

## CASE, PERSON AND NUMBER IN BASQUE LONG DISTANCE AGREEMENT

### 0. Introduction

Basque is a prima facie good exponent of the George/Kornfilt (1980) thesis that agreement and Case are two sides of the same phenomenon (structural case). This view is implicit in Chomsky's minimalist formulation of the relation between agreement features and Case (Chomsky, 2000; 2004, 2005).

- (1) Nik zuri liburuak eman dizkizut  
I-erg you-dat books-abs given Aux[3plA-2sD-1sE]  
"I gave you the books"

Chomsky (2000) proposes that uninterpretable features, such as number and person on the one hand and case on the other, are used to yield the "dislocation" property. Chomsky's approach to implement the dislocation property is that for convergence, uninterpretable features must be deleted in the course of computation. Consider the following sentence:

- (2) An unpopular candidate was elected

(8) has three kinds of uninterpretable features: (i) the agreement features of T; (ii) the EPP-feature of T that requires the movement of the DP; and (iii) the Case feature of the DP. The agreement features of T identify T as a Probe. The Case feature of DP marks the DP (the Goal) as a candidate for either checking the uninterpretable features of T (Agree), or in addition, for erasing the EPP-feature of T by merging to it (Move). Agree precedes Move, and erases the uninterpretable agreement features of the Probe and the Case feature of the DP. The EPP-feature of T can be checked by an expletive, or by raising of the DP. Case renders a DP "active" for Agree or Move. A DP with a checked Case can not enter into either Merge or Move if the Probe consists of f-features:

- (3) \*John<sub>i</sub> seems to t<sub>i</sub> that [ he is upset]

When the EPP-property of T is checked by an expletive, we see Long Distance Agreement. In (11) the finite verb *seem* agrees in number with the plural DP *children*, not with the expletive:

- (4) There seem to be children in the garden

In (4), the expletive erases the EPP-feature of T. Since the expletive has a single f-feature [person], it cannot check the f-features of T, which require a full set of (interpretable) f-features. The T probe is forced to look down for a suitable Goal. It finds the embedded DP and checks its features and the Case-feature of the DP. Examples such as (4) illustrate another aspect of the Agree operation: uninterpretable f-features can only be checked by Goals possessing a full set of f-features. This dependency also goes in the opposite direction: only complete Probes (Probes with a whole set of person, number and gender features) can check the Case feature of a DP Goal. Consider in this regard the French sentence (5):

- (5) Les enfants semblent [ (les enfants) être [fatigués (les enfants) ]]

The participle *fatigués* has gender and number features. However, its complement *les enfants* agrees with the finite matrix verb *sembler* "seem" and raises to check its EPP feature. It is an "active" element. The number and gender features of the participle do not check its Case feature, and the DP is free to enter into Agree or Move operations with a higher Probe.

Covariation of Case and Agreement in Basque is expected in this system.

What I will try to show you today is that this tight relation between Case and agreement must be loosened. There is no biunivocal relation between Case and agreement in Basque, when one looks beyond simple configurations like (1). In particular we will be looking at Long Distance Agreement in Basque (Etxepare, 2006). At the end of the talk, I will be suggesting an approach to the Basque/Case relation that dispenses with anything like the activation condition. In fact, I will suggest that Agree performs the function of Case assignment in languages like Basque, without invoking a separate notion of Case. The claim will be supported by a set of ancillary hypothesis that I will defend in what follows:

- (i) The existence of Number and Person as two distinct Probes
- (ii) The existence of an operation searching in complement domains, Agree (contra e.g. Koopman, 2006; Chandra, 2007)
- (iii) The clitic status of person agreement in Basque
- (iv) The independent status of case (DP-licensing) and agreement

### 1. Basic data on Basque

1.1. Some general properties of Basque concerning the expression of case and agreement

Basque is an ergative (active, Dixon, 1994) language: subjects of unaccusative verbs and objects of transitive verbs share absolutive case; all other subjects (including unergative predicates) bear ergative case:

- (1) a. Emakume-a-Ø etorri da  
 woman-D-A arrived aux[3sA]  
 "The woman has arrived"
- b. Emakume-a-k emakume-a-Ø ikusi du  
 woman-D-Erg woman-D-A seen aux[3sA-3sE]  
 "The woman saw the woman"
- c. Emakume-a-k hitzegin du  
 woman-D-Erg spoken aux[3sA-3sA]  
 « The woman has spoken »

Levin (1983; Eguzkitza, 1986; Ortiz de Urbina, 1989-> Basque is not "syntactically" ergative. Also, it consistently shows ergative morphology both on overt arguments and the agreement system (unlike e.g. Warlpiri, Hale 1981, 1983).

Basque has three grammatical cases: Ergative, Dative and Absolutive, marked as *-k* for the ergative, *-(r)i* for the Dative and zero for the absolutive. Inflection shows agreement with all three grammatical cases (and the language has generalized pro-drop):

- (2) a. Zuk ni ikusi n-au-zu  
 you-erg me-A seen aux[1sA-root-2sE]  
 « You saw me »
- b. Zuk niri liburua eman d-i-da-zu  
 you-erg me-dat book-D-A given aux [3sA-root-1sD-2sE]  
 "You gave me the book"

The verbal-inflectional complex consists of two parts: one is constituted by the lexical verb and the Aspect marker; the other is the inflected auxiliary, encoding Agreement, Mood and Tense:

- (3) a. Esan-go d-i-da-te  
 say-fut aux[3sA-1sD-3pIE]  
 « They will tell me »
- b. Esan d-eza-ke-gu  
 say aux[3sA-root-pot-1pIE]  
 "We can say"

The language, as shown in (3), possesses generalized pro-drop. The auxiliary roots mark two distinctions: valency (number of actants); and realis/irrealis, which uses a different set of auxiliary roots. In all cases, we find four basic auxiliary complexes. Here's the realis set:

- (4) A: n-aiz "I am V" (He is gone)  
 A-D: n-atza-i-zu "I am V to you" (He is gone to you)  
 A-E: n-au-zu "You have V me" (He has visited me)  
 A-D-E: d-i-zu-t "I have V it to you (He has given it to me)

The uniform linear order in which the morphemes occur in the inflection is (5):

- (5) Absolutive-Root-Predative-Dative-Modal-Ergative-Tense

The agreement paradigms show two distinct affix series, corresponding to absolutive on the one hand, and dative and ergative on the other. Here's the agreement affixes for each series forms (simplified from Hualde, 2003:206):

(6)	ABS	DAT	ERG
1S	n-	-da-/t	-da-/t
2S	z-	-zu	-zu
3S	d-/z-/b-/l-	-o	Ø
1P	g-	-gu	-gu
2P	z-	-zue	-zue
3P	d-/z-/b-/l-	-e	-te

The 3rd person singular absolutive and ergative is not represented in the paradigm. Its locus is occupied by Tense and Mood markers. There is however an overt dative 3rd person affix (-o/-e, thus contrasting also in number). See Laka (1988); Ortiz de Urbina (1989); Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina (2003).

