Ergative Displacement: Cyclic expansion of search-space
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1 Introduction: The phenomenon and the theory

Canonically, the person and number of the absolutive S/O control the PX and PL morphology on the Basque agreement complex, exponents by hypothesis of the [participant] and [number] probes of v. (1)a-(1)b. When absolutive S/O has no [participant] features, a default Tense/Mood-conditioned morphology appears in the PX position, and in certain Tense/Mood contexts this knows no exceptions, (1)c. In others, a [participant] ergative A, that is a 1st/2nd person, anomalously controls the PX morphology, just in case absolutive O cannot control it, that is when the latter is 3rd person, (1)d. This is *ergative displacement* or ED, (2).

(1)  
a. Berakj i  gu j  gj-a-itj-u  "she has us"  
    he.ERG  us.ABS  1'-TM-PL-vhave
b. Berakj i  gu j  gj-in-tj-u-en  "he had us"  
    he.ERG  us.ABS  1'-TM-PL-vhave-PT
c. Gukj i  hura/haiekj  d-∅/itj-u-guj  "we have it/Them"  
    we.ERG  it/them.ABS  X-(PL)-vhave-1'
d. Gukj i  hura/haiekj  g-en(∅/itj)-u-en  "we had it/Them"  
    we.ERG  it/them.ABS  1'-TM-(PL)-vhave-PT

(2)  
Ergative Displacement (ED): In 1/2>(X+>3) combinations, 1/2.A ergative controls the PX agreement morphology that in other contexts is controlled by 1/2.S/O absolutive.  
Tense Condition: ED only occurs in certain Tense/Mood contexts, characterizable as non-present (or subset of such contexts in some dialects).  
NB: ED does not affect Case/case or PL morphology; and it does not in itself affect SX morphology either, that is ED is independent of whether 1/2.A remains coded or not by the SX system in addition to the PX system (C4:DBL).

The phenomenon is *agreement displacement*. It does not affect case, so A remains ergative and O absolutive. Looked at more closely still, it does not seem to affect the Case-assignment mechanism itself either: there are two indications that T Agrees with A, one coming from an overt reflex of T-A number Agree (the morpheme *en* [TM] in (1)d, XN), and one coming from auxiliary selection, which selects the same auxiliary with or without ED (Laka 1993:54), arguably one sensitive to the presence of T-Agree/ergative assignment (Rebuschi 1983, Albizú 2000, 2002).  
It does not, furthermore, affect any syntactic or semantic binding/scope property that can be tested. These are few, because the contexts where ED happens are limited: A has to be 1st/2nd person. Still, one can see that A.ERG remains the antecedent of the anaphor *bere buru* with or without ED: see Laka (1993:54, Albizú and Eguren 2000:8). I will elaborate this point here at length, because it is an important cornerstone of the syntactic approach to ergative displacement and agreement displacement in general, and contrasts with semantic approaches that posit that the agreement controller in such contexts occupies a higher syntactic position than the other core argument (e.g. Camie and Jelinek 2005, Rice and Saxon 2002, Dechaine 2001, Bruening 2001; see discussion of Algonquian below).  
The anaphor involved looks like a SELF/bodypart anaphor, whose binding conditions in general are discussed in Reinhart and Reuland (1991), Reuland and Reinhart (1995), Reuland
(2005a): in *bere buru*, *buru* means 'head, self', and *bere* is a possessive pronoun whose φ-feature vary with that of the binder. Elordieta (2001:78-82) argues that *bere buru* is a clause-bounded, not subject-oriented anaphor that unambiguously diagnoses $A > (O' >) O (> PP)$ $A$-position c-command in (di)transitives, and whose binding is not fed by local scrambling (unlike scope) or by Ā-movement (C3). The anaphor has no problem being in say a dative bound by an absolutive, as in (3). It also has no a priori problem being an ergative. The most famous paradigm occurs with object-experiencer psych-verbs, as in (4), where either the experiencer or the object may be the anaphor. The constructions are discussed particularly by Antaigoiti (2000:110, 2003), Oyharçabal (2003), G:§4.9.3. One possibility is that the ergative anaphor is bound because object experiencer psych-verbs have a structure where the theme $A$-moves over the experiencer so there is a level of representation where the experiencer c-commands the theme (Belletti and Rizzi 1988, arguing from *Pictures of himself, frighten John* but also *Himself, frightens John*, unlike in Basque). However, subsequent research has suggested that the experiencer is indeed base-generated higher than the theme (see particularly Pesetsky 1995). At the same time such "backward binding" has been shown to be more general in causatives and argued to fall under logophora (Zribi-Hertz 1989, Pollard and Sag 1992, Reinhart and Reuland 1993; for Basque, Oyharçabal 2003). It is an independent fact about the *bere buru* anaphor, as about English SELF anaphora, that in contexts where there is no potential binder they do have an interpretation meaning something like 'X's self, X': for Basque see G:4.2.9.1 and Oyharçabal (2003).

(3) Peioi bere bura arekin mintzo da
Peio-ABS his head.with talking X-√1V
Peio is talking to himself. (Rebuschi 1993:00, cf. Elordieta 2001:82)

(4) a. Nire buruak izutu n1-a-u proj.
my head.ERG frightened 1-TM-√2V me.ABS
I frightened myself (psychological, fear not controlled)
b. Nire burua izutu d-u-ti proj.
my head.ABS frightened X-√2V-1 me.ERG
I frightened myself (agentive) (Oyharçabal 2003; my annotations)

With this in place, replicating the results reached by Laka (1993) and Albizu and Eguren (2000) cited earlier, it is significant that in both the present, which admits no ED, and in the past, which has ED in 1/2>3 combinations only, the *bere buru* anaphor can be bound by A in O but not by O in A. The result is clear: only $A > O$ binding is available, never $O > A$. The interpretation depends on whether one expects the *bere buru* anaphor binding to be fed by A-movement; SELF-anaphor binding in English is, but the evidence is so far lacking in Basque, unless object experiencer psych-verbs are so interpreted.

(5) a. *Geure buru-ak/ekikusi g-a-iij-u-(ztei) proj.
our head/heads.ERG seen 1'-TM-PL-√ZV-PL' we.ABS
b. √Geure buruaikusi d-iij-u-gui (ispiluan) proj.
our heads.ABS seen X-PL-√2V-1' mirror.D.in we.ERG
We saw ourselves. (UE)

Raising past an experienter to bind *bere buru* is out with verbs like iruditu 'seem', either raising to ergative (C3) or to absolutive (C5), for different reasons, so one cannot replicate Kate seems to herself to be tired.
The same conclusion about the inertness of ED to binding can be reached from the binding of the reciprocal anaphors *bata beste* and *elkar*. Less is known about the conditions on these elements (see G.4.9.1, 4.9.3, Rebuschi 1993, Artiagoitia 2000:00, Oyarzabal 2003). However, they can at any rate be fed by A-scrambling, like quantifier binding: Elordieta (2001) argues that the agreeing dative in Basque always originates above the object of ditransitives, and thus (7) shows that A-scrambling of the object over it lets it bind the dative (criterial Ā-movement does not feed any of such binding).

(7)  
We.ERG girls.ABS each other.DAT shown X-√3V-PL-3-1'
We have shown the girls to each other. (Rebuschi 1993, ex. 37)

In the following examples, A can bind such a reciprocal in O, but never vice versa, regardless of ED. So ED again is inert for binding relations. For this speaker *elkar* is a learned form; *bata* *bestea* is normal, and the ergative is *batak beste*a under the circumstances where such an ergative is independently possible (op.cit.).

(8)  
a. Elkar/batak beste /i ku sui d-u-gui kalean  
each.other.ABS seen X-√2V-1' street.D.on we.ERG
b. *Batak beste/*elkar /i ku sui g-i-ti-u-(zte) kalean  
each.other.ABS seen 1-TM-PL-√2V-(PL') street.D.on we.ABS
We see each other on the street. (UE)

(9)  
a. Elkar/batak beste /i ku sui g-en-u-en kalean  
each.other.ABS seen 1-TM-√2V-PT street.D.on we.ERG
b. *Batak beste/elkar /i ku sui g-in-ti-u-(zte)-n kalean.  
each.other.ABS seen 1-TM-PL-√2V-(PL')-PT street.D.on we.ABS
We saw each other on the street. (UE)

The final point is subtler. One argument that has been given for A-movement in agreement displacement contexts is the following, developed for Algonquian (McGinnis 1998b): when it is O rather than A that controls the relevant agreement, so-called "inverse contexts", it prevents A from undergoing cross-clausal Agree/A-movement ("raising-to-object"). This follows by locality if it has an A-position above it. In Basque, inverse contexts are non-ED contexts, where O controls agreement, and the process is cross-clausal copy raising discussed in C1. Examples given in Artiagoitia (2001ab), C1, contain 3rd person O if A undergoes this process; but (10) shows a 1st/2nd person O controlling PX/PL agreement does not impede A's copy raising. (Other tests are blocked by restriction of copy-raising to 3rd persons).
Finally, ED does not necessarily affect the agreement morphology that A.ERG would normally control: beside the $g$-$en$-$it$-$u$-$en$ [1'-TM-(PL)-√-PT] of (1)d, $g$-$en$-$it$-$u$-$gu$ exists in some dialects, keeping the SX $gu$ controlled by 1.PL A.ERG in (1)c, and there is every indication that the variation between the two is a matter of spell-out or late reduction of multiple coding of φ-features (C4:DBL). Descriptively, I refer to such forms as $gen(it)ugun$ as ED + ERG doubling.

ED is a point of remarkable stability in the Basque dialects. The earliest Basque sources present it essentially as it is in contemporary dialects: the forms $ba$-$z$-$e$-$n$-$du$ [if-2-TM-have] ‘if you had it’, from the year 1110, shows ED in expressing 2.R.SG A as the prefix $z$-; in many dialects the contemporary equivalent would be $bazendu$. Across the contemporary dialects, there is some ED loss, or at least apparent ED loss, giving mixed paradigms where ED as described above has arbitrary gaps (XN); but if ED loss is a striking phenomenon, it is so because it stands in contrast to the remarkable stability of ED in most dialects. There is also some extension outside the Tense Condition contexts (XN), but it is virtually negligible.

The present chapter develops the theory of ED as search-space expansion, one that can be encapsulated as follows: if the [participant] probe of $v$ finds no match in the object constructed by Merging $v$ with its complement, it must and can wait until A is added to the structure, at which point it falls into its search space and $v$-A Agree for [participant] becomes possible. Like most recent proposals for a syntactic account of ED, it starts from Laka’s (1993) emphasis on the correlation between ED and the unavailability of absolutive to control [participant] agreement that it canonically does. It contrasts not only with pre-Laka thematic approaches, but also with recent investigation of ED-like phenomena in other languages using purely morphological devices (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 1997, 2001 Bobaljik 2000); a comparison of these with the syntactic approaches (XN) gets at the heart of the difference between the leading ideas. For ED is not parochial to Basque; phenomena with the same distribution in terms of φ-feature combination are present in many other languages, and the recurrence of ED is important in formulating a theoretical account, in separating the essential (1/2>3 combinations, for example) from the incidental, the parochial (the Tense Condition). At the same time, the Basque corpus of this work permits an investigation of the theoretical proposal in remarkable detail, and in turn, the inquiry will discuss many patterns in Basque dialects that have never been systematically investigated, such as the variation of theme markers according to the plurality of A.ERG in ED.

