussed at length particularly in Lafon (1959:392ff.), Rebuschi (1983:547ff.), Oyharçabal (1993).

Oyharçabal (1993:103f.) addresses the syntactic status of allocutive agreement. He shows that it cannot bind anaphora, and it does not count for a principle of anaphora distribution that singles out the A/S/O agreement controllers (known as the Aresti-Linschmann Law; see Rebuschi 1997 and references therein). Albizu (1997:00) emphasize that the allocutive dative does not count for the Person Case Constraint. Its controller cannot be overt, though this is also true of certain arguments with a similar interpretation and their homologues in other languages, discussed below.

Oyharçabal (1993:106ff.) formulates the essential features of a theory of allocutivity that I will assume. He base-generates the allocutive as an adjunct to the TP, which explains for him why it is agreement and all, so equally why it only occurs on agreement complexes and not e.g. on non-finite forms. The position also lets it interact with C to express the restriction to matrix declaratives; in Oyharçabal's specific analysis, the allocutive is an operator that must move to an empty (featureless) C. Other systems with similar properties are envisagable: so Albizu (1992, 1997) takes allocutives to be base-generated in an FP (cf. Uriagereka 1995) between C and MoodP. Albizu's proposal has the added advantage of providing a source for the allocutive flag AF that often occurs in allocutive forms, as the head F. Both approaches put the allocutive at the edge of what is called here the T system, and C2 provides evidence that it in fact lies beyond it.

Formally, allocutive agreement avails itself of the expression of 2F (and 2R in LN, Sou) when it is not a PX/PL controller, that is of SX and gender. In indicating agreement controllers, I put allocutive after a colon. Thus from the synthetic verb *egon* 'be, rest', present 1.S is *n-a-go* [1-TM-√be], and the allocutives 1.P:2F.M/2R are *n-i-a-go-k/zu* [1-AF-TM-√be-M/2R]. Allocutive agreement is often differentiated from non-allocutive controllers of SX and gender by position. There is also often a special element, the allocutive flag AF, or its effects in terms of allomorphy and readjustment. Finally, for one or two auxiliary roots (depending on dialect), the presence of allocutives leads to a change of root, of which the most consistent (invariable) and striking is the use of the 2V root *edun* where non-allocutives would use 1V *izan*. Rebuschi (1983:620ff.) convincingly demonstrates that the change involves the spell-out of *izan* + allocutive flag as *edun*. Hence present 1S of the 1V auxiliary is *n-a-iz* [1-TM-√1V], allocutive 1S:2F.M *n-a-u-k* [1-TM-√2V-M], the same form as the 2V auxiliary for neutral 2.M>1; the allocutive usage should more perspicuously be glossed[1-TM-√1V+AF-M]. These matters are all reviewed in more detail APPENDIX BM.

2.9.3 Implicatives

Basque allocutive agreement is often compared with the so-called ethical dative or dative of address in the Romance languages like French, which encode the addressee by a dative clitic corresponding to its status, that is familiar vs. respectuous. A rather spectacular but real example, coding also plurality of addressee in both matrix and embedded infinitive, is in (35). Like the allocutive, such datives cannot be replaced by a non-clitic argument and is inert syntactically for such considerations as the Person Case Constraint. However, the Romance dative of address is neither obligatory where it is possible, nor is it limited to matrix declaratives.

(35)   Pourtant, hein, il avait dit mort ou vif, je te me vais te me vous lui faire passer un sale quart d'heure. (Google; verified)

These properties of datives of address recall quite a different phenomenon of Basque, *implicative constructions* (or "enveloping forms"). I mention them here because they are closely related semantically to the allocutive, and they will be needed in C2; I draw entirely on Rebuschi (1983:569ff.). There the predicate meaning 'have' in a particular dialect takes what seems to be a state-denoting small clause as complement, and an ergative *pro* corresponding to either the speaker or addressee or both, as in (36)a. No possession is implied.[34] A similar usage exists for the dative with the verb meaning 'be', (36)b, also obligatorily non-overt unlike say an experiencer dative.