When the finite verb possesses two person indexes, the ABS is 3rd person, a restriction that is usually interpreted as a PCC (of the me-lui sort, see Albizu, 1997; Ormazabal, 1998; Ormazabal and Romero, 1999; Rezac, forthcoming, a.o)):

- (7) a. \*Zuk Mireni ni aurkeztu na-i-o-zu  
 you-erg Miren-dat me-abs introduced aux[3sA-3sD-2sE]  
 "You introduced me to Miren"
- b. Zuk niri Miren aurkeztu d-i-da-zu  
 you-erg me-dat Miren-abs introduced aux[3sA-1sD-2sE]  
 "You introduced Miren to me"

### 1.2. The issue

- (8) a. [<sub>NC</sub> **gure liburuak** bi eratan argitaratzea] pentsatu ditugu  
 our books-abs two ways publish-nom-D thought aux[1plE-3plA]  
 "We thought of publishing our books in two different ways"  
[www.geocities.com/euskal\\_abizenak/bazkidetu.html](http://www.geocities.com/euskal_abizenak/bazkidetu.html) -
- b. [<sub>NC</sub> **gauzak** ongi egitea] gustatzen zaizkit  
 things-abs well do-nom-D like-hab aux[3plA-1sD]  
 "I like doing things well"  
[revista.consumer.es/web/eu/20031001/entrevista/](http://revista.consumer.es/web/eu/20031001/entrevista/)
- c. Bertan munipak [<sub>NC</sub> (**gu**) botatzen] saiatu gaituzte  
 there policemen-erg us-abs oust-nom-D tried aux[1plA-3plE]  
 "There, the policemen tried to oust us"  
[torturano.bitacoras.com/archivos/2006/07/02/no-es-casual-que-pretendan-poner-otro-cuartel-de-la-guardia-c...](http://torturano.bitacoras.com/archivos/2006/07/02/no-es-casual-que-pretendan-poner-otro-cuartel-de-la-guardia-c...)

In (8a,b), the matrix auxiliary agrees in number with the object of the infinitival. In (8c), both the number and person features of the embedded object are cross-referenced in the auxiliary, which becomes transitive. In all cases, singular absolutive agreement is also possible:

- (9) a. [**Gauzak** ongi egitea] gustatzen zait  
 things-abs well do-nom-D like-hab aux[3sA-1sD]

"I like doing things well"

- b. Bertan munipak [**gu** botatzen] saiatu dira  
 there policemen-abs us-abs oust-Nom-D tried aux[3plA]  
 "There, the policemen tried to oust us"

Despite their basic similarity, I will argue here that the two LDA phenomena should be kept separate. The two phenomena are distinguished at least in terms of (i) the predicates that allow them, and (ii) the different locality conditions that hold of each of them. Basically, it would seem that whereas Person LDA belongs in the domain of restructuring and clitic climbing, Number-LDA belongs in the domain of (long distance) Agree, and the two operate under somewhat different conditions.

## PART I: TWO PROBES

### 1. Person and Number as two different Probes

Consider (10):

- (10) a. [**gu** botatzea] pentsatu dute  
 us-abs oust-nom-D thought aux[3sA-3plE]  
 "They thought of ousting us"
- b. [(**Haiek**) botatzea] pentsatu dituzte  
 they-abs oust-nom-D thought aux[3plA-3plE]  
 "They tried to oust them"
- c. [(**gu**) botatzea] pentsatu gaituzte  
 (us)-abs oust-nom-loc thought aux[1plA-3plE]  
 "They thought of ousting us"

Context: talking about new recruitments in a football team.

- (11) a. [atzeritarrak ekartzea] baztertu dugu  
 foreigners-abs bring-nom-D rejected aux[3sA-1plE]  
 "We rejected recruiting foreigners"
- b. [**atzeritarrak** ekartzea] baztertu ditugu

foreigners-abs bring-nom-D rejected aux[**3plA-1plE**]  
 "We rejected recruiting foreigners"

c. \*[**zu** ekartzea] baztertu zaitugu  
 you-abs bring-nom-D rejected aux[**2sA-1plE**]  
 "We rejected recruiting you"

The possibility of agreeing long-distance with either person or number seems to divide LDA verbs in two sets: on the one hand those verbs that allow LDA in person; on the other, those that allow number LDA, but not person. The split between person and number strongly suggests the existence of two different probes (see also Ritter, 1995; Taraldsen, 1995; Alexiadou, 2003; Bejar, 2003; Rezac, 2003, 2004; Sigurdsson, 2004, 2006; Holmberg and Sigurdsson, 2008, a. o.). The conclusion is well supported in Basque from the analysis of other morphosyntactic phenomena. A representative case is the series of displacement phenomena affecting 3<sup>rd</sup> person absolutes (so-called dative and ergative displacement). Here's an instance of dative displacement in the Hondarribia variety (Fernandez, 2004):

(12) a. Niri **sagarra** gustatzen zait (STANDARD)  
 me-dat apple-abs like-hab aux[**3sA-1sD**]  
 "I like the apple"

b. **Neri** sagarra gustatzen **nau** (HONDARRIBIA)  
 me-dat apple-abs like-hab aux[**1sA-3sD**]  
 "I like apples"

c. **Neri sagarrak** gustatzen **nauzki**  
 me-dat apples like-hab aux[**1sA-PL<sub>3ABS</sub>-3sE**]  
 "I like apples"

In (12c), the absolute person affix agrees with the dative, but the absolute number affix agrees with the absolute object (*apples*). The examples also feature a mismatch between Case marking and agreement indexing. For displacement phenomena see among others (Laka, 1988; Albizu and Eguren, 2000; Fernandez, 2001, 2004, 2006; Fernandez and Ezeizabarrena, 2001; Rezac, 2003, 2006a,b).

The conclusion that number and person constitute two different probes in Basque is also supported by the following asymmetry in the predicates that license LDA:

person LDA is limited to transitive verbs; Number LDA can be licensed in intransitive DAT-ABS. In other words, something like (13b) is possible, but (13c) is completely impossible:

(13) a. Atsegin zait [ zu ikustea]  
 nice aux[**3sA-1sD**] you-abs see-nom-D  
 "I enjoy seeing you"

b. Atsegin zaizkit [(holako gauzak) ikustea]  
 nice aux[**3plA-1sD**] such things-abs see-nom-D  
 "I enjoy seeing such things"

c. \*Atsegin zataizkit [(**zu**) ikustea]  
 nice aux[**2sA-1sD**] you-abs see-nom-D  
 "I enjoy seeing you"

This suggests that the Number probe is located somewhere in between the external argument (associated to transitive verbs) and the most embedded verb. A plausible site is the aspectual projection dividing an external v head and the internal verbal projection (see Alexiadou, 2003; Etxepare, 2006):

(14) ...[<sub>VP</sub> v<sup>0</sup> [<sub>Asp</sub> Asp[<sub>uNum</sub>] [<sub>VP</sub> V<sup>0</sup> [<sub>NomC</sub> ...DP<sub>abs</sub>...]]]]

Since person LDA is obligatorily associated to transitive predicates, I will assume that it is parasitic on the small v projecting the external argument:

(15) [<sub>VP</sub> v[<sub>uPerson</sub>] [<sub>AspP</sub> Asp[<sub>uNumber</sub>] [<sub>VP</sub> V<sup>0</sup> [<sub>NomC</sub> ...DP<sub>abs</sub>...]]]]

## 2. Selective Matching

One intriguing thing concerning number LDA, is that it does not select just any plural DP in the embedded clause:

(16) a. [**inbertsio batzu** egitea] aztertu ditugu  
 investment some-abs buy-nom-D considered aux[**3plA-1plE**]  
 "We considered making some investments"

b.\*[**Galerei** konponbide bat ematea] aztertu diegu  
 losses-dat solution one-abs give-nom-Dconsidered aux[3sA-**3pID**-1plE]  
 "We considered providing a solution for the losses"

b. [**zuri** opari bat egitea] pentsatu dizugu  
 you-dat present one-abs do-nom-D thought aux[3sA-**2sD**-1plE]  
 "We thought of making you a present"

The target is always the embedded absolutive object. This is so even if ordinarily, the dative agrees in person and number with the inflected verb:

(17) **Haiei** eman die  
 they-dat given aux[3sA-**3pID**-3sE]  
 "He/she gave it to them"

If the embedded clause does not contain an absolutive object then LDA in number is impossible:

(18) \* [**Bolondresei** laguntzea] aztertu ditut/diet  
 volunteers-dat help-nom-D considered aux[**3pIA**-1sE]/[3sA-**3pID**-1plE]  
 "I considered (the possibility of) helping the volunteers"

This contrast with "local" agreement:

(18') **Bolondresei** lagundu diet  
 volunteers-dat help aux[3sA-**3pID**-1sE]  
 "I helped the volunteers"

Person LDA is possible with both absolutives and datives:

(19) a. [ zu gonbidatzea] pentsatu dugu  
 you-abs invite-nom-D thought aux[3sA-1plE]  
 "We thought about/planned to invite you"

b. [ (**zu**) gonbidatzea] pentsatu zaitugu  
 you-abs invite-nom-D thought aux[**2sA**-1plE]  
 "We thought about/planned to invite you"

(20) a. [zuri opari bat egitea] pentsatu dugu  
 you-dat present one-abs do-nom-D thought aux[3sA-1plE]  
 "We thought of making you a present"

## PART II: LOCALITY ISSUES

### 3. The Minimal Link Condition and cyclic locality

#### 3.1. Basic LDA configurations

Number LDA is blocked by intervening dative DPs as shown by contrasts such as (21a,b):

(21) a. Joneki [ e; **liburu batzuk** erostea] aztertu ditu  
 Jon-erg book some-A buy-Nom-D considered aux[3sE-**3pA**]  
 "Jon considered buying some books"

b. \*Joneki [ e; Mireni **liburu batzuk** erostea] aztertu ditu  
 Jon-erg Miren-dat book some-A buy-Nom-D considered aux[3sE-**3pA**]  
 "Jon considered buying Miren some books"

Not any intervening constituent blocks LDA. Only Case marked arguments do:

(22) a. Joneki [ e; Mirenentzat **liburu batzuk** erostea] aztertu ditu  
 Jon-erg Miren-ben book some-pl buy-Nom-D considered aux[3sE-**3pA**]  
 « Jon considered buying some books for Miren »

b. Joneki [ e; Mirenekin **liburu batzu** idaztea] aztertu ditu  
 Jon-erg Miren-soc book some-abs write-Nom-D considered aux[3sE-**3pA**]  
 « Jon considered writing some books with Miren »

LDA is also blocked by overtly realized subjects in embedded nominalizations:

(23) a. Joneki erabaki du [ e; Aitorrek traste zaharrak botatzea]  
 Jon-Erg decided Aux(3sE-3sA) Aitor-E thing old-pl throw off-Nom-Det  
 "John decided (for Aitor) to throw off the old things"

b. Joneki [ e; liburu horiek eros-te-a] erabaki ditu  
 Jon-erg book those buy-Nom-D decided Aux(3sE-3plA)

“John decided to buy those books”

The presence of an overt or a tacit obviative subject in the infinitival complement of a verb such as *erabaki* “decide” has an immediate effect in the availability of Long Distance Agreement:

- (24) a. Jonek<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> **traste zaharrak** botatzea] erabaki ditu  
 Jon-E thing old-Det-pl throw off-Nom-Det decided Aux[3sE-**3plA**]  
 “John decided to throw off the old things”
- b. Jonek [Aitorrek **traste zaharrak** botatzea] erabaki \*ditu  
 Jon-E Aitor-Erg thing old-Det-pl throw-Nom-D decided Aux[3sE-**3plA**]  
 “John decided that Aitor should throw off the old things”

This may not be a matter of defective intervention, though, but rather of cyclic locality. San Martin (2001) has argued in the context of Basque nominalizations, that overtly realized subjects are only possible under a full CP structure. If so, a structure that contains an overtly realized subject may constitute an opaque domain for agreement. Finite clauses do not allow LDA of any sort either:

- (25) \*Jonek uste ditu [Aitorrek **liburuak** ebatsi dizkiola]  
 Jon-erg think aux[**3plA**-3sE] Aitor-erg books stolen aux[3plA-3sD-3sE]  
 “Jon thinks that Aitor has stolen his books”

Etxepare (2003, 2006) shows that independent Tense in the embedded nominal clauses is incompatible with LDA generally. It has been argued that an independent Tense is only possible under a complete C-T probe (San Martin, 2001; Alboiu, 2006, a.o). Here is an illustration:

- (26) a. [Bihar liburu batzuk saltzea] pentsatu genuen  
 tomorrow book some-abs sell-nom-D thought aux[1plE-3sA]  
 “We thought of buying some books tomorrow”
- b. \*[Bihar **liburu batzuk** saltzea] pentsatu genituen  
 tomorrow book some-abs sell-nom-D thought aux[1plE-**3plA**]  
 “We thought of buying some books tomorrow”

Compare this to temporal modifiers like *bi egun barru* “within two days” which do not necessarily refer to the speech time:

- (27) a. [Bi egun barru liburu batzuk saltzea] pentsatu genuen  
 two day within book some-abs sell-nom-D thought aux[1plE-3sA]  
 “We thought of buying some books within two days”
- b. [Bi egun barru **liburu batzuk** saltzea] pentsatu genituen  
 two day within book some-abs sell-nom-D thought aux[1plE-**3plA**]  
 “We thought of buying some books within two days”

### 3.2. Aspectual and temporal heads in nominalized clauses

There are three basic nominalization clauses in Basque: (i) those headed by a determiner (27a), those headed by a spatial postposition (27b) (iii) and those headed by the genitive marker *-ko*, which are always futurate events (27c):

- (27) a. [kuluxka bat egite-**a**] pentsatu dut  
 nap one do-nom-D thought aux  
 “I thought of/planned to have a nap”
- b. [Kuluxka bat egite-**n**] saiatu naiz  
 nap one do-nom-loc tried aux  
 “I tried to make a nap”
- c. [Kuluxka bat egite-**ko**] esan didate  
 nap one do-nom-gen told aux  
 “They suggested me to make a nap”

Etxepare (2006) makes the following connections:

- (28) a. [Joate-**n**] ari naiz  
 go-nom-loc prog am  
 “I am going”
- b. [Egite-**n**] saiatu  
 do-nom-loc try  
 “Try doing”
- c. [<sub>AspP</sub> [<sub>NomC</sub> egite] -**n** ]

- (29) a. Etorri-**ko** da  
 come-fut is  
 "He/she will come"
- b. [Egite-**ko**] esan  
 do-nom-gen tell  
 "Tell (someone) to do (something)"
- c. [<sub>TenseP</sub> [<sub>NomC</sub> Egite] -**ko**]

For the article: Etxeberria (2005) and Eguren (2006) consider it an element of category D. Artiagoitia (1997, 2004) claims it can also realize a number feature. In the context of nominalizations, it is ambiguously related to the presence of both independent and anaphoric Tense and it is obligatory in those nominalizations presenting an overt subject, but can occur without (Artiagoitia, 1994; Etxepare, 2006). I will assume here that it is an element of category Tense. This is supported by the fact that it seems to freely alternate with *-ko* in future embedded events (Artiagoitia, 1994; 2003):

- (30) [Joatea/-ko] proposatu dit  
 go-nom-D/-gen proposed aux[3sA-1sD-3sE]  
 "He/she proposed me to go"

If we consider the kind of nominal dependent selected by person and number LDA predicates, we'll realize that person LDA involves mostly aspectual phrases of the following sort:

- (31) Egite-n saiatu/hasi/bukatu/ibili/lortu  
 do-nom-loc try/start/finish/do-usually/get-to  
 "Try/start/finish/get to"

There are two sets of exceptions: (i) modal verbs such as *espero* "hope", and (ii) some activity verbs such as *pentsatu* "plan/think" or *erabaki* "decide". The latter however, give rise to the following contrasts:

- (32) a. [[(zuri) laguntzen] segitzea] pentsatu dizugu  
 you-dat help-nom-loc continue-nom-D thought aux[3sA-2sD-1pIE]

"We thought of keeping to help you"

- b. ?(?)[[(zuri) laguntzen] saiatzea] pentsatu dizugu  
 you-dat help-nom-loc try-nom-D thought aux[3sA-2sD-1pIE]  
 "We thought of trying to help you"

The contrast suggests that in the case of person LDA, the complements of verbs such as *pentsatu* can only belong in the aspectual domain.

As for modal verbs such as *espero* "to hope", the kind of modality they select is realized in or below the aspectual domain, according to Cinque's adverb based hierarchy (1999). Let us therefore assume they select a complement of aspectual nature.

If this is the right way of characterizing the nominal complements of person LDA configurations, we can (tentatively) establish the following:

- (33) [<sub>VP</sub> ... V [ Asp<sub>[uNum]</sub> [ V [ DP<sub>[P/Num]</sub> ]]]] (Person LDA)

Whereas Person LDA occurs across aspectual clauses, Number LDA may happen across temporal domains: this is shown by the fact that future marked complements allow number LDA:

- (34) [<sub>NomC</sub> **Liburu hauek** erosteko] eskatu dizkidate  
 book these buy-nom-fut asked aux[3pIA-1sD-3pIE]  
 "They asked me to buy these books"

Let us thus (tentatively) establish the following structure for Number LDA dependents:

- (35) [<sub>VP</sub> ... V [<sub>TP</sub> ... T<sub>D</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> .V<sub>[uP]</sub> [ Asp<sub>[uNum]</sub> [ V DP<sub>[P/Num]</sub> ]]]] (Number LDA)

The domain defined by [<sub>v</sub>...Asp...]] constitutes a strong phase.

### 3.3. Restructuring vs. non-restructuring predicates

The kind of predicate that allows number LDA does not typically inform the class of restructuring predicates. A verb such as *gustatu* (from Spanish *gustar* "like"), of the *piacere* class (Belletti and Rizzi, 1988) is not a restructuring predicate in Spanish:

- (36) a. Me gusta comprarlos  
 cl-dat likes buy-inf-cl-acc  
 "I like to buy them"
- b. \*Me los gusta comprar  
 cl-dat cl-acc likes buy-inf  
 "I like to buy them"

In fact, most verbs in the family of non-obligatory control verbs for instance, (see appendix B) are of the non-restructuring sort. If this is correct, number LDA cannot be trivially equated with other connectivity phenomena (clitic raising, long distance Case assignment) common in restructuring contexts. Restructuring contexts have been claimed to involve very reduced complements, such as VPs or Aspectual Phrases (Wurmbrandt, 2001, 2003, 2003; Bobaljik and Wurmbrandt, 2005; Cinque, 2003). In a radical approach to restructuring, Wurmbrandt claims that complements of restructuring verbs are actually bare VPs, lacking even an external argument. The connection between the matrix inflected verb and the embedded object can thus be accommodated along the lines of Phase-locality. But note that for a verb such as *gustatu/gustar* it is not clear what the semantic result of such a reduction would be: *comprar* "buy" requires an agentive subevent in its conceptual structure. In a typical restructuring context (say, *try*), the agentive component of the matrix verb and that of the embedded verb may undergo some sort of event structure unification (Wurmbrandt, 2001). It is not easy to see what unifying the event structure of *gustar* and that of *comprar* would yield as a unified event structure, at least under a restrictive approach to complex event structures. A Cinquean analysis (1997, 2004) whereby the restructuring verb is a functional item also faces the issue that *gustar* as such, does not seem a promising candidate for a functional or semi-lexical item. In Heine and Kuteva's lexicon of grammaticalization (2002) for instance, there is no entry for something like *gustar*. This suggests that number LDA occurs in configurations which incorporate some functional structure.

Person LDA on the other hand seems to be basically limited to typical restructuring predicates.

### 3.4. Expanding the search domain

If bare aspectual phrases are the right nominal complement for person LDA configurations, person LDA can recur under cyclic agree in Chomsky's terms (32b): the addition of a bare aspectual complement (cf. 32a) does not contribute a strong phase.

- (37) a.  $v_{[uP]} \dots V_{[AspP Asp [VP V [ Asp [ V [ DP_{[P/Num]} ] ] ] ] ] ] }$
- b. Jonek [[ **liburuak** erosten ] segitzea] pentsatu ditu  
 Jon-erg books-abs buy-nom-loc continue-nom-D thought aux[3plA-3sE]  
 "Jon thought of continuing to buy books"

Unlike person LDA configurations, we expect number LDA configurations to resist expansion. This is borne out:

- (38) a. [**Lanak** bukatzea] aztertu ditugu  
 works-abs finish-nom-D considered aux[3plA-1plE]  
 "We considered finishing the works"
- b. [**Lanak** bukatzea] onartu ditugu  
 works-abs finish-nom-D accepted aux[3plA-1plE]  
 "We accepted finishing the works"
- c. \*[[**lanak** bukatzea] aztertzea onartu dituzte  
 works-pl-abs publish-nom-D consider-nom-D accepted aux[3plA-3plE]  
 "They accepted considering finishing the works"

This is expected, since the nominal complements selected by those predicates are of T-length, and therefore involve an internal small *v*, and therefore inner phases. This predicts that the maximal length for number LDA is one level of embedding.

- (39)  $Asp_{[uNumber]} \dots V_{[TP T \dots v \dots Asp \dots V_{[TP T \dots v \dots Asp \dots V \dots DP]} ] ] }$

By the time we hit the highest embedded *v*, the complement of *v* is sent to Spell Out, and the Aspectual head in the matrix clause will not be able to value its number feature.

#### 4. Agreement configurations

Number LDA in Basque fails to apply to those nominal dependents that do not agree and check Case with the matrix verbal structure. This includes complex predicates, object control configurations and unergative predicates.

##### 4.1. Complex predicates

Consider the following contrasts:

- (40) a. [e harri horiek altxatzen] probatu dute/dituzte  
stone those lift-Nom-Loc attempted aux[3pE-3sA]/[3pE-3pA]  
‘‘They attempted to lift those stones’’
- b. [e harri horiek altxatzen] proba egin dute/\*dituzte  
stone those lift-Nom-Loc attempt done aux[3pE-3sA]/[3pE-3pA]  
‘‘They attempted to lift those stones’’

In (40), we contrast a complex predicate composed by a noun plus the light verb *egin* ‘‘do’’ (the (b) case) with its incorporated or synthetic versions (the (a) case). Only in the latter case is LDA possible. At the same time, only in the latter could the infinitival clause occupy one of the agreement slots corresponding to the ditransitive/transitive auxiliary. In the complex predicate configuration the auxiliary agrees with the bare noun, the indirect object (in 40) and the subject. There is no room for more agreement relations, and the infinitival is left out of the Case/agreement domain. In that precise case, LDA is impossible (40b). Compare those cases to the following:

- (40') a. Jonek harria probatu du  
Jon-erg stone tried aux[3sA-3sE]  
‘‘Jon tried the stone’’
- b. \*Jonek harria proba egin du

Jon-erg stone trial done aux[3sA-3sE]  
‘‘Jon tried the stone’’

##### 4.2. Object Control

*Ikusi* ‘‘see’’ takes a transitive auxiliary which does not cross-reference the infinitival:

- (41) Jon<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> **kopla horiek** kantatzen] ikusi dut/\*ditut  
Jon-abs song those sing-Nom-Loc seen aux[1sE-3sA]/[1sE-3pA]  
‘‘I saw Jon singing those songs’’

Compare with *entzun* ‘‘hear’’ a dative control verb:

- (42) Jon<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> **kopla horiek** kantatzen] entzun dizkiot  
Jon-dat song those-abs sing-Nom-Loc heard aux[3sE-3sD-3pA]  
‘‘I heard/listen Mikel singing those songs’’

In (41) the subject and the object exhaust all the possibilities for agreement with the auxiliary. In (42) the ditransitive auxiliary offers room for one more agreeing element. In that case LDA (and local agreement too) become possible. (41) and (42) should be compared to (41') and (42'):

- (41') Jon ikusi dut  
Jon-abs see aux[3sA-3sE]  
‘‘I saw John’’
- (42') Joni hori entzun diot  
Jon-dat that-abs heard aux[3sA-3sD-1sE]  
‘‘I heard that to John’’

##### 4.3. Unergative predicates

Unergative aspectual verbs which select for infinitival clauses do not allow LDA either. Consider the verb *jardun* ‘‘to be doing something’’. It takes a locative infinitival clause, but it doesn't take an object, despite the fact that it shows a transitive auxiliary:

- (43) a. Jonek<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> lan egiten] jardun du egun osoan

Jon-erg work do-Nom-Loc act aux[3sE-3sA] the whole day  
 “Jon has been working the whole day”

b. Jonek horretan jardun du  
 Jon-erg that-in act aux[3sE-3sA]  
 “Jon has worked/acted on that”

c. \*Jonek hori jardun du  
 Jon-erg that-abs acted aux(tr)  
 “Jon worked/acted on that”

It does not allow LDA either:

(44) Jonek<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> **apunteak** kopiatzen] jardun\*ditu  
 Jon-erg notes-abs take-Nom-Loc worked aux[3sE-3plA]  
 « Jon worked taking notes »

Unergative verbal periphrases like *ondo/gaizki egin* “to act correctly/incorrectly” do not license LDA either:

(45) a. Jonek<sub>i</sub> ondo egin du [e<sub>i</sub> **sosak** gordetzen]  
 Jon-erg well done aux(3sE-3sA) money-abs-pl keep-Nom-Loc  
 “John acted correctly by keeping (his) money”

b. \*Jonek<sub>i</sub> ondo egin ditu [e<sub>i</sub> **sosak** gordetzen]  
 Jon-erg well done aux[3sE-3pA] money-abs-pl keep-Nom-Loc

## 5. Direct and indirect agreement

### 5.1. Disjoint probing

The data in the previous section place number LDA in the context of an agreement chain, that starts with the absolutive DP, but has a crucial link in the nominal clause, which must itself be part of the Case/agreement domain of the matrix verb. Etxepare (2006) and Preminger (2009) claim that Number LDA is performed in an indirect way, via an intermediate functional projection with unvalued number features (see also Bhatt, 2005, for Hindi). Preminger discusses the following case (from Etxepare, 2006) in support of this idea:

(46) Uko egin die [kalteordainak eskatzea-ri]

refusal done aux[3sA-3plD-3sE] damages-abs ask-dat  
 “He/she refused to pay damages”  
 (lit. He/she made a refusal to paying damages)

In (46) the auxiliary verb in the matrix agrees in case (dative affix) with the nominalized clause which has dative case. However, the dative affix is also a plural one, and that can only be by agreement with the absolutive. The applicative probe (-e) fuses person and number. We could say that it agrees at the same time with its complement and something inside it. But this would make (47) grammatical:

(47) \*Uko egin dizugu [(zu) ikusteari]  
 refusal done aux[3sA-2sD-1plE] you-abs see-nom-D-dat  
 “We refused to see you”

Preminger suggests that the nominalized clause contains an unvalued Number feature in D, which is valued by the absolutive object:

(48) ...[DP D<sub>[uNum]</sub> [...DP<sub>[Num-pl]</sub> ...]]

The embedded DP values the number feature in D. The auxiliary agrees with the DP, and values its number features indirectly through D.

(49) Aux<sub>[uNum]</sub> ... [DP D<sub>[Num]</sub> [...DP<sub>[Num-pl]</sub> ...]]

Apparently, person LDA does not obey the same conditions: first, the person probe cannot value its person feature against the nominalized clause, since the latter does not have any person feature; then, there are cases where the restructuring predicate does not agree with the nominalized clause. This is the case of the intransitive *saiatu* “try” which has a single set of person and number features:

(50) Saiatu naiz [garaiz agertzen]  
 tried am in-time show-nom-loc  
 “I tried showing up in time”

It nevertheless licenses person LDA:

Which-pl do-nom-loc help-fut aux[3plA-1sD-2sE]  
 "You're gonna help me to do which ones?"

- (51) Saiatu gaituzte [NomC (gu) botatzen]  
 tried aux[1plA-3plE] us oust-nom-loc  
 "They tried ousting us"

The transitive auxiliary in (51) is strictly possible with first and second person embedded objects, and should be considered as a late insertion exponent of a bipersonal auxiliary. Transitive forms are not possible with third person:

- (52) (?)?[Xabier botatzen] saiatu dute  
 Xabier-abs oust-nom-loc tried aux[3sA-3plE]  
 "They tried ousting Xabier"

### 5.3. Edge DPs

One further argument in favor of indirect agreement is the fact that elements at the edge of the embedded clause do not trigger number agreement (unlike many other LDA languages):

- (53) a. \*Ez dakizkit [zeintzu aukeratu]  
 neg know-pl which-pl select-part  
 "I don't know which ones to choose"

Pied-piping as an alternative (Koopman, 2006):

- (54) a. [Horiek egiten] utzi dizkit  
 those-abs do-nom-loc let aux[3plA-1sD-3sE]  
 "He/she let me do them"  
 b. [Zeintzu egiten] utzi dizkizu?  
 Which-abs do-nom-loc let aux[3plA-1sD-3sE]  
 "Which ones did he/she let you do?"
- (55) a. [Zeintzu egiten] lagunduko didazu?  
 Which-pl do-nom-loc help-fut aux[3sA-1sD-2sE]  
 "You're gonna help me to do which ones?"  
 b. \*[<sub>NC</sub> Zeintzu egiten] lagunduko dizkidazu?

## PART III: AGREE AND CLITIC DOUBLING

### 6. Agree and clitic doubling

#### 6.1. Person LDA as clitic doubling

Person LDA allows agreement with dative goals too. Preminger (2009) claims that agreement with Dative arguments is actually clitic doubling. I would like to add the following supporting evidence. Restructuring predicates allowing person LDA may seemingly agree with either the indirect or the direct object:

- (56) a. [hura zuri ondo saltzen] jakin dizute  
 that-abs you-dat well sell-nom-loc known aux[3sA-2sD-3plE]  
 "They've been able to sell it well to you"  
 b. [Haiek ondo saltzen] jakin dituzte  
 those-abs well sell-nom-loc known aux[3plA-3plE]  
 "They've been able to sell them well"

They can also agree with both:

- (57) [Haiek zuri ondo saltzen] jakin dizkizute  
 those you-dat well sell-nom-loc known aux[3plA-2sD-3plE]  
 "They've been able to sell them well to you"

What you cannot do is the following:

- (58) ??[Joni entziklopediak saltzen] jakin diogu  
 you-dat encyclopedias sell-nom-loc known aux[3sA-3sD-1plE]  
 "We've been able to sell John encyclopedias"

You cannot agree with just the dative in (58) leaving number agreement with the embedded object unexpressed. Once you agree with the dative, you must also agree with the absolutive. Remember that agreeing with the absolutive across a non-agreeing dative is not possible (the intervention effect in section 3, repeated here):

- (59) \*Jonek<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> Mireni **liburu batzuk** erostea] aztertu ditu  
 Jon-erg Miren-dat book some-A buy-Nom-D decided aux[3sE-3pA]  
 "Jon considered buying Miren some books"

Agreeing with the dative seemingly opens the way to long distance number agreement with the object. This is only the case with restructuring predicates. The effect is reminiscent of the one observed by Anagnostopoulou (2003) in the Greek applicative construction. She notes the following contrast:

- (60) a. \*To vivlio charistike tis Marias apo ton Pedro  
 the book-nom award-pass the Mary-gen from the Pedro  
 "The book was awarded Mary by Peter"  
 b. To vivlio tis charistike (tis Marias) apo ton Pedro  
 the book-nom Cl-gen award-pass the Mary-gen from the Pedro  
 "The book was awarded Mary by Peter"

(60a) is ungrammatical because the theme cannot undergo NP-movement to T. This is so because the movement is blocked by the applicative indirect object (genitive). When the indirect object is doubled by a clitic, the blocking effect disappears. She argues that in clitic constructions, the intervening formal D-features of the genitive move to T before the nominative, and are spelled out as a clitic. Once the intervening features have been removed, the probe can skip the dative DP in its search and agree with the embedded object. In our case, that means number agreement with the absolutive object.

## 6.2. The intervention effect

If the reasoning above is correct, the Basque dative affix has the following two properties: (i) it bears substantive person and number features; (ii) it is a head; (iii) it is a clitic; (iv) it occurs in applicative constructions relating the indirect object to other pieces of the clausal structure. In this, the clitic reminds very much of the Spanish dative clitic *le*, which has also been claimed (Ormazabal and Romero, 1999; Bleam; Cuervo, 2003) to lexicalize an applicative head:

- (61) ...[ IO cl<sub>[person, number]</sub> O]

Then, the presence of the affix in the auxiliary verb can be seen as a consequence of cliticization into the finite verb. Let us now come back to the intervention effect:

- (62) \*Jonek<sub>i</sub> [e<sub>i</sub> Mireni **liburu batzuk** erostea] aztertu ditu  
 Jon-erg Miren-dat book some-A buy-Nom-D decided aux[3sE-3pA]  
 "Jon considered buying Miren some books"

The basic structure of (62) according to the applicative hypothesis is the following (I omit the lexical verbs; OI is indirect object, O object):

- (63) Asp<sub>[uNum]</sub> ... [TP T<sub>[uNum]</sub> [AppP IO App<sub>[Person/Number]</sub> [ V<sub>[person]</sub> ... Asp<sub>[uNum]</sub> ... O]]]

In a structure like (63), with the applicative head having interpretable person and number features, the unvalued Number features of the higher aspectual head cannot reach into the embedded object. This is the intervention effect. The issue now is to know why the following is also impossible:

- (64) \*[zuei liburu bat erostea] aztertu dizuet  
 you-dat book one-abs buy-nom-D considered aux[3sA-2sD-1sE]  
 "I considered buying you a book"

The reason must be that the person clitic must, but cannot raise across the structure defined by complements of Number LDA verbs. They are too "rich". In other words, there is no way to get the dative affix to the inflected verb.

If the two hypotheses stand up, then we can get rid of the notion of "defective" intervention. At the same time, we account for the mysterious "selective" matching operated by Number agreement. A last contrastive set is constituted by the following cases:

- (65) a. [<sub>NC</sub> (guk) zuek gonbidatzea] aztertu dugu  
 we-erg you-abs invite-nom-loc considered aux[3sA-1pIE]  
 "We considered inviting you"  
 b. \*[ zuek gonbidatzea] aztertu zaituztegu  
 you invite-nom-D considered aux[2sA-1pIE]  
 "We considered inviting you"

The first case is a non-reduced nominalized clause, which can host an overt subject (65a) and is thus opaque to Agree. The second can be approached in more than one way: one possibility, entertained by Rakowski and Richards (2005) for analogous cases, is that the person probe in the matrix verb targets first the nominalized clause. This nominalized clause is supposed to have a third person feature:

$$(66) \quad \text{Aux}_{[\text{Person/Number}]} \left[ \underbrace{\text{T}_{[3 \text{ Person}]} \dots \text{V}}_{\text{DP}_{[\text{Person}]}} \right]$$

In (66), the auxiliary probe targets first the embedded T with a person feature. Once it values its person feature against T, it then probes into the embedded D. The latter cannot be other than either number, or if person probes more than once, the different goals must match. In any case, agreement with other than 3<sup>rd</sup> person will be impossible. We cannot avail ourselves from this technical solution because there is no person feature in T. In our terms, (65b) is impossible, because person agreement is clitic doubling, and as such, cannot occur across non-restructuring predicates.

### 6.3. The dative in dative-absolutive constructions

This analysis of the intervention effect raises an issue concerning the position of the matrix dative argument. If, as proposed by many (Baker, 1996; Fernandez, 1997), the dative argument sits in the Spec of the matrix VP, it should block LDA:

(67) a. Atsegin      zaizkit                      [holako liburuak    erostea]  
           pleasureable aux[3p1A-1sD] such    books-abs buy-nom-D  
           "I like to buy such books"

$$b \dots [{}_{\text{VP}} \text{V}^0 [{}_{\text{ASP}} \text{ASP}_{[\text{uNum}]} [{}_{\text{VP}} \text{DP}_{\text{dat}} \text{V}^0 [{}_{\text{NomC}} \dots \text{DP}_{\text{abs}} \dots ]]]]$$

Datives in Basque however, are not a homogeneous class concerning their structural position. There are two basic orders in Basque absolutive-dative predicates: one, comprising motion predicates and predicates of oriented activity, have an unmarked ABS-DAT order. Others, basically involving raised possessors and subjects of psychological predicates, have an unmarked DAT-ABS order. There is evidence in Basque (Etxepare and Oyharçabal, 2009; Rezac, 2009) that the latter are "high applicatives" (Pylkkanen, 2001; Cuervo, 2003; Jeong, 2006).

Ortiz de Urbina (2003) notes the following difference between DAT-ABS and ABS-DAT configuration concerning the case of the cause:

(68) a. Beharrak Mikel pro    diru-eske    etorriarazi dit  
           need-erg M.-abs me-dat money-asking come-cause aux[3sA-1sD-3sE]  
           "Need made him come to me asking for money"  
       b. (?)Goseak    zopa hori    izugarri gustatuarazi dio Mikeli  
           hunger-erg soup that-abs terribly like-cause    aux[3sA-3sD-3sE]  
           "Hunger made Mikel like the soup enormously"

In (68a) the causee is absolutive, whereas in (68b) it is dative, suggesting that in the *gustatu* "like" case, it is higher than the absolutive.

Elordieta (2001) notes that the reflexive *bere burua* "his/her head" can only be bound from a higher base generated argument. Reflexive binding in Basque cannot be fed by A-bar movement, or short scrambling. In DAT-ABS configurations, the dative binds the anaphor, but the reverse is not true:

(69) a. Joni    bere burua    gustatzen    zaio  
           Jon-dat his    head-abs like-nom-hab aux[3sA-3sD]  
           "Jon likes himself"  
       b. \*Jon    bere buruari    gustatzen    zaio  
           Jon-abs his    head-dat like-nom-hab aux[3sA-3sD]

In ABS-DAT configurations, the opposite holds:

(70) a. Jon    bere buruari    mintzatu zaio  
           Jon-abs his    head-dat talked    aux[3sA-3sD]  
           "Jon talked to himself"  
       b. ??Joni    bere burua    mintzatu zaio  
           Jon-dat his    head    talked    aux

All dative-absolutive verbs involved in number LDA in Basque are of the type DAT-ABS. I will assume that "high applicative are out of the scope of the inner aspectual head hosting unvalued number.

## PART IV: CASE AND AGREEMENT

### 7. Case and Agreement.

#### 7.1. Absolutive subjects

Boeckx (2003): LDA across restructuring infinitives. Restructuring infinitives as VPs unable to check the case of the inner object:

(71) [... **Aux**<sub>[uAgr]</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> v<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> V<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> **DP**<sub>[Case]</sub> V<sup>0</sup> ]]]]

Given that Basque is an ergative-absolutive language, where absolutive case is checked inside vP (see Laka, 2000) the option represented in (2) makes a clear prediction: we should be able to find LDA (and long-distance case-checking) with absolutive subjects. But this is not the case. Consider the following contrast:

- (72) a. [ **liburuak** irakurtzea] gustatzen zaizkit  
books-Abs-pl read-inf-D like-hab Aux[**3plAbs**-1sgDat]  
“I like to read books”
- b. [**Haurrak** geldi egotea] gustatzen \*zaizkit  
children-Abs quiet be-inf-D like-hab Aux[**3plAbs**-1sgDat]  
“I like the children to be quiet”

In (72a) LDA with the inner object is possible. Assume that this follows from the ability of the matrix auxiliary to reach into it. Then, it is not clear why the same thing is not possible in (72b), with another absolutive DP. The contrast follows straightforwardly if (72b) is a CP, with a person feature in T which licenses an overt subject. CP being a strong phase, the matrix auxiliary would not be able to reach into the DP.

The contrast between the (a) and (b) cases also raises an issue concerning Case. We have seen Basque as paradigmatic instance of biunivocal Case/Agreement relation. The contrast above shows that agreement with the matrix auxiliary is effected with a DP that has its own Case checked. In other words, that the domain of Case checking and the domain of agreement are two different domains.

#### 7.2. Dative Complements

- (73) Uko egin die [ **agindu horiek** betetzeari]  
refusal-Abs done aux [3sE-**3plID**-3sA] order those obey-Nom-D-Dat  
“He/she refused to obey those orders”

(73) presents a ditransitive predicate, whose arguments agree with the auxiliary. The Absolutive marker refers to the bare noun in the complex predicate *do refusal*. The auxiliary agrees in Case (Dative) with the nominalized clause, but the dative affix in the auxiliary is plural, showing that it also agrees in number (but not in Case) with the absolutive object. There is no possible source for the Case of the object in the matrix clause.

Basque LDA questions the notion of active Goal (Chomsky 2000, 2001) as a relevant notion for Agree. The conclusion is identical to the one reached by Bhatt (2005) in view of Hindi LDA. Rejection of the idea of an active Goal in Chomsky’s terms, forces us to rethink those cases in which it is useful (Bhatt 2005: 39):

- (74) a. \*John<sub>i</sub> is certain [ t<sub>i</sub> will win]  
b. \*John<sub>i</sub> to seem [ t<sub>i</sub> is intelligent]] would be surprising

Bhatt suggests that the requirement that the Goal be active (that is, has an unchecked Case feature) is operative for pied-piping/move, but not for Agree. This is a completely ad hoc solution.

## PARTV: CASE

Torrego and Pesetsky (2001, 2004): Nominative Case is an uninterpretable T feature in D. Accusative Case is a uninterpretable Aspect feature in D. If Case is an interpretable but displaced feature, why couldn't we envision the following parameter?

- (75) Language A:  
Case is non-interpretable T and Asp features in D
- Language B:  
Case is non-interpretable Person and Number features in F

In language B, Case is Agree. Language B would present the following properties:

### 8.1. Absence of freezing effects

- (76) a.  $T_{[Tense]} \dots DP_{[uTense]}$   
 b.  $F_{[uPerson/uNumber]} \dots DP_{[Person/Number]}$

The DP, which has interpretable person and feature probes, can be probed into more than once by different probes in each case.

### 8.2. Phase related valuation

In Language A, Case is a property of the DP, once it is eliminated, the motivation for a Case relation disappears. In Language B, this is not the case:

- (77)  $F_{[Number]} \dots F_{[Number]} \dots DP_{[Person/Number]}$

### 8.3. Licensing of DPs in the absence of F

The fact that the licensing of the DP does not depend on F allows phenomena of the following sort:

- (78) PCC obviation by elimination of F (Ormazabal, 1998; Rezac, 2006)

Jonek ni Mireni aurkeztu nau  
 Jonterg me-abs Miren-dat introduced aux[1sA-3sE]  
 "Jon introduced me to Miren"

- (79) Non-agreeing arguments (Etxepare, forthcoming)

Ni gauza asko ikusia naiz  
 Me-abs thing many seen aux[1sA]  
 "I have seen many things"  
 (lit. I am seen many things)

- (80) Agreement with weak quantifiers (Etxeberria and Etxepare, 2009)

a. Ikasle asko etorri da/dira gaur  
 Student many-abs come Aux[3sA]/[3plA] today  
 "Many students came today"

b. Ikasle askok ez du/dute hori maite  
 student many-erg neg aux[3sA-3plE]/[3sA-3plE] that-abs like  
 "Many students do not like that"

c.  $[_{Measure\ Phrases}\ ikasle\ asko]$

### 8.4. Displacement phenomena

Rezac (2003):

- (81) a. Nik Jon ikusi dut  
 I-erg Jon-abs seen aux[3sA-1sE]  
 "I have seen Jon"

b. Nik Jon ikusi n-u-en  
 I-erg Jon-abs seen aux[1sA-3sE-Past]  
 "I saw Jon"

- (82) a.  $[DP_{V[uPerson]} [\dots DP_{[Number]\dots}]]$

b.  $[DP_{[Person]} V_{[uPerson]} [\dots DP_{[Number]\dots}]]$

### Some References

Anagnostopoulou, E., 2003, *The Syntax of Ditransitives. Evidence from Clitics*. Studies in Generative Grammar 54. Mouton de Gruyter.

Arregi, K. and G. Molina-Azaola, 2004, "Restructuring in Basque and the Theory of Agreement" In G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds) *WCCFL 23 Proceedings*. MA: Cascadia Press. 101-114.

Artiagoitia, Xabier, 1994, "Verbal Projections in Basque and Minimal Structure" ASJU XXVIII-2: 341-504.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2002, "The functional structure of Basque NPs" In X. Artiagoitia et al. (eds.) *Erramu Boneta: A Festschrift for Rudolf de Rijk*. Gasteiz: Arabako Fori Aldundia-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. 73-90.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2003, "Subordination" In Jose Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 634-752.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, "Izen Sintagmaren Birziklatzea: Izen Sintagmatik Izen Sintagmaren inguruko Funtzio-Burueta" In Pablo Albizu eta Beatriz Fernandez (eds.) *Euskal Gramatika XXI. Mendearen Atarian: Arazo Zaharrak, Azterbide Berriak*. Gasteiz: Arabako Foru Aldundia-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. 13-38.

Baker, M., 2003, *Lexical Categories*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Baker, M. (2008) *Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Bhatt, Rajesh, 2005, "Long Distance Agreement in Hindi-Urdu" NLLT 23: 757-807.

Bobaljik, J. and S. Wurmbrandt, 2005, "The Domain of Agreement" NLLT 23. 809-865.

Boeckx, C., 2003, "Intricacies of Icelandic Agreement" Ms. University of Maryland.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2003, "Long Distance Agreement in Hindi: Some Theoretical Implications" Studia Linguistica, 23-36.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, "Conditions on Agreement in Japanese" NLLT 22: 453-480.

Branigan, P. and M. McKenzie, 2002, "Altruism, A-bar Movement, and Object Agreement in Innu-aimûn" LI 33-3: 385-408.

Bruening, B., 2001, *Syntax at the Edge*, MIT Ph.D. Dissertation.

Butler, J., 2004, *Phase Structure, Phrase Structure and Quantification*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of York.

Chomsky, N., 1995, *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2000, "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework" In Roger Martin and Juan Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step: Papers in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, MIT Press: 89-147.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2001, "Derivation by Phase" in Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press: 1-52.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy" In Adriana Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*. Vol 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chung, S., 2004, "Restructuring and Verb Initial Order in Chamorro" Syntax 7-3: 199-233.

Dechaine, R.-M., and Wiltschko, B., 2002 "Decomposing pronouns" LI 33: 409-442.

Den Dikken, M., 2004 "Agreement and Clause Union" In Katalin E. Kiss and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds) *Verb Clusters. A study of Hungarian, German and Dutch*. Linguistik Aktuell 69. John Benjamins. 445-499.

Elordieta, A., 2001, *Constituent Permutation and Word Order in Basque*. Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University. HIL Publications.

Etxeberria, U., 2005, *Quantification and Domain Restriction in Basque*. Doctoral Dissertation Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea-University of the Basque Country.

Etxepare, R., 2003a, "Urruneko komunztadura eta menpeko infinitiboak euskaraz" Lapurdum VIII: 167-206.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2003b, "Valency and Argument Structure in the Basque Verb" In Jose Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 363-425.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2003c, "Negation" In Jose Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds), 516-563.

Etxepare, R. and J. Ortiz de Urbina, 2003d, "Focalization" In Jose Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds), 459-515.

Etxepare, Ricardo (2006) "Long Distance Number Agreement in Substandard Basque" In Joseba Lakarra et alii (eds) *In honor of Larry Trask*. ASJU supplements. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.

Etxepare, Ricardo and Urtzi Etxeberria (2009) "Measure and Counting in Basque" In Blanca Urgell et alii (eds) *Proceedings of the Mitxelena Chair*.

Fernandez, B., 1997, *Egiturazko Kasuaren Erkaketa Euskaraz*. Doctoral Dissertation. Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea-University of the Basque Country.

Fernandez, B. 2004, "*Gustatzen nau gustatzen dizu: aditz laguntzaile eta komuntzadura bitxiak perpaus ez-akusatiboetan*" In Albizu, Pablo and Beatriz Fernandez (eds). 87-112.

Goenaga, P., 1984, *Euskal Sintaxia: Konplementazioa eta Nominalizazioa*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea-University of the Basque Country.

Gueron, J. and J. Lecarme (eds) *The Syntax of Time*. Current Studies in Linguistics 37. MA:MIT Press.

Haddican, Bill, 2001, "Basque Functional Heads" *Linguistics in the Big Apple: Working Papers in Linguistics*. New York University.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2005, *Aspects of Language Variation and Change in Contemporary Basque*. Doctoral Dissertation, New York University.

Hornstein, N., 1999, "Movement and Control" *LJ* 30: 679-708.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2001, *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*, Oxford: Blackwell.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2003, "On Control" In Randall Hendrick (ed.) *Minimalist Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell. 6-81.

Hualde, J. I. and J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) *A Grammar of Basque*, Mouton Grammar Library 26, Mouton de Gruyter.

Kayne, R., 1994, *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press.

Laka, Itziar, 1993, "Unergatives that assign ergative, unaccusatives that assign accusative" In J. Bobaljik and C. Phillips (eds.) *Papers on Case and Agreement I*, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 18: 149-172.

Landau, Idan, 1999, *On Control*, MIT Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics.

Lecarme, Jacqueline, 2004, "Tense in Nominals" In J. Gueron and J. Lecarme (eds).

Mahajan, Anoop, 1989, "On agreement and agreement phrases" *MITWPL* 10.

McGinnis, Martha, 1998, *Locality in A-Movement*. Doctoral Dissertation MIT.

Martin, Roger, 1996, *A Minimalist Theory of PRO and Control*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Ormazabal, Javier, 1995, *The Syntax of Complementation: On The Connection Between Syntactic Structure and Selection*, University of Connecticut Ph.D. Dissertation.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1998, "A Conspiracy Theory of Case and Agreement" In Roger Martin and Juan Uriagereka (eds) *Step by Step*. MIT Press.

\_\_\_\_\_, J. and Juan Romero, 2001, "Agreement Restrictions" Ms., University of the Basque Country-Universidad de Alcala.

Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1989, *Parameters in the Syntax of Basque*. Kluwer.

Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego, 2004, "Tense, Aspect and the Nature of Syntactic Categories" In Jacqueline Guéron and Jacqueline Lecarme (eds.).

Polinsky, M., 2003, "Non-Canonical Agreement is Canonical" *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101:2, 279-312.

\_\_\_\_\_, and E. Potsdam, 2001, "Long Distance Agreement and Topic in Tsez" *NLLT* 19: 583-646.

Preminger, O. (2009) "Breaking agreements" Ms. MIT

Rezac, M., 2003, "The fine structure of cyclic Agree" Syntax 6:2, 156-182.

San Martin, I., 2001, *On Subordination and the Distribution of PRO*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland.

San Martin, I. and J. Uriagereka, 2002, "Infinitival Complementation in Basque" in Xabier Artiagoitia et al (eds.).

Svenonius, Peter, 2004, "On the edge" In David Adger, Cecile de Cat and George Tsoulas (eds) *Peripheries. Syntactic Edges and Their Effects*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. 259-288.

Sigurdsson, H. Á., 1996, "Icelandic Finite Verb Agreement" Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 57, 1-46.

Wurmbrandt, S., 1998, *Infinitives*, MIT Ph.D. Dissertation.

Zagona, K. (2003) "Tense and Anaphora" In Andrew Barss (ed.) *Anaphora*. Blackwell,