In XN, I present ED in a more leisurely way by examining the theoretical approach to it that forms the backbone of my proposal, that of Laka (1993), as well as some of the alternatives. Such a course exposes the generalizations and the issues that have been raised, and that must be accounted for. XN presents in detail my own proposal. This starts from the theory of ED for Basque in Rezac (2003), and of ED cross-linguistically in Béjar and Rezac (2004). The empirical scope of the present work allows a far greater range of data to be taken into account and to be accounted for, ED as it is present in the Basque dialects of the corpus, and at the same time to...
address many general theoretical issues that have been addressed but briefly: the scope of ED (can \( \phi \)-sets other than A control it?), the theoretical nature of search-space expansion and its empirical correlates in Basque, the difference between person and number, what happens to Agree between T and A in ED, the nature of the Tense Condition. Most of the theoretical contribution of this chapter is contained here, and the following two sections address rather two empirical phenomena in Basque that are closely tied to ED. XN is a lengthy overview of the nature of theme markers in the dialects of the corpus, a recalcitrant and incredibly varied component of Basque verbal morphology whose conditioning appears to be nearly any property in the agreement complex, including some that yield crucial evidence about ED and about agreement in general. This brings the chapter to a point where most of what I have to contribute concludes, and such a conclusion ensues in XN, along with an overview of what very little is known about the origin of ED, and of the fascinating glimpses in the theories of R. Lafon and R. Gómez of what may have been.

APPENDIX ED-LOSS treats the loss of ED in the corpus: it is a necessary ingredient of the work because any theory of ED must address partial loss of ED and provide the devices to deal with it, yet it it an appendix because I am not convinced that ED loss really happens (rather than appearing to happen in the spell-out), and because if it does happen, the theoretical tools to deal with are provided and justified in C3, for the DD phenomenon where the corpus of attested variation discussed is virtually exhaustive with respect to that phenomenon.

2 The hypothesis space

I will assume from the outset that the mapping of argument structure to syntactic structure is not affected by ED; in other words, it is not a grammatical function changing process. Laka (1993:54-6) presents the seminal and to my mind largely conclusive arguments against such approaches (Heath's 1976 antipassive analysis, Ortiz de Urbina's 1989 split ergativity analysis). The strongest are the following:

(i) ED does not affect number agreement: the displacement is partial, for person only. This is difficult to capture if ED and non-ED constructions differ in argument or functional structure. Number agreement indicates that ED includes a non-ED structure as part of its derivation.
(ii) ED does not change hierarchical A/O relations.
(iii) ED does not affect Case-morphology (see above).

Most approaches follow the intuition that ED occurs to provide a controller for the canonically ABS-controlled PX morphology when ABS cannot do so, and furthermore that there is some connection between the fact that ED affects PX, and the existence of default morphology for and only for PX. Perhaps the earliest among those to articulated this, Azkue, says, "Es posible que esta gran anomalía [ED -MR] sea producto de lo que en Física llamamos atracción del vacío." (II:556/§791) From this starting point, one may develop either a syntactic or morphological approach; in this section.

Within generative syntax, the classical analysis of ED capitalizing on this is that of Laka (1993). ED is \( X^0 \)-movement within the agreement complex. The movement is an instance of Move \( \alpha \) and subject to the regular conditions on Move \( \alpha \) grouped under the Empty Category Principle (ECP). Thus, Laka's approach belongs squarely among the syntactic approaches. However, the application of Move \( \alpha \) that creates ED takes place in the mapping from S-structure
to PF, and that conditions the "information" available to the ECP. Following Aoun, Hornstein, Lightfoot, and Weinberg's (1987) proposal, ECP requires head government by a phonologically overt head at PF, and antecedent government at LF, the latter of which never sees ED (p. 58f.). This permits Laka to provide an elegant account of the Tense Condition, one that I believe is wrong (XN), precisely because of which it is essential in understanding the condition.

The descriptive generalization that Laka defends for ED is the following:

(11) Ergative Displacement: If an inflected form has:
   (1) An empty initial A[BS]-head
   (2) An ergative clitic
   (3) An overt [head in the T-adjointed agreement complex].
   The ergative clitic surfaces in the initial ABS position. (Laka 1993:57)

Laka proposes the following structure for the Basque agreement complex in T, where + marks (left) head-adjunction created by regular bottom-up move α (p. 41ff.), the ABS, DAT, and ERG agreement markers originate as clitics adjoined to I, Mood, and T respectively (p. 38-40), and the lowest of the heads in the complex, I, takes [AspP … [VP … ]] as complement:

(12) [I ABS+I+ √]+[Mood DAT+Mood]+[ERG+T] (cf. Laka 1993:38f.)

ED now works as follows:

(13) ED mechanics in Laka (1993)
   (i) The ABS clitic is subject to a language-specific constraint that prevents it from being realized as ∅ at PF (p. 61f.), distinct from not being realized (p. 51, 62n29). Both Laka (p. 62n30), and for similar data in Yimas, Phillips (1993), suggest some link to the EPP; in Noyer's (1992) theory, PX would be an obligatory position of exponence at Autonomous Morphological Structure.
   (ii) If there is an ERG morpheme, it lowers into the ABS position by a regular application of Move α (p. 56ff.). This derives both ED and the disappearance of canonical SX agreement.
   (iii) By the ECP, the trace of ERG must end up head-governed at S-structure by an overt head in, or raised from Mod to, T. This derives the Tense Condition.
   (iv) If there is no such heads, Move α fails, and lexical insertion (p. 60) applies to supply default morphology to the ABS slot, one that is conditioned by the head of the structure (p. 46ff.).
   (v) Move α (ED) pre-empts lexical insertion by being more economical (p. 61-2).
   (vi) Phonological matrices are assigned at PF. Therefore, a displaced ERG clitic is spelled-out using ABS morphology, being now in the ABS position (p. 62ff.). The canonical form taken by an ERG clitic is such because of its configurational relationship to T, not because it contains [ERG] feature (p. 63); when it lowers to ABS, it is spelled out differently.

There is great significance to point (vi), though it involves anachronistic reasoning. In terms of distinctions introduced much later (see CO), Laka is giving arguments that ED is pure φ-feature displacement of the type that φ-Agree is responsible for, rather than syntactic X^0-, movement or morphological movement (Merger). Case is not carried along by the the clitic that lowers from ERG to ABS. That follows automatically if ED is non-canonical valuation of a φ-probe, and not if it is movement of an X^0 terminal in the syntax that comes from the ergative DP,
since such \(X^0\)'s pied-pipe case-morphology, as in clitic movement. Movement after spell-out, via Merger in DM, would displace actual phonological matrices; it has been invoked for agreement displacement phenomena (see C4:DBL; most relevantly for ED by Halle and Hale 1997, discussed by Bobaljik 2000), but it is clearly incorrect here (synchronically).

A further essential ingredient of Laka's proposal is that 3\(^{rd}\) person is syntactically underspecified, which is different from being spelled out by a null morpheme:

\[(14) \ldots\] the facts argue in favor of a distinction between phonologically null morphemes and empty nodes. Non-overt morphemes are those which have a non-overt feature matrix but are phonologically empty\[\ldots\] These elements are as active as overt morphemes. Empty nodes have empty feature matrices; third person absolutive and ergative clitics are instances of this class. (Laka 1993:52).

This means that a 3\(^{rd}\) person ERG clitic cannot lower in the syntax by move \(\alpha\) to ABS, since its features are not there (p. 56f.).\(^2\)

Laka's approach stands as a model of syntactic approach in virtually reducing ED to independent principles, and it achieves an admirable mix of detailed empirical coverage and elegance. The principles have changed, and I submit that they have changed for the better. The distinction between \(\phi\)-Agree and \(X^0\)-movement (C0) explains in a way not available before why ED should obey syntactic conditions, yet why it should not pied-pipe Case, and why it should have no consequences for the Binding Theory; clitic movement differs on both these points (e.g. Zubizarreta 1998 for Spanish clitics). The conditions on what moves where, given in the account that follows in terms of locality/cyclicity and underspecification, fare at least as well. On the other hand, the idea of head-government at PF is unavailable, in general and particularly if ED is \(\phi\)-Agree; and I will argue in XN that indeed the generalization based on it is incorrect. Indeed, the deployment of the ECP here is an example of what minimalism seeks to avoid, the deployment of a technology to unify phenomena that the unification of does not help in understanding. There is little in the Tense Condition on ED (PF head-government use of the ECP) that resembles the locality requirements on \(wh\)-movement (LF antecedent-government).

There are also properties of ED that are left untouched by the proposal, all of which will be addressed in what follows:

\[(15) \text{ Gaps in Laka's (1993) account of ED} \]

(i) From the structure in figure (12), it is evident that DAT-to-ABS lowering should be at least possible, and by locality of movement (anachronistic for the framework of Chomsky 1989) pre-empt ERG lowering.\(^3\)

\(^2\) A different consequence is that a 3\(^{rd}\) person ERG clitic is not be visible for interference with the Mood-conditioned imperative default, unlike 1\(^{st}\)/2\(^{nd}\) person clitics (p. 50-2); see XN.

\(^3\) There is a different way of putting this that reveals it is really a part of Laka's account, rather than a gap. The T-head is the highest in Laka's structure, so can be singled out (admittedly by a stipulation) as special on that basis, and that might make it the required governing head (Javier Ormazabal, p.c.). At the same time, the system puts into relief the ergative -Tense relationship: either the ergative lower under the government of Tense (filled by tense morphology or by Mood raised to it), or Tense/Mood condition the default PX (Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, p.c.). This must be set against the fact that factors such as the presence of an applicative head also condition default PX (APPENDIX BM), so Tense does not really end up being special.
(ii) In considering examples where O.ABS controls PX, and where A.ERG with the same features does, as in (1)b vs. (1)d, one sees a difference in the theme marker, *in* vs. *en* respectively. This must be accounted for.

(iii) ED does not affect number agreement. This is something Laka does address at length (p. 35-7), and here she makes a suggestion that ends up as one of the bases of the account I will propose: "the facts from Basque morphology appear to support a theory of agreement where person and number are separate entities (Shlonsky 1989)." (p. 37)

Syntactic approaches that follow in the line of Laka's analysis are Fernández and Albizu [F&A] (2000) and Rezac [R] (2003); they contain a common core that largely derives Laka (1993), and shared and independent innovations. Both are situated within a somewhat different view of clause structure and adopted here in C1: $v$ (for F&A, $V$) here is $V$ and then raises to $v$, and Agree is checking.

Assumptions:
(i) 3rd person is not represented as a feature in the syntax, yet singular is.
(ii) Person and number agreement occur separately.

Mechanics:
(i) $v$ Agrees with and assigns ABS to O/S; if O/S is 3rd person, it Agrees only for number. (For F&A, $v$ here is $V$ and then raises to $v$, and Agree is checking.)
(ii) $v$ (F&A's V+$v$) Agrees with [Spec, $vP$] if it still has an unvalued person feature.
(iii) T Agrees with A in [Spec, $vP$] for features that A still has not Agreed for: all in non-ED contexts, number in ED contexts. T-A Agree leads to ERG assignment.

Empirically, the approaches differ in the feature content of T, discussed in XN. They differ in their theoretical goals as well. F&A's point is to establish the potential separation of agreement and Case, seen in $v$ agreeing for person with the ergative A. R's point is to derive the preference of $v$ Agree with O to Agree with A for person from cyclicity, and the consequences of Agree between $v$ and A for [participant] only for Case assignment. F&A and R do not address in depth many of the points treated by Laka, nor some of the lacunae she left: both partially and somewhat inconclusively address the Tense Condition and default PX; F&A raise cases where ED is doubled by the regular SX morphology of the ergative, R raises the invisibility of the dative; theme markers are not addressed by either work. I return to these points in their place.

The alternative to a syntactic analysis of agreement displacement is a morphological one. The seminal proposal here is to be found in Bobaljik and Wurmbrand's (1997, 2001) and Bobaljik's (2000) analysis of Itelmen, and the resemblance of the Itelmen phenomenon to Basque ED is stunning. I discuss the data and their analysis in XN, and a comparison of syntactic with morphological approaches is kept to there. Morphological analyses for Basque ED are to be found in Fernández (1999) in the DM, Albizu and Eguren (2000) in OT, and Albizu (2002) in DM again. The latter two works represent a considerable advancement in terms of detail, and I raise their insights in their place, but I do not review them here. To give a flavour of the mode of analysis: Albizu (2002) explores impoverishment (feature deletion) for ED. The ergative agreement morpheme comes with a feature matrix that distinguishes ergative case from other cases, [CASE, +MARK, -OBL, +ARG], which is pruned to [CASE] in the suitable context of other
features in the agreement complex such 3rd person absolutive past. Vocabulary entries and insertion principles ensure that a person feature associated with [CASE] only is spelled out as PX.

In general terms, it seems to me that a crucial claim of a morphological analysis is that agreement displacement is no different than any other morphological phenomenon that are implemented by the same mechanism as posited for it, such as allomorphy or impoverishment. These are however tools of considerable power, and they cannot be limited in such a way as to account for what seem to be some of the key properties of ED, that is sensitivity of anomalous PX control by 1st/2nd person A to O being 3rd person, rather than 1st/2nd, or indeed rather than to a heterogenous set of environments such as 1>2.PL. Indeed, as the discussion of Itelmen raises, there are agreement displacement phenomena that have precisely such properties, and they should be handled in morphological terms (Bobaljik and Branigan’s forthcoming treatment of Chukchi, Wiltschko’s 2003 of Halkomelem Salish). So the question comes down to the reality of ED being as ED is: is it a fact of synchronic significance that the ED context is 1/2>3, or is this synchronically as arbitrary as an arbitrary set of contexts such as 1>2.PL would be? The remarkable coherence and cross-linguistic recurrence of ED, in the form where 1/2.A controls morphology normally reserved for S/O in 1/2>3 contexts, suggests the former; yet it does not establish it, for there may be a diachronic motivation (XN), and ED-like systems do seem to give rise to more arbitrary systems (XN).

At this point, it seems to me that what can and must be done is to fully explore each alternative on a large-enough data set, and see how the theories stack up. It is to contribute to this goal, by exploring a syntactic account, that I seek to do in this chapter.

3 ED as cyclic expansion of search-space

3.1 The proposal: Split q-probe and cyclic expansion

The ED pattern is cross-linguistically wide spread, setting aside the Tense Condition, which is parochial to Basque. Béjar (2003) discusses it for Georgian, Karok, and Erza Mordivian, shown in TABLE; Itelmen is discussed at greater length in XN. In each case, there is a single position of exponence for [participant] agreement in a transitive construction, underlined, and A/O compete for its control according to the ED pattern in (17):

(17) ED pattern: O controls v’s [person] in X>1/2 contexts; A does in 1/2>3 (in non-present).

Unlike in Basque, in these languages the morphology of the prefix position differentiates whether A or O controls it: so in Georgian a 3>1 and 1>3 combination alike results in a morpheme for [1], but it is m in the first case and v in the second.

TABLE: Agreement displacement (Béjar and Rezac 2004)
The two tenets of the syntactic approach to ED in Basque both derive from Laka (1993); they are adopted by Fernández and Albizu (2001), Fernández (2001), Rezac (2003), Béjar and Rezac (2004), and here:

(18) Elements of Basque ED:
  a. **Person-Number separation**: Person and number enter into separate syntactic agreement, that is separate Agree relations. Therefore, the two can track different arguments, as in ED (Laka 1993:35ff., 55-6)
  b. **3rd person underspecification**: 3rd person is underspecified with respect to 1st/2nd person, so that which constitutes Agree of a probe with 1st/2nd person is not capable of occurring with 3rd person. (Laka 1993:45ff., 56-7)

The two ideas are distinct. The cross-linguistic ED pattern of alternation between O and A as controller of a position of exponence follows from the underspecification of 3rd person; the separation of person and number explains why number is not subject to this alternation. I will start with the former.

The ingredients of the syntactic account of ED proposed here were developed in C0. The first is the cyclic expansion of search-space. For a probe on v, the first domain of search for the establishment of Agree relations is its complement, because the v + complement unit is the first-
constructed syntactic object that contains $v$. Within this domain, any probe on $v$ attempts to find a matching goal in accordance with the minimal-search constraint on Agree. The specifier of \( vP \) is added after the complement, on a second cycle of the construction of the \( vP \). If, and only if, there remain at that point, on this second cycle, probes on $v$ that have not found a match on the first cycle, within the complement of $v$, do they search the new object, starting at the top, with the specifier. \( v-[\text{Spec, } vP] \) Agree may now be established.

The second ingredient is the feature-geometric approach to underspecification proposed in Béjar (2003). Here I will adopt the development of its interaction with the notions of Agree, matching, and valuation in Béjar and Rezac (2004) and reviewed in C0.\(^4\) For the discussion of Basque, not nearly all the details are necessary. The relevant idea underlying the coding of \( \phi \)-features by the \( \phi \)-feature geometry is that the relative underspecification of A with respect to B, here of 3\(^{rd}\) person with respect to 1\(^{st}/2^{nd}\) person, is given by the subset relation among sub-trees of the \( \phi \)-feature geometry. In Basque, 3\(^{rd}\) person lacks the feature [participant] and any of its dependants, while 1\(^{st}/2^{nd}\) person do have [participant] (C1, C3).

(19) a. 1\(^{st}/2^{nd}\) person in Basque b. 3\(^{rd}\) person in Basque

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{RE} \\
\pi \quad \text{individuation} \\
| \\
\text{local} \\
| \\
\text{participant} \\
(\ldots) \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{RE} \\
\pi \quad \text{individuation} \\
| \\
\text{(local)} \\
| \\
\end{array}
\]

In turn, the basic idea of the proposal that \( \phi \)-probes are subsets of the feature-geometry is that different \( \phi \)-probes are constituted by different bits of the \( \phi \)-feature geometry, which defines the

---

\(^4\) In Béjar and Rezac (2004), the approach to person features has the following desired properties:

(A) Individual person values are subsets of elements, segments, organized in a structure whose dependency relations determine possible sub-structures.

(B) Individual segments can match with separate goals, giving the possibility of matching partially with O and expanding to match fully with A.

(C) Valuation is distinct from matching, properly divorcing the ED pattern from valuation.

The mechanics, for reference purposes:

(i) \textit{Agree}

a. Each feature that seeks to Agree is distinguished by being active upon insertion into the derivation.

b. Agree for a feature \([F]\) upon matching with a goal \([F']\) copies \([F]\) and all features that entail \([F']\) to \([F]\); this copying constitutes valuing.

c. An active feature that is locally related to a non-active feature (that is, standing in the configuration created by copying under Agree) is no longer active.

(ii) \textit{Entail} is a reflexive relation: given the set-theoretic representations \(A', B'\) of feature structures \(A, B\) respectively, \(A\) entails \(B\) if and only if \(B'\) is a (possibly proper) subset of \(A'\).

(iii) \textit{Match Requirement}: for a probe feature \([F]\), some \([F']\) entailed by \([F]\) must match.

(iv) \textit{Case Filter}: a \(\phi\)-feature must be licensed by Agree of some feature \(F\) that entails it (\textit{entail} being reflexive).
distinctions to which they are sensitivity. In Basque, in ED contexts, the φ-probe of \( v \) is sensitive to the [participant] / non-[participant] distinction, so it has the content in \( [\pi \rightarrow \text{local} \rightarrow \text{participant}] \) (henceforth noted simply \([\text{part}]\)). In non-ED contexts, to which I return in XN, the φ-probe is as in English a bare \([\pi]\), so it is not sensitive to this distinction. In both cases, there is a separate [individuation] probe, which will be responsible for number agreement; however, the two probes are not grouped together into a single big φ-probe joined by a node such as [RE]. In Mohawk, the φ-probe contains further the dependant [speaker] of [participant], so it is sensitive to distinctions among 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) persons. Thus, in Basque any goal that contains the sub-tree \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local} \rightarrow \text{participant}] \) (1\(^{st}\) or 2\(^{nd}\) person ) fully satisfies the \([\text{part}]\) probe, and it will not seek for another goal. Any goal that has a smaller sub-tree not containing \([\text{part}]\), namely the 3\(^{rd}\) person, will value the probe indeed, permitting it to be deleted by LF, but it will leave it with the [participant] feature to continue striving to Agree if other goals are brought within its search-space. This happens precisely by the cyclic search-space expansion just discussed.

\begin{equation}
\phi\text{-probes of } v \text{ in Basque in ED contexts}
\end{equation}

\[
\{ \pi, \text{individuation} \} \quad v
\]

\[
\mid
\text{local}
\]

\[
\mid
\text{participant}
\]

Let us now combine the two ideas. The process may be seen in TABLE, representing the Agree mechanism for the data in TABLE, with certain simplifications that do not bear on the mechanics: only the PX is discussed here (the rest comes later), I keep to the singular, I set aside the feature [local], and I assume for simplicity that 2F is at least \([\pi-(\text{local})\text{-participant}]\), probably plus more, signaled as (X) (see C1).

**TABLE: PX agreement in EB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>2.SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>1-TM-(\sqrt{})-PT</td>
<td>2-TM-(\sqrt{})-PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{I saw her,})</td>
<td>(\text{Thou sawest her,})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>1-TM-(\sqrt{})-PT</td>
<td>2-TM-(\sqrt{})-PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{He saw me,})</td>
<td>(\text{Thou sawest me,})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.SG</td>
<td>1-TM-(\sqrt{})-PT</td>
<td>2-TM-(\sqrt{})-1-PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{He saw thee,})</td>
<td>(\text{I saw thee,})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE: Mechanics for PX Agree in EB**
On the first cycle of the construction of the vP, v Merges with its complement that contains some goal, S/O, and the φ-probe of v attempts to Agree with it. If this goal contains the feature [participant], the [part] probe of v is satisfied by Agree (unshaded cells); this is the case if the goal is 1st/2nd person. Valuation copies the features of the goal to the probe, they are spelled out to PF, and the probe will not be further active for Agree. If the goal lacks [participant], the [part] probe will still see it and Agree with it, because they share a common subset of the feature geometry, namely at least [π]. As with 1st/2nd person goals, the value of the 3rd person goal is copied to the probe. This suffices to allow the probe to delete by LF, because it has entered Agree. Yet, the goal and the value it yields have no correspondent to the [participant] feature of the φ-probe of v, which therefore remains active, and able to Agree. On the second cycle, a new potential goal is added in transitive constructions, A in [Spec, vP]. If, and only if, this goal contains [participant], the φ-probe of v can Agree with it (shaded cells). This "non-canonical" agreement of the [part] probe of v with A is ergative displacement, as normal as the "canonical" agreement with S/O. In this paradigm, the shaded-unshaded distinction, or the "direct" vs. "inverse" distinction of traditional terminology, correlates with overt morphology, the morpheme glossed TM in TABLE; I return to this.

The system is identical when one turns to one of the languages discussed in Béjar (2003), Béjar and Rezac (2004) where the person probe of v has a richer structure, such as Nishnaabemwin with the structure [π-(local)-participant-hearer]. In Nishnaabemwin, 1st person is further underspecified just as [π-(local)-participant], and the 2nd person is the more highly specified [π-(local)-participant-hearer]. Again, I keep to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person singular, and in the 3>3 combination to the obviative>proximate, eschewing [local]; see op.cit. for more discussion. The derivation for the data in TABLE is given in TABLE. Again, the unshaded cells are those where the O controls the probe for all the structure the probe has, and the shaded cells are those where there remains a segment of the probe to Agree with A, if A has the corresponding feature; again, there is a correlation with the "inverse" marker glossed INV that is discussed in op.cit.
TABLE: Singular paradigm for Nishnaabemwin (Béjar and Rezac 2004)

Core agreement small caps, theme suffix (not discussed here) underlined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>2.SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>w-see-įgw-n</td>
<td>3-see-3.INV-OBV</td>
<td>'That sees this.'</td>
<td>'I see him.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>N-see-į</td>
<td>1-see-3.INV</td>
<td>'He sees me.'</td>
<td>G-see-į</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.SG</td>
<td>G-see-į</td>
<td>2-see-3.INV</td>
<td>'He sees you.'</td>
<td>G-see-įm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE: Cyclic Agree for the Nishnaabemwin singular paradigm (Béjar and Rezac 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>2.SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part — part</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>part — part</td>
<td>hear — hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part — part</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>part — part</td>
<td>hear — hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.SG</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AGR O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
<td>π — π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part — part</td>
<td>part — part</td>
<td>hear — 2</td>
<td>hear — 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mechanics permits it to be seen that the mechanics of Basque and Nishnaabemwin is identical. The difference lies in that the latter has a richer probe than the former, making the distinction between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person (2\textsuperscript{nd} person more highly specified), in addition to the Basque distinction between participant and non-participant. This gives rise to a pattern more complex than ED, where the underlined element controls the relevant agreement: 1/2>3, 3>1/2, 1>2, 2>1. The point of Béjar and Rezac (2004) is that these are underlying identical patterns: in both, O, the first goal of the φ-probe of v, controls the probe if it is sufficiently rich to fully Agree for its specification, and only then can A Agree for whatever remains of something does.

In either scenario, there is a first step of φ-Agree between v and O/S, assigning it the v-related absolutive Case. The interaction of v-A Agree and Case is addressed in XN: there remains a stem of T-A Agree that gives A ergative. One possible extension of the mechanics would be to follow v-O Agree by A-movement of O, creating a higher specifier of v where O is over A. This construction, which can creates object shift O > A orders in Icelandic (Jonas 1996), can lead to O A-binding an anaphor in A, something not possible otherwise (McGinnis 1998b):
If such A-movement is a consequence of the valuation of the [π-local-participant] probe of \( v \), and O would have an A-position higher than A in all and only non-ED contexts, that is in all contexts where it values the [π-local-participant] probe of \( v \), regardless of whether A later moves higher or not. This apparently does not occur in Basque, since O has no more binding possibilities in non-ED contexts than in ED contexts, and inversely A in ED than in non-ED contexts, as discussed in XN. However, just such an A-movement has been convincingly argued for by McGinnis (1998a), Bruening (2001:113-117, 277-8) for Algonquian languages, which have a [π-local-participant-hearer] probe in the present system (Béjar 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2004). In all and only "inverse" contexts, where O is more specified than A on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person > 1\textsuperscript{st} person > proximate (local) > obviative hierarchy, it has an A-position higher than A (McGinnis's argument suggests that A further lacks a higher position above such a shift O). As can be seen, the result is trivially implemented, but it is not a necessary consequence of mechanics that yields the ED pattern and thus arguably its elaborations.

It is worth-while considering the logic of the resulting system in reverse, to see what features of it lead to the desired conclusions. The placement of the φ-probe on \( v \) is what makes S/O the first goal and A the second goal, given cyclic construction; it is an extension of the logic of placing the absolutive-assigning φ-probe on \( v \) in absolutive languages, so it finds (first) O rather than A. The choice of the φ-probe of \( v \) has being specified for [participant], more than simply [π] and less than [speaker], defines an equivalence class of matching goals containing all goals with the feature [participant]: 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} persons. Specification for a dependent of [participant] leads to greater sensitivity, discriminating among 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} persons, found in Algonquian and Mohawk; specification for less than [participant] means that even 3\textsuperscript{rd} person goals fully deactivated the probe, found in non-ED contexts in Basque. Put differently, variation in the specification of a φ-probe in the φ-feature geometry of a language manipulates the criteria for halting a search, under the assumption that Agree executes a minimal search for a match (some subset of the probe), and that this search may continue until a goal at least as richly specified as the probe (its superset) is found.

The discussion so far has been limited to the [part] portion of the φ-probe of \( v \). The φ-probe of \( v \) also contains a separate [individuation] probe, comprising number and class/gender. By an assumption to which I return in XN, all DPs have an [individuation] feature, so S/O will necessarily satisfy the φ-probe of \( v \) in this respect. That is why there is no displacement of PL agreement in Basque (or it seems, in similar languages) analogous to ED. Because the probes that are spelled out by the PX and PL morphology have different satisfaction conditions, they can be controlled by different arguments, all the while their coincidence in being primarily controlled by S/O follows from their joint placement on \( v \), between A and O/S.
3.2 Search space expansion: \( v \), [Spec, TP], and allocutives

The derivational mechanics expand the search-space of \( v \) from the object with which it Merges first, to objects added later to the syntactic object containing \( v \), so long as the probe(s) of \( v \) remain capable of triggering Agree. Within this broad picture, the actual mechanism of search-space expansion has alternative implementations, some compatible, depending on other choices make in the theory. The minimalist choice is the following:

\[(23)\] \textit{Search-space}: The search-space of a probe is the entire syntactic object within which a probe finds itself [so long as the probe can trigger syntactic operations].

This definition of search-space lets the upper bound on it be intrinsic, to follow from when a probe can no longer actively implement operations, according to whatever mechanism is adopted for this: minimal search for active probes, explicit pivots/loci, etc. (see C0). These mechanisms will properly prevent objects that are too high up from a probe from falling into its search-space, for they preclude a probe too deeply embedded from triggering operations, and thus syntactic objects from being tampered with. Thus, \( v \) will for example never see the argument of a higher clause, since no mechanism allows probes on \( v \) to trigger operations when its CP is finished.

The definition is independent of the adoption of labels or not: if labels are indeed explicitly represented by Merge, these mechanisms limit active probes to the label, if not, they allow somewhat greater freedom, concomitant with the greater freedom in what will count as label, in what will project (Chomsky forthcoming). It is also independent of assumptions about head-movement, which under specific assumptions could be viewed to expand search-space. If head-movement occurs, whether classically or along the different minimalist alternatives such as sideward movement (Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998), reprojection (Koeneman 2000, Bury 2003), or consequence of selection (Frampton and Gutmann 1999), then if and only if it brings the probes of the raised head to where they can trigger operations will material introduced after the introduction of the target head fall into the search-space of the raised one. Whether this is true depends again on the mechanism that determines which head is active, as above, and on the result of head-movement: when two different heads are involved they may be viewed as keeping their identity or amalgamating in the result, while under the reprojection proposal there is only a single head in a new position.

There is another possibility that seems fairly natural, yet not as automatic as (23): the search-space of a probe is its sister. In a system with labels, this gives the same results as (23) under most assumptions, but in a system without labels, it restricts the search-space of a probe to the object with which it Merges first, its complement (Chomsky REF). For concreteness, consider the representations in (24) of the more traditional \([T, [vP [D, NP] [v, VP]]]\). In (24)b, where Merge projects labels, it is clear that all material within the vP is the sister of some occurrence of \( v \), the VP being the sister of the first-Merged occurrence and the vP containing the specifier of \( v \) the sister of one of the labels. There is no way to exclude the specifier from forming part of the search-space of \( v \) without complete stipulation.

\[(24)\]

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \{T, \{D, NP\}, \{v, VP\}\} \\
&\text{b. } \{T, \{v, \{D, NP\}, \{v, \{v, VP\}\}\}\}
\end{align*}\]
In a is given the representation in created by a Merge that does not project labels. Only a single occurrence of \( v \) occurs, and VP is its sister. Merge thus provides a natural definition of search-space: the search-space of a probe is what it is Merged with. Nevertheless, this is still a stipulation compared to (23). Indeed, a syntax without labels relies crucially on the fact that when embedded in a larger structure such as \( \{v, \text{VP}\} \) or \( \{\text{DP}, v, v\text{P}\} \), a head like \( v \) can continue to trigger operations such as selection (of specifiers) and successive cyclic movement (Chomsky 2000 et seq.), as well as its visibility to external selection (Collins 2002). Thus, even when embedded in a larger syntactic object, \( v \) drives operations; restricting the search-space of these operations to a subset of that object, however naturally defined, needs to be stipulated. If it is, search-space expansion of \( v \) from its complement to its specifier can still occur, but it requires head-movement of \( v \) to T, as discussed above (cf. Béjar 2002, Rezac 2002a).

Basque permits the investigation of the upper limits of the search-space expansion of \( v \), the results of which bear on these possibilities. One line of evidence will not be discussed here, for it presupposes a full analysis of the AD phenomenon (C5). Briefly, the S of unaccusative + dative psych-verbs, moved to [Spec, TP], can value the [part] probe of \( v \), which cannot see it prior to its movement because of the intervention of the dative. These cases to suggest that the search-space of \( v \) can extend to [Spec, TP], but at the same time, they will for independent reasons suggest the collapse of T and \( v \) as a single element, and treating [Spec, TP] as an (outer) specifier of \( v \).

A different line of inquiry is made available by the existence of allocutive agreement (XN). In certain contexts the \( \phi \)-features of the non-argumental addressee are coded by SX and gender agreement morphology, sometimes combined with the "allocutive flag" (AF). Thus a form such as \( n\text{-a-go} \) [1-TM-\( \sqrt{\text{be}} \) ] 'I am' can become \( n\text{-}(i-)a\text{-go-k/n/zu} \) [1-(AF-)TM-\( \sqrt{\text{be}} \)-MASC/FEM/2], the additional morphology indicating that the addressee is 2\textsuperscript{nd} person familiar masculine, feminine, or 2\textsuperscript{nd} person respectuous. Syntactically, XN has adopted the hypothesis of Oyharçabal that allocutive agreement is codes a non-argumental proclitic that is base-generated as adjoined high in the TP area. Allocutive agreement thus provides a context where there is a \( \phi \)-set clausemate to \( v \) that is base-generated considerably higher than A can be; this remains true even under an eventual reduction of T and \( v \) to a single head (C5). It is natural to pose the question whether allocutive agreement is susceptible to ED, in other words, whether allocutive agreement can ever be coded by PX, just like agreement with the ergative A is coded by PX under ED. This is so not only in the context of the theory developed here, but also in the context of earlier investigations, for allocutive agreement makes use of the same morphological types as regular 2\textsuperscript{nd} person ergatives (and datives), that is SX and gender, and the ergatives do undergo ED. Indeed, the question has been investigated at length by Lafon (1955) and Rebuschi (1983). The answer to the question, after a couple of rounds of, seems to be no.

At first the answer is clearly no. In synthetic verbs like \( \text{egon} \) 'be (at a location)', \( \text{jakin} \) 'know', allocutive markers never undergo ED. Likewise, there is never ED of allocutives with analytic verbs, setting aside allocutives of the 1V configuration with a sole S.ABS argument. So, allocutives of the 1V' configuration (S.ABS and O'.DAT), of the 2V configuration (A.ERG and O.ABS), and 3V (2V + O’.DAT), can never code the allocutive by PX, regardless of the \( \phi \)-values of the other agreement controllers; if there is no controller of PX, then PX assumes a default value. TABLE shows these facts; for each form on the left, adding allocutive on the right is by the gender marker \( na \) and the default PX is not modified; if controlled by the 2F allocutive it should be \( h \) (\( \emptyset \)), not \( z \). To be contrasted is that happens when the same gender marker \( na \) signals the presence of 2.fam.sg.fem. A ergative argument. Here the present tense \( d\text{-u-}n \) [X-\( \sqrt{2V-F} \) ] 'she
has it', without ED, corresponds to a past with ED of A, so 2F.F controls the PX: \( h-u-(na)\text{-}n \) [2F-\( \sqrt{2V} \)-F-PT] 'she had it'. Similarly if a dative is added, present \( d-i-o-n \) [X-\( \sqrt{3V} \)-3-F] 'she has it to him', as tense with ED \( h-i-o-(na)\text{-}n \) [2F-\( \sqrt{3V} \)-3-(F-)PT] 'she had it to him'. The data are from EB, but the facts hold for all dialects.

### TABLE: Allocutive inert for ED (EB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Non-allocutive</th>
<th>Allocutive (2F.F: na [F])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1V 3.S synth.</td>
<td>z-e-go-en '(s)he was'</td>
<td>zego-( n )-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V 3.S&gt;3.S synth.</td>
<td>z-e-ki-en '(s)he knew it'</td>
<td>zeki-( n )-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1' 3.S+&gt;3.S aux</td>
<td>z-i-tza-i-o-n 'it was to her'</td>
<td>zitzio-( n )-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V 3.S aux</td>
<td>z-u-en '(s)he had it'</td>
<td>zi-( n )-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3V 3.S&gt;3.S+&gt;3.S aux</td>
<td>z-i-o-n '(s)he had it to him'</td>
<td>zio-( n )-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[X-TM-( \sqrt{be} )-PT]</td>
<td>[X-TM-( \sqrt{know} )-PT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[X-TM-( \sqrt{1V'-DF} )-3-PT]</td>
<td>[X-TM-( \sqrt{2V} )-PT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[X-TM-( \sqrt{1V'} )-DF-3-PT]</td>
<td>[X-( \sqrt{2V} )-PT]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation with the 1V verb \( izan \) 'be' and serving as 1V auxiliary for certain tense-mood combinations, is more complicated. As detailed in XN, when allocutive affixes are added to where \( izan \) is expected, what appears is forms of 2V \( *edun \), meaning 'have' and serving as the 2V auxiliary for the same tense-mood combinations where \( izan \) is found. Furthermore, allocutive agreement uses the same morphology (SX, gender) as ergative A when ED does not occur, and S/O of course both use the same agreement morphology in Basque as an absolutive language. Consequently, there arises a systematic identity between allocutive of \( izan \) for absolutive S with \( \varphi \)-features \( \alpha \) and allocutive with \( \varphi \)-features \( \beta \), and (non-allocutive) \( *edun \) for absolutive O with \( \varphi \)-features \( \alpha \) and ergative A with \( \varphi \)-features \( \beta \); the 2.fam.sg.fem. allocutive of \( n-a-iz \) [1-TM-\( \sqrt{1V} \)] 'I am' is \( n-a-u-n \) [1-TM-\( \sqrt{2V} \)-F], where the root \( iz \) is replaced by \( u \) and the gender morpheme \( n \) is added, but the same morphological analysis also means 'you (fam. fem.) have me'.

One of Rebuschi's (1984: chapter 9) contributions is the understanding that AUX choice here has nothing to do with some putative ergative status of allocutive. He observes that the use of \( *edun \) for \( izan \) when allocutive morphology is added in complementary distribution with the

---

5 The additional difference between \( zuan \) and \( zinan \), aside from adding \( na \), is due to the presence of the allocutive flag in the latter.
6 The 1V auxiliary for other tense-mood combinations, \( *edin \), behaves as described above.
7 The addition of allocutive affixes to 2V \( *edun \) substitutes the root \( i \) for \( u \), due to the presence/influence of the allocutive flag \( i \); in some dialects the root \( i \) is independently the realization of the root of 3V \( *edun \) 'have' and 3V auxiliary, due to the presence/influence of the dative flag \( i \). So in Gipuzkoan, the allocutive of \( du, ditu \) is \( dik/n, dizik/n \), identical to 3.S>2.F.M/N>3.S.IP. The two roots \( i \) seem to be one insofar as they trigger the same PL marker allomorphy, \( zki \). In other dialects, such as Labourdin, the root \( i \) of 3V is limited to 3rd person datives, and 1st/2nd person takes \( u \); hence 3.S>2.F.M/F>3.S ikuk/n differs from allocutive of \( du, ditu \), which are \( dik/n, dizik/n \). The Gipuzkoan formation, and the prevalent positioning of allocutive SX between DAT and ERG, as well as the similarity between AF \( i \) and the \( i \) of DF \( ki, i \), lead to the traditional treatment of allocutive SX as "dative", at least when applied to 2V, or generally. The collapse is epiphenomenal, due to root allomorphy in the presence of the dative and allocutive flags, sometimes giving the same results, and it has no further bearing on ED. See XN.

In dialects where datives control PX, allocutives can still never do so (see C3), regardless of whether a potential ED context (non-present, all other arguments 3rd person) is met or not.
appearance of an independently allocutive flag AF with other verbs, and thus *edun here is not the 2V 'have/'auxiliary, but rather the realization of izan + AF.

The relevance of this for ED is that it is exactly in contexts where A ergative undergoes ED, and thus controls PX morphology, that the parallelism of 2V *edun with allocutives of izan breaks down, for in the latter the allocutive morphology fails to control PX (Laflon 1955:331f., Rebuschi 1984:590ff., Alberdi 1995:283f.). Thus 2.S.F>3.S 'you (fam. fem.) had it' is h-u-(na)-e(n) [2F-√2V-(F)-PT], where A.ERG controls the PX h (and in some dialects, the gender marker as well), but the allocutive of 3.S 'he was' z-e-n [X-TM+√1V-PT] is z-u-na-n [X-√2V-F-PT], where the 2.fam.sg.fem. allocutive controls only the gender morpheme na and not the PX morphology, which is the past tense default z.8 This is fully systematic for all φ-values and all ED contexts, as well as of any interpretation of the A ergative, including the so-called "implicative" (XN) which is close in semantics to allocutive ("you have the house beautiful" = "the house is beautiful").9

The manifest conclusion is that the allocutive is not subject to ED. There is a great strength in this argument, for the allocutive fails to undergo ED in precisely the one context where it would be most expected to be so: that is, in exactly those forms where independent factors conspire as to make it systematically indistinguishable from the ergative in the morphology modulo ED, and when there no other element to either undergo ED or to block the allocutive from undergoing ED. Instead, exactly in these potential ED contexts morphological forms like zu nan exist that break the identity of izan + allocutive with *edun, and that have no other use.

This conclusion is consistent with several proposals about the interaction of search-space expansion and allocutives. Principally: (i) allocutives are not visible because they are adjuncts; (ii) allocutives are not visible because by the time they are attached, the φ-probe of v is already embedded and cannot trigger operations. (ii) would follow particularly naturally in the system if there is a natural reason for the φ-probe of v to cease to be active by the time the allocutive is added. For reasons discussed in C5, the φ-probe of v should be able to Agree with an element raised to [Spec, TP]. A natural delimitation of the activity of the φ-probe of v to the TP follows under the proposal in C5 that T+v constitute a single Case/Agree locus, but it could also be stipulated by limiting syntactic head movement of v to T. By the time the allocutive is added, e.g. to the head F between T and C, the TP is closed off, and Agree with it cannot take place. The result converges with the evidence that the T-system is the domain significant for agreement, and that the allocutive belongs to the C-system, as restrictions on its distribution to matrix clauses suggest (C1:alloc). However, possibility (i) is not to be discounted: allocutives are in any case anomalous by for example being unable to bound, as Oyharçabal (1993) shows (see C1), and whatever accounts for this might account for their immunity to v's φ-probe.

This conclusion runs up against an apparent exception in the Gipuzkoan dialect (and some others, see below). I will argue that this exception is only apparent, the result of a diachronic development (the origin of allocutives from implicatives) that is synchronically coded not as ED

---

8 The presence of gender marker na in hu(na)n, while not a feature of EB or the literary dialects, is wide-spread: see XN.
9 Thus, the allocutive of 3.S z-e-n [X-√1V-PT] is 3.S : 2F.M/2F.F/2R zu-re-ka/na/zu-n [X-√2V-M/F-2-PT] (last in LN, or as Sou zitizin), not the forms identical to ED of 2.F.M/3.S, h-u-(k)ae(a)n [2F-√2V-M/F-PT], 2R >3.S z-em-te- (zu)-e(n) [2-TM-√-(2)-PT], and the same for X>3.P. Exactly the same difference is found in the other ED context, unreal: the conditional 2>3.S/3.P forms show ED, giving e.g. 2.F.M/F/3.S h-u-ke [2F-√2V-PTOT]. However, the conditionals of 3.S (EB litzake [X-√1V-PT], dialectal lizate, litzake, and from auxiliary *edun stepping in this function, laitake) is in the allocutive 3.S : 2.F.M/F l-u-ke-k/n, baside on l-u-ke, the form of *edun in the conditional = 3.S>3.S, + allocutive SX.
but as allomorphy of the default PX. The argument necessarily involves considerable minutiae; the reader not interested in them will find nothing of importance in the excursus.

3.2.1 Excursus: Gipuzkoan allocutives

At first look, here it seems that the allocutive does undergo ED in Gipuzkoan: the 2F.S.M, F allocutives of 3.S zen/zen 'he was' are uam, uan, which are identical 2F.S.M, F>3.S 'you (fam. masc., fem.) had it'. Lafon (1955:332) makes an interesting proposal, further developed by Rebuschi (1984:592ff.): the allocutive uam, uan do not have the analysis Θ-u-a-na-n [2F-√2V-M/F-PT] of the ED 2F.S.M, F>3.S forms, but rather [X-√2V-M/F-PT], that is exactly the same as the non-Gipuzkoan z-u-(k)a/na-n forms above; the only difference is that the default PX morpheme in this, and only in this, context is Θ, independently characteristic of Bizkaian, not the z of the other dialects including Gipuzkoan.

The possibility of such an analysis rests externally on the fact that the 2F PX h of the northern dialects has become Θ in Gipuzkoan, and internally on the assumption that the morphological conditions of default insertion can be sensitive to the presence of allocutive agreement, which is independently true (XN). The analysis must then be extended on the basis of the latter point, for ED happens not only in past forms that without ED use the default prefix z/Θ, but also in irrealis forms that use the default prefix i. Non-Gipuzkoan dialects normally show a contrast here between 2F.S.M, F>3.S h-u-ke-(k/n) [2F-√2V-POT(-M/F)], with ED, and 2F.S.M, F allocutive of 3.S l-u-ke-k/n [X-√2V-POT-M/F] with no ED and default PX i. The relevant Gipuzkoan dialects however have u-ke-k/n for both; if the Lafon-Rebuschi analysis is to be pushed, it must be assumed that in allocutive contexts default PX can be Θ where other dialects have h.10

The Rebuschi-Lafon proposal makes a great deal of sense. As noted above and shown in TABLE, the 2F.M/F allocutives of the 3.S/P 1V izar 'be/1V auxiliary' are the only ones, in any dialect, to show ED. So on the one hand, the Low Navarrese and Souletin dialects that also have 2.R allocutives do not have them undergo ED, though this is a weak argument because these dialects do not have any allocutives produce ED-like forms. On the other hand, and more strongly, in no dialect, including Gipuzkoan, does allocutive morphology undergo ED anywhere else: this holds for other 1V verbs (including the 1V auxiliary *edin), or allocutives of 1V' (S.ABS + O'.DAT) izar, or of 2V/3V *edun.11

To illustrate this point, let us take G-Hern-ne-SSeb (Yrizar). In this dialect, 3.S + 2F.M, F allocutive, uam, onam, are identical to 2F.M, F>3.S u-ke-n, u-na-n [√2V-POT-M, F-PT], up to a choice of the allomorphs realizing the gender suffix [M] (a vs. ke). Thus, when added to 3.S (and 3.P), the allocutive seemingly undergoes ED. Yet when allocutive is added to 2V 3.S>3.S z-u-en [X-√2V-PT], it cannot undergo ED, M/F z-i-ke/ña-n [X-√2V+AF-M/F-PT], with which may be compared 3.S>2F.M/F>3.S z-i-g/ña-n [X-√3V-M/F-PT]; just like the 2F.M/F O' dative in the latter form, the allocutive cannot control PX agreement, though there is no other potential PX controller, and so the past default z appears. This contrasts with what happens to A ergative in 2.M/F>3.S>3.S in the same dialect, which does control PX in Ω-i-o-ke/na-n [2F-√3V-3-M/F-

10 A further complication is Rebuschi's (1984:594) observation that some Gipuzkoan dialects seem to have uke that lacks gender distinction, for both 2F.S.M/F>3.S (where lack of gender distinction is a property of the EB, literary varieties, and most non-Bizkaian/Gipuzkoan dialects) and for allocutive 2F.M, F allocutive of 3.S, where gender distinctions are typically retained in other dialects.

11 My conclusions here are based on the investigation of selected allocutive forms for all the dialects in Y-B-I and Y-G-I, with a more cursory examination of the other dialects.
PT]. Equally, when allocutive is added to 1V' 3.S+>3.S zi-tzay-o-n [X+TM-√1V-3-PT], again with no PX controller, it cannot control PX, so the result is zi-tzayo-ke/na-n (M/F allocutive).

From a syntactic point of view, this last example is particularly telling: as the other forms show, 3.S absolutive S of unaccusatives are evidently compatible with apparent ED of the allocutive in this dialect, adding a dative in the 3V form does not affect ED of the ergative, yet when allocutive is added to 3.S + dative unaccusative, it cannot undergo ED. All this points to the 3.S/P 1V + allocutive forms, the only ones where, in the Gipuzkoan dialects, the allocutive can seem to undergo ED, not really showing ED, which is the Lafon-Rebuschi proposal.

The traditional way of understanding these facts is that when allocutive is added to izan, the resulting form outside of possible ED has the same structure as if the allocutive counted as ergative, in part because izan assumes the root of *edun when allocutive is added, whereas this is never the case elsewhere: when allocutive is added to 1V' izan, for example, again setting aside ED contexts, forms that look like nothing non-allocutive are produced in general, except for allocutives of 2V where forms that look like the allocutive were dative are produced in some dialects (see note 7). Now, this seems roughly correct, if properly qualified. Yet this too comes down to saying that apparent ED of allocutives is parasitic, analogical -- not real. The allocutive cannot itself undergo ED; it piggy-backs on ED of ergative. This idea can be used to understand, perhaps in diachronic terms made clearer below, why under the Lafon-Rebuschi proposal allocutive forms chose strange allomorphs (∅ for default past and irrealis PX) just in those forms where they end up looking as if ED applied to them.

It turns out that Lafon-Rebuschi proposal cannot stand as developed, and that it must be modified relying on the idea in the preceding paragraph. The proposal relies on the ambiguous analysis of a form like Gipuzkoan ∅-u-a/na-n, used for 2F.M/F>3.S and 3.S + 2F.M/F ALLOC past auxiliaries: in the former case, the ∅ PX is controlled by 2F A ergative because Gipuzkoan has lost initial h, in the latter it is the past tense default independently occurring in Bizkaian. Already, this is curious; Bizkaian itself never has the Gipuzkoan ED-like allocutives (M/F allocutives of 3.S are always forms like soan/sonan, with past default PX s). Moreover, the proposal can be tested. Lapourdin dialects generally retain h as 2F PX. Most behave in the non-Gipuzkoan manner for allocutives, contrasting 2.F.F>3.S hunan type with 2.F.F allocutive of 3.S, zunan, where default PX occurs. Yet a few have Gipuzkoan-like forms here. And in all, these allocutive forms begin with h, exactly as when 2F (of any origin) controls PX, and not with ∅. The crucial forms are those of (i) L-Sane-Spee (Duhau), (ii) L-SJean-Guéthary (Sarraillet), (iii) L-SJean-Urrugne (Sein). TABLE compares the allocutive forms of 3.S/3.P with cases

12 The details are not relevant, so I footnote them. First, the notion of "same structure" for Z = X + allocutive and Z = Y + ergative here needs to stated at a certain level of abstraction: as seen from the G-Hern-SSeb-Y dialect, there may be different choices of allomorphs like [M] ke vs. a, and this is common. Second, consider the following common Gipuzkoan situation: the allocutive of a 3V form like 3.S>3.S d-i-o k/n [X-√3V-3-M/F], is identical to 2.M/F>3.S>3.S d-i-o k/n [X-√3V-3-M/F], except that allocutivity enters into the realization of default PX as z rather than d; yet it is always only the latter, not the former, than can undergo ED in the past, giving zi-o-ke/na-n [X-3V-3-M/F-PT] vs. ∅i-o-k/n respectively [2F-√3V-3-M/F-PT]. d-i-o k/n ≠ zi-o-k/n, but it is only the effect that allocutivity has on the realization of the default prefix, and this does not occur in all dialects, and it seems irrelevant to the guiding intuition of the traditional view (although there is no dialect in Y-G-I/II to have all the right data without this; G-Azp-Motrico is as good as it gets, q.v.). Rather, what seems to block i-o-k/n for zi-o-ke/na-n on the intuition of the traditional view is that X and Y in Z above are different: X + allocutive is 3.S>3.S + allocutive, but Y + ergative is 3.S>3.S + ergative.

13 Some have lost ED, so hunan itself is zunan.

14 This conclusion is based on investigation of the relevant allocutive forms for all the dialects in Y-L.
where PX is controlled by 2F A under ED, both leading to h PX and neither to \( \emptyset \) (sometimes beside allocutive forms of the non-Gipuzkoan type), and contrasts allocutive forms of 3.S>3.S, where default PX \( z \) appears.

**TABLE: ED of allocutives in Labourdin (past tense forms)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Alloc of 1V</th>
<th>2V</th>
<th>3V</th>
<th>Alloc of 2V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M zu(k)an/huen</td>
<td>hitun/hiten</td>
<td>hien</td>
<td>M/F of 3.S&gt;3.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>M huen</td>
<td>hituen</td>
<td>hien</td>
<td>zionan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>M huen/zuken</td>
<td>hituken/zituken</td>
<td>hien</td>
<td>zionen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, it can no longer be considered an accident of historical loss of h that the 2F.M/F allocutive and A give rise to forms with the same PX; instead, the allocutive forms clearly possess a PX that is diachronically and canonically controlled by 2F, and one that clearly has no connection to the past default in any dialect. Yet this does not diminish the evidence adduced above that apparent ED of allocutives is not real ED and that it is piggy-backing on ED of ergatives: as TABLE shows, allocutives of 3S>3.S in these dialects again lack ED in contrast to 2F>3.S>3.S (and so do allocutives of any other form, like the 1V' paradigm). Moreover, in the synchronic implementation of the Lafon-Rebuschi proposal, nothing technically hinders the ED-like allocutives chose past (and irrealis) default PX h just in these forms, rather than \( z \) (and \( l \)). It is just totally ad-hoc and striking that the default chosen -- just in these forms -- should be exactly the form that realizes 2F PX, something that is more or less the case in the original proposal anyway. Yet this convergence has a reasonable diachronic explanation, one that is a concrete realization of the traditional take on these allocutive forms as being due to the independent convergence, just here in the system, of allocutive with the ergative.

Rebuschi (1984:534) suggests that the allocutive has its origin in implicatives. XN discusses these forms: in a nutshell, a regular 2V 2F.M>1.S form like \( n-a-u-k \) [1-TM-√2V-M] 'thou hast/aux me' has usage such as 'I am at home' (lit. 'thou hast me at home'), indistinguishable in meaning from allocutive of simple 1V 1.S \( n-a-i \z\) 'I am (at home…). Implicatives with 2F.M/F A ergative subjects, the most common type, were grammaticalized as allocutives. This is attractive, for it explains why the allocutive of \( izan \) uses *edun universally in the Basque dialects; implicatives are formed with the verb 'have', of which *edun is the commonest, and at the same time the commonest 2V auxiliary. If this is so, then the Gipuzkoan formation would actually be more archaic, for the implicative forms that gave rise to allocutives are just regular forms with ergative, and do show ED. The archaism of this formation is independently supposed by Alberdi (1995:283f.), who cites Schuchardt (1893:235) for the suggestion that they were destroyed by introducing \( z \) default PX for H[2] from 3.S zen of which they were allocutive.

Upon grammaticalization of implicatives in their allocutive function, allocutive morphology was abstracted from them as SX/gender marker. Apparently, this left the old implicative forms as highly anomalous where they could not be analyzed as just involving addition of SX/gender, that is in ED contexts; and so as in Schuchardt's suggestion, they were largely eliminated by simply taking SX/gender on forms without ED. 15 This is significant; whereas ED of the allocutive argument in the old implicative forms was subject to strong pressure to be eliminated, the use of

---

15 Somehow, further, the allocutive flag was introduced in these new forms (see Alberdi 1995:284f.)
the 2V *edun 'have/auxiliary' in what came to be allocutives of 1V izan 'be/auxiliary' as not.
Evidently the system could capture auxiliary root alternation as a regularity, coding it (on
Rebuschi's proposal) as izan + allocutive − *edun, but it could not capture coding of allocutive
by PX in addition to SX/gender, that is ED of the allocutive. Where they were not replaced, the
old implicatives showing ED were kept through the Lafon-Rebuschi proposal: the PX Ǿ/h was
analyzed as an allomorph of the default PX restricted to these forms.16

Interestingly enough, the posited phenomenon also occurs in reverse: allocutive forms of
3.S/P influence 2F.M/F>3.S forms so the latter lose ED. It is seen in TABLE that in L-SJean-
Urrugne, 2.M/F>3.P forms have the alternative form zituken/zitunen beside hituken/hitunen.
These forms show no ED and the default past PX z. The diachronic development here is fairly
clearly from ED to non-ED forms: in L-Sare-Zugarramurdi; Bonaparte in mid-18C records
are identical to the ED loss phenomenon found in many dialects (XN). However, they are often
strikingly isolated: this particular dialect has no other instances of ED loss, including in all
allocutive forms of 2VPt, 3VSPt, 3VPt paradigms (e.g. 1.S>3.S alloc. fem ninan, nienan,
noizkanen resp.). The phenomenon is fairly wide-spread; it occurs in several other L-Sara
subdialects, but also for example in the Fuentarrabia forms of the synthetic verbs eduki, ekarri,
jakin, given by Azkue III:117/§952.6, 121:954.5, 122/§958.6 respectively.17

This shows that allocutives of 3.S/P and 2F.M/F>3.S/P influence each other diachronically,
in a way no other allocutive -- non-allocutive pair does. The origin of the former from
implicative use of the latter provides an explanation, for this created a morphological near-
equivalence between of roughly the same meaning.

I think this examination of the allocutive evidence suggests that allocutives do not undergo
ED, not in the sense that the analysis in this work proposes, as cyclic search-space expansion of
the φ-Agree of v. The internal isolation of the Gipuzkoan ED-like allocutives among the
behavior of allocutives in all other contexts in the same dialects is just too great, and it has a a
plausible diachronic explanation and synchronic implementation.

3.3 Second cycle effects and Basque

The cyclic expansion mechanism results in derivational ("timing") differences between
v-O and v-A person Agree, since the former happens on the an earlier point in the derivation than
the latter. One consequence is representational differences between v-O and v-A person Agree, in
a way to be detailed below. These differences could potentially be exploited by spell-out. These
can be called second cycle effects, following Béjar (2003:79ff.; for Georgian 127-131, 151ff.; for
Karok 159-161), Béjar and Rezac (2004). They are common cross-linguistically in ED patterns,
as shown in TABLE: either A or O can be the valuer of v's agreement morphology and the
identity of the controller is predicted by the ED pattern, but the spell-out distinguishes values
contributed by O, e.g. [1] m in Georgian, from those contributed by A, e.g. [1] v.18

If there were no languages that show the ED pattern without O and A being differentiated,
the case that O and A compete for the syntactic control of the same person probe would be

---

16 Something that is not unusual since allocutives do chose allmorphs that appear only there ([M] ke for a, for
eexample), and they can do so only in certain forms, that is in allocutive of 3.S/P and not in other allocutives.
17 One may well wonder whether the introduction of gender marking doubling 2F S/O/A PX controllers, a Bizkaian-
Gipuzkoan phenomenon (XN), might not have its origin here as well.
18 I return to how S behaves in languages like Georgian in XN.
weakened. However, Basque is exactly a language where this does occur: for example, 1.A, 1.O, 1.S are coded identically by the PX n, and distinct from the way they are coded when they do not compete for control of v’s person probe, which is SX da’t. Yet, many if not all dialects do signal a difference between whether PX is controlled by O or A, in the form of the morpheme that follows PX, and that in XN has been called the theme marker. This fascinating and difficult piece of morphology that seems ultimately sensitive to nearly any property of the agreement complex is studied in detail in APPENDIX TM; here I will limit the details to those relevant to the study of the distinction between O, A, and S as PX controllers. The relevant contexts are thus those where there is a 1st/2nd person PX controller, when PX is default, the theme marker varies according to properties such as tense, but not normally according to the φ-features of other arguments (though see APPENDIX TM).

In most dialects, the form of all pieces somehow related to agreement, including the theme marker, is identical in the case of O and S control of the PX, and partly differentiated in the case of A control of the PX. The most differentiated system is that of EB, which systematically differentiates PX control by 1st/2nd O (TM ind) from 1st/2nd A (TM if A is singular, en if plural -- see XN). A great many dialects show the same range of distinctions.

TABLE: 2V past in EB (structure: PX-(TM)-…)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>z-uen</td>
<td>z-uten</td>
<td>n-uen</td>
<td>g-en-uen</td>
<td>h-uen</td>
<td>z-en-uen</td>
<td>z-en-uten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>z-ituen</td>
<td>z-it-uten</td>
<td>n-ituen</td>
<td>g-en-ituen</td>
<td>h-ituen</td>
<td>z-en-ituen</td>
<td>z-en-it-uten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>n-ind-uen</td>
<td>n-ind-uten</td>
<td>n-ituen</td>
<td>g-en-ituen</td>
<td>h-ituen</td>
<td>z-en-ituen</td>
<td>z-en-it-uten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>g-en-tuen</td>
<td>g-en-t-uten</td>
<td>g-en-ituen</td>
<td>h-ituen</td>
<td>z-en-ituen</td>
<td>z-en-it-uten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.F</td>
<td>h-ind-uen</td>
<td>h-ind-uten</td>
<td>h-ind-uten</td>
<td>h-ind-ugun</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>z-in-tuen</td>
<td>z-in-t-uten</td>
<td>z-in-tudan</td>
<td>z-in-tugun</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>z-in-tuzten</td>
<td>z-in-tuz-uten</td>
<td>z-in-tuzedan</td>
<td>z-in-tuztegun</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is however not always so. In some dialects the theme marker of ED and non-ED contexts collapse for certain person values of PX controller. At the extreme lack of sensitivity lies B-Oroz-Arbaiza. Virtually all forms where PX is controlled by 1st/2nd person are ambiguous between 3.S/P>a, with a O controlling PX, and a>3.S/P, with a A controlling PX under ED.19 For example, gendu sen is both 3.S>1.P and (ED) 1.P>3.P. There is no difference of PX or the theme marker. The only distinction that exists between non-ED and ED forms is i in 3.S>1.S nen duin vs. ED 1.S>3.S nendun, rather isolated (cf. discussion of B-Lek (HEE) below).

TABLE: 2V past in B-Oroz-Arbaiza (structure: (PX)-(TM)-…)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABS ERG</th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>3.PL</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>g-uen</td>
<td>g-udien</td>
<td>n-end-uen</td>
<td>g-end-uen</td>
<td>s-end-uen</td>
<td>s-end-ubien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>g-uesan</td>
<td>g-uesien</td>
<td>n-end-uesan</td>
<td>g-end-uesan</td>
<td>s-end-uesan</td>
<td>s-end-ubiesan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>n-end-uen</td>
<td>n-end-ubien</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>n-end-uesan</td>
<td>n-end-uesen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>g-end-uesan</td>
<td>g-end-ubiesan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>g-end-uesan</td>
<td>g-end-ubiesan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>s-end-uesan</td>
<td>s-end-ubiesan</td>
<td>s-end-udasan</td>
<td>s-end-ugusen</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>s-end-ubiesan</td>
<td>s-end-ubiesan</td>
<td>s-end-ubiedusan</td>
<td>s-end-ubiegusan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Keeping in mind that O always controls PL, which is not subject to ED, so 3.S>1.P must be compared to 1.P>3.P, not 1.P>3.S, if full identity including the PL marker is wanted (this does not matter for PX-TM- morphology).
As theme markers vary across the dialects in the corpus (and sample dialects from other major dialects) between these two extremes, there is virtually no constancy in form-function correlation. For example, in EB theme markers are phonologically "heavier" in non-ED forms; but the opposite is the case in B-B-wA:O (see APPENDIX TM).

The theme marker does not differentiate only O and A. It also differentiates S control of PX - not just from A control of PX under ED, but also from O control of PX. This is not something that can easily be determined from the present/past of auxiliary verbs, whose 1V forms with 1/2 PX are the ones subject to most lexicalization. The gap can be filled by considering synthetic verbs in those dialects where there are enough of them, frequent enough, and systematic enough in formation. This investigation is undertaken in APPENDIX TM. The result relevant here is clear: while it typical to collapse the O-S theme marker and contrast it with A, there are dialects that make a three way distinction between S, O, and A theme markers. Less clearly, there also seem to be dialects that consistently collapse S, A theme markers in opposition to O. The available patterns are indicated in the following table.

**TABLE: Synthetic verbs for 1/2 PX controller, past tense (PX-TM-√...)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PX controller:</th>
<th>S≠O≠A</th>
<th>S–O≠A</th>
<th>S≠O–A (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Lafitte)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1/2</td>
<td>n/h-ind-a-√</td>
<td>n/h-en-√</td>
<td>n/h-e-√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g/z-in-√</td>
<td>g/z-en-√</td>
<td>g/z-e(n)-√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O X&gt;1/2</td>
<td>n/h-ind-a-√</td>
<td>n/h-en-√</td>
<td>n/h-en-√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g/z-in-√</td>
<td>g/z-en-√</td>
<td>g/z-en-√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1/2&gt;3 (ED)</td>
<td>n/h-e-√</td>
<td>n/h-e-√</td>
<td>n/h-e(n)-√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g/z-in-√</td>
<td>g/z-e-√</td>
<td>g/z-e(n)-√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An important conclusion follows from all this: one cannot challenge the control of PX by A and O as genuine control by A, O of the same morphology simply because in some dialects a different theme marker follows. On the one hand, S is also differentiated from O by the theme marker; on the other, the differentiation is not a necessary concomitant of the A - O difference in PX control, for it is absent or differently distributed in some dialects. At the same time, the sensitivity of the theme marker to whether the PX controller is A, O, or S must be encodable.

The theory underdetermines the analysis of theme marker sensitivity to the A-O-S contrast in PX control. One issue is what the theme-marker is; but to I will simply assume it is related to the spell-out of \( v \) or of its \( \phi \)-probes, since among the \( \phi \)-features coded in the agreement complex only those of the PX systematically enter into its conditioning (see APPENDIX TM for details and qualifications). Perhaps it is a spell-out of \( v \) itself, perhaps it is inserted as a terminal in the morphology upon the spell-out of \( v \)'s \( \phi \)-probe, etc. I will begin by looking at the A-O contrast, because it is more pervasive (O and S usually share theme marker), and because the analytic options are more limited, since the type of \( v \) is the same, that is the transitive \( v \) selecting an

---

20 The exception, noted in APPENDIX TM, is that \( \emptyset \) TM for 1/2 PX is limited to ED, probably for historical reasons.

21 They are only a handful per tense (4-5), and there are no relevant 1V* forms for most dialects.

22 The theme marker for 3 and 3>3 is \( e \) or \( a \) throughout. If TM is a vowel only, it may be displaced by the initial vowel of the root if such exists.
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external argument, regardless of whether A or O control its \([part]\) probe. The following is a catalogue of differences between O and A-control of \(v\)'s \([part]\) probe that theme-marker variation could be sensitive to:

(i) Timing: \([part]\) Agree with A and O occurs at different points in the derivation. \([part]\)-O Agree occurs when \(v\) has not yet selected its external argument (or rather, during the same timing-unit); \([part]\)-A Agree occurs after its selectional requirements are discharged.

(ii) Projection / head-movement: In a system with labels, \([part]\) Agree with A and O occur from different projections of \(v\): \([part]\)-O Agree occurs from the lowest occurrence of \(v\), the one whose complement is VP; \([part]\)-A Agree occurs after the selection of the external argument and thus when \(v\) has projected as consequence of its Merge. These two occurrences of \(v\) can be contextually differentiated: for example, only the second occurrence (first projection) of \(v\) in \(\{v, \{A, \{v, \{v, VP\}\}\}\}\) are \(v//\_\_v\). The same applies, mutatis mutandis, if \(v\)-A Agree actually requires \(v\)-to-T movement (see XN on this possibility).

(iii) Split \(\phi\)-probe. \([part]\)-O Agree occurs at the same time as \([number]\)-O Agree (that is, \([individuation]\)-Agree), and with the same argument. \([part]\)-A Agree occurs separately of the Agree of \([number]\) on \(v\), because that feature always Agrees with O.

How these differences can be exploited for spell-out of the theme marker depends on the theory of spell-out; they all make the right A-O cut, and no incorrect cuts (e.g. differentiating 1.S A/O and 2.R O from 2.R A).

Exploiting (i) alone, that is without (ii), requires that the insertion of the theme-marker occurs at the same point as \([part]\)-Agree: the theme-marker takes one form if \(v\) still has an undischarged selectional feature, and another form if it does not. One can tie this in with Chomsky's (REF) proposal that spell-out occurs literally at the point of Agree. Keeping to a minimum of what is spelled-out, the \([part]\) probe of \(v\) is spelled-out upon its valuation, and vocabulary insertion for the theme-marker occurs at the same time, either because it is the \(X^0\) that hosts the probe \((v)\), or because it is a terminal inserted by the morphology upon the spell-out of some portion of \(v\) (say).

Exploiting (ii) calls for treating seriously the Bare Phrase Structure idea that if they exist at all, labels/projections are no more and no less than copies of the lexical items that project them, possibly with their content modified through Agree at earlier steps in the derivation. This proposal is developed in Rezac (2002b); Béjar (2003:00) draws the inescapable consequence that any occurrence of a lexical item, label (copy) or original, should be available for vocabulary insertion, and this view is adopted in Béjar and Rezac (2004):

\begin{align*}
(25) \quad \text{Vocabulary insertion (under assumption the theme marker spells out } v) \\
\text{a. First-cycle vocabulary item: } & \emptyset \leftrightarrow v// \\
\text{b. Second-cycle vocabulary item: } & ind \leftrightarrow v//\_\_v
\end{align*}

A necessary aspect of the potential spell-out of labels is that duplication of the spell-out of the properties of a lexical item must normally be prevented. For example, it must not be the case that the \([part]\)-probe valued from O is spelled-out on each occurrence of \(v\) after being valued on the original; this is one of the conclusions of Noyer (1992/1997) about the spell-out of

\text{23} If a reader remarks on a general similarity of the theme-marker to the past tense marker, both being often \(Vn\), this seems real, but it is in no way associated with ED, A-O-S distinctions, or even PX being 1/2 rather than default: see APPENDIX TM.
morphosyntactic features, which can spell-out (be discharged) once only. The impossibility of spell-out out an uninterpretable feature follows if upon being valued and spelled-out, a feature is literally deleted from the lexical item, which then projects. The empirical conclusion that a φ-feature must delete upon Agree before the Agreeing head projects is arrived at independently in Béjar (2003: 187 and passim), Abels (2003: 59f.), and Rezac (2004a: 24 and passim). Rezac (2002b) motivates projection upon Agree conceptually from the idea that feature valuation / deletion modifies a lexical item, and since its original occurrence is not to be changed, it must re-Merge, this new copy being called a label.

However, in the case of (25) the question arises somewhat differently: the theme marker is not spelling out an uninterpretable feature, but rather $v$ itself (or a terminal inserted locally at $v$). The same concern arises in theories that treat head-movement as successive reprojection of the same lexical item, so that $v$ and $T$ for example are simply $V$ in different configurations (Koeneman 1999, Bury 2003, 2005): lexical insertion must be ensured to target only a single position in such as sequence of reprojected heads. It seems that in general then, spell-out of a feature $F$, interpretable or uninterpretable, eliminates it across multiple positions to which it is linked in the syntax by movement. One way in which this can work out naturally is if the multidominance theory of movement is adopted (XN), whereby there is only a single copy of a lexical item, whose Merge is in fact Merge of references to this copy (its occurrences).

Option (iii) relies on quite a different idea: that it is a possible condition for the vocabulary insertion of the theme-marker whether the [part] probe of $v$ was valued together with its [number] probe or not. This kind of difference can be naturally exploited by any system that exploits (i) already, because there will be a point in the derivation where [number] on $v$ is valued from O, but [part] is still not and waits for Agree with A. A different possibility is a φ-probe is affected if only one of its sub-features, [number]. Agrees, and the other does not. Béjar (2003: 81f., chapter 4) develops this possibility, in conjunction with (ii). As a version of option (ii) indeed, it simply follows that there is a representational difference between [part]-O and [part]-A Agree, because they occur from different projections, and only in the former case does the same projection contain both [part]-O and [number]-O Agree; see Béjar and Rezac (2004).

Implementing option (iii) without (i) or (ii) entails finding some difference would have to be found between the [part] and [number] sub-probes of the φ-probe of $v$ Agreeing with separate arguments that does not rely on this happening either at different points in the derivation, or from different projections of $v$. Such a difference can easily be postulated -- some kind of annotation of the φ-probe if [part] cannot Agree but [number] does -- but it does not seem to follow naturally. Ideally, one would like to be able to investigate this option through the Agree of the [part] and [number] segments of a φ-probe with different arguments within its complement, [number] with the closer one and [part] with the farther one, and see whether this leads to the insertion of the same theme marker as [part]-A Agree rather than [part]-O Agree. However, in Basque, and perhaps universally, such contexts seem impossible to create for independent reasons: see C1, C5.

The various proposals for the correlation of theme marker form with the A - O distinction in controlling PX fall into two groups: either the theme marker is sensitive to whether the [part]
probe of \( v \) is valued on the first or second cycle, or to whether it is valued in tandem with [number] or not. These are two very distinct options; only on the former is there a deep connection with search-space expansion, with the ED pattern. The main goal of Béjar and Rezac (2004) is to understand person-hierarchies cross-linguistically in terms of the ED pattern, specifically, to view so-called direct contexts 1/2(3)>3 as instances of cyclic search-space expansion of the person probe of \( v \) to \( A \), in contrast to inverse patterns where it is valued from \( O/S \). If it is search-space expansion that the theme-marker is sensitive to, it falls in with other markings of search-space expansion or lack thereof, namely second-cycle effects in languages like Georgian and Karok, and inverse markers in languages like Algonquian. This analysis of theme markers has been anticipated by Gómez (1994:109), who proposes that the theme marker found in 3>1/2 non-present had its origin as the inverse marker of the Algonquian type (see APPENDIX TM for more on various proposals on the origin of the theme marker).

Impressionistically, \( S \) PX controller is less often singled out from \( O \) by the theme marker than \( O \) is from \( A \), though as TABLE shows it does occur. This \( S \) vs. \( A \), \( O \) distinction must have a different source from the \( A \) - \( O \) distinction. One difference are the properties of \( v \), which has an external argument when there is \( A/O \), but not when there is \( S \). There is a \( \varphi \)-Agree correlate of this that could also be recruited to make the distinction: when and only when there is \( A \) does \( T \) have a \( \varphi \)-probe that Agrees with it (see XN).

There is a different phenomenon in Basque morphology, far more marginal, that also seems to be sensitive to the difference between first and second cycles: it distinguishes 3>1/2 contexts from 1/2>3 contexts. Theme markers are generally not informative when PX lacks a [part] controller, and this includes 3>3 contexts: yet these are potentially important. In 3>3, the [part] probe of \( v \) is never valued from either \( O \) or \( A \), as the insertion of default PX shows. However, in a sense a second cycle does occur: \( v \)'s [part] probe, not being valued from \( O \), will attempt to Agree with \( A \) once Merged, on a second cycle. A survey of various person hierarchy systems considerably richer than Basque in the literature in Béjar and Rezac (2004) (Mohawk, Algonquian, and Kashmiri), indicates that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person \( A \) tends to be in some way more specified than 3\textsuperscript{rd} person \( O \) in terms of person hierarchies: typically, 3>3 contexts pattern with 1/2>3 (so-called direct contexts), rather than with 3>1/2 (inverse).

The evidence bearing on this in Basque occurs in TABLE. The relevant aspect of the paradigm is the vowel preceding the final \( n \) indicating past tense. When the morpheme preceding \( n \) is not the SX \([1']\), su \([2]\), or e \([PL']\), there is a vowel that alternates between \( a \) and \( e \). This vowel is normally regarded as epenthetic, and indeed, across Basque dialects, it is subject to variation, while within a particular dialect it is often consistent. In this dialect, it seems to have a systematic alternation: it is \( a \) when \( O \) is 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, and as \( e \) otherwise. Hence 3.S>1.S \textit{naben} vs. 1.S>3.S \textit{neban}, 3.S>1.P \textit{gaittusen}, 1.P>3.P \textit{gendusan}, and so on:\footnote{The vowel has been the subject of some discussion, mostly not relevant here. See De Rijk (1981:220ff.) for a fascinating hypothesis about its origin (summarized in XN, NOTE).}

**TABLE: B-Lek:HEE 2V past indicative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>e-ar-e</td>
<td>e-ar-e</td>
<td>n-ar-aen</td>
<td>n-ar-aen</td>
<td>g-end-an</td>
<td>g-end-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>e-ar-aen</td>
<td>e-ar-aen</td>
<td>n-ar-1-2aen</td>
<td>n-ar-1-2aen</td>
<td>g-end-2aen</td>
<td>g-end-2aen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>n-ar-aen</td>
<td>n-ar-aen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-ar-aen</td>
<td>n-ar-aen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The vowel a can hardly be an exponent of 3rd person absolutive O; all evidence converges on this never having an exponent. It is not an exponent of singular, since it does not occur with 1.SG O. It is not an exponent of any ergative, since it is stable across all ergative values. It does not correlate with ED as such, since it occurs in 3>3 contexts. However, it does correlate exactly with all direct contexts, that is 1/2/3>3, as opposed to all inverse contexts, X>1/2. That is, it correlates with contexts where cyclic expansion is possible, where v’s [part] probe is not valued on the first cycle from O, even though it may not end up being valued from A either.

3.4 T-Agree

C1 has discussed the theoretical and empirical evidence for φ-Agree between T and ergatives. An argument from long-distance number agreement has established that T has a φ-probe that relates to the next lower DP, normally ergative A, but in the case of raising-verbs also absolutive S of a lower clause as in (26); φ-Agree by T (+ perhaps X0-movement) is spelled out as te.

(26) Hizkuntzalari honi liburuak/#liburuak gustatzen zai-zki-o-la lingui that.DAT books.ABS/#ERG liking √1V'-PL-3-that ematen d-u-te.j. seeming X-√-PL'

The books seem like they appeal to that linguist. (AI)

Under ED, 1st/2nd person A ergative controls the [part] probe of v, and naturally one poses the question how this affects the φ-Agree relationship between T and A ergative. Theoretically, this has ramifications for such constructs as the Activity Condition (XN), that would propose to allow a DP to Agree once only, or perhaps to Agree once only per φ-feature (Rezac 2003). The investigation is hampered by the fact that the canonical 1st/2nd person SX morphology controlled by A ergative, like that controlled by O' dative, has been analyzed in C1 as X0-movement from the corresponding controller. For O' dative controllers of it, a specific argument for this is available in C3. For A ergative, the evidence is weaker, and rests on the parallelism with datives. One such parallelism, discussed in C4:DBL, occurs when A ergative controls PX and SX under ED. Consider the dialect fragment in TABLE. In the present tense, 1st/2nd person ergatives control the SX morphology t [1], gu [1'], su [2], suite [2-PL'] for 1.sg. 1.pl, 2.r. 2.pl respectively. In the past tense, the same ergatives control PX morphology under ED, namely n [1], g [1'], s [2], s [2]. Yet, in some cases, they may also trigger the regular SX morphology, at the same time, giving forms like genitugun beside genitun.
This is a phenomenon whereby SX morphology doubles the A-controlled PX morphology. The doubling phenomenon is only available when an ergative or a dative controls PX, not when an absolutive does; its overt realization is follows morphophonological rather than morphosyntactic properties (for example, trisyllabic forms favour it). As mentioned, for datives it will be shown in C3 that SX morphology corresponds to X₀-movement that albeit contingent on φ-Agree does not entail φ-Agree for the features of the SX X₀ clitic, and combination of PX control by dative + SX doubling will be argued to show transparently φ-value of v’s φ-probe + this X₀-movement. The fact that ergative doubling shows all the same properties as dative doubling suggests that the ergative-controlled 1st/2nd person SX morphology is also a realization of X₀-movement, like the identical dative morphology, whether it doubles PX or not. So SX morphology cannot be viewed as evidence of φ-Agree by T.

The doubling phenomenon eliminates any theoretical use that can be made of the disappearance of canonical ergative SX morphology under ED, for this is simply incorrect. Likewise, I now believe that little can be made of the fact that the super-plural marker te of 2.PL ergatives is retained under ED in general even in forms and in dialects that perform no other doubling, as the 2.P>3 ED forms in TABLE show; this super-plural te probably has in any case an X₀-movement source contingent on any φ-Agree between 2.PL non-absolutive (XN). Conclusions regarding the validity and scope Activity Condition on the basis of such evidence made in Rezac (2003) cannot stand, and I have not adopted the condition here (see XN); specifically, the occasional lack of SX if A controls PX under ED cannot be viewed as evidence that v-A Agree for [part] entails failure of T-A Agree for the same.²⁷

ED however provides quite a different evidence for φ-Agree between T and A. In many dialects the theme-marker shows sensitivity to the singular vs. plural