(36)   a. Haien etxe   hori   ederra   d-u-zu.
            their house   that   beautiful   X-√have-2
            Their house is beatiful (lit. You have their house beautiful). (Rebuschi 1983: 571)
        b. Eskola honen aitzindaria Noam Chomsky   zai-ku
            school this.of leader   √be.to-DF+1'
            This school's leader is Noam Chomsky (implication: we, the speaker/addresse, do not belong to this school) (Rebuschi 1983: 586; my translation based on his discussion)

Because implicatives essentially predicate an experiencer subject of a state, they have the same meaning as 'be' with addressee allocutive. Morphologically, a class of allocutives is identical to implicatives, due to synchronic morphological quirks perhaps go back to a shared origin (C2). However, the reverse is not true: the subject of implicative 'have' can be 2nd person plural and 1st person singular and plural, not available for allocutives; implicatives occur in embedded contexts where allocutives are impossible, but in turn they are never obligatory; if the subject of an implicative is not second person, it itself takes allocutive agreement in the relevant contexts; and some dialects use a different 'have' predicate than *edun*.

---

[i] Presumably also, though I am not certain:

i Danak *legez ibilten* // Or asi nintzoan // Lelengo olgantza ederrak // Ortxe egin NOAZAN // Zelango poz-ikarak // Etorten jatazan // Orain igoten dodan // Eremu baltzean. (Egan 1959 XII 5-6 p. 126, Gabriel Aresti, "Bizkaitarra [II]").

[ii] I have not investigated this in any depth. I have come across examples like (i) more than once.
(i) nahikoa zuzenak iruditzen zaizkidan bi idea
     Two ideas that seem to me like they are sufficiently straightforward. (*Uztaro* 27, 1996, p. 114, http://denda.ueu.org/pdfak/uztaro27.pdf)
[iii] Parallel examples confirmed in course, e.g. *tontoa eman nuen*.
[iv] The literature offers examples of similar constructions, although not ones where remote Agree can be guaranteed by both lack of ergative case and non-extraction out of the containing clause, only by the former:
(i) Sorginak ere sarritan senarminakin dabiltzatela dirudite, ipuin batzuren esana aintzat hartzen badugu behintzat. (Jose Luis Arriaga, 1984, *Euskal mitologia*, 126)

---

[34] The meaning recalls that of experiencer *have* in English, and there is similar restrict to stativity, but implicatives cannot be 3rd person ergatives, and the lack the special requirement of experiencer *have* noted in Belvin and Den Dikken (1997:166ff.) that the small clause predicate contain a pronoun liked to the subject of *have*.

(ii) Euskaraz emandako hitzak, beste alderditik, idatzizko froga bati dagozkionak baino ahozko froga batetik ateratakoak direla dirudite. (Lore Erriondo et al., 1993, *Hizkuntza, hezkuntza eta elebiduntasuna*, 122)

[v] Lafitte's observation, keeping as he does to the literary Navarro-Labourdin dialects, is classic:

(i) Il y a beaucoup de flottement dans la manière de placer les uns par rapport aux autres les divers suffixes de la conjugaison: *ke* du potentiel, *z* pluralisateur, suffixe-sujet, suffixe-datif, *te* pluralisateur. Il ne faut pas s'étonner de trouver à côté de *erran lezakegu* 'il nous le dirait', une formme comme *erran lezaguke*; à côté de *diogute* 'ils nous l'ont', une variant comme *diotegu*; à côté de *dautate*, un doublet domme *dautet* 'il me l'ont'; à côté de *nemazkoke*, 'je les lui donnerais', des formes comme *nemakeo, nemozke*. (Lafitte 289/§570)

[vi] Cf. Gómez 2005 for perspectives on this "single-auxiliary" analytic tradition.

[vii] But see Lafon's (p. 388f.) discussion of *l* in non-irrealis past contexts (also comment thereon in Azkarate and Altuna 2001:206n60):

[…] mais il est hors de doute que, cez Dechepare et Liçarrague, *l-* figure parfois dans des formes qui ont valeur d'indicatif pur et simple: par example au prétérit de *egon* (p. 146 et 156)… *laryola*, de *iarion* 'couler', exprime sans nul doute un fait positif dans le vers B1v 9 … Cet example est d'autant plus remarquable que l'on trouve chez Liçarrague une expression analogue: *haguna lariola* (Mc, 9, 20) '(se tournoit çà et là) en escumant', litt. 'tandis que l'écume lui coulait' […] Bonaparte signale d'autre part (V. b., 10ᵉ tableau suppl., n. 4) que […] *emon legian*, avec prefix *l-* de lláuxiliaire, signifie non seulement 'qu'il le donnât', mais encore 'il le donna, l l'avait donné'. D'après le P. Zavala, 'a qui l'on doit, dit-il, cette observation', 'c'est a Plencia, à Guecho et aux environs que cette substitution a lieu ordinairement, et elle est plus ou moins en usage dans toute la Biscaye'." (Lafon, p. 388-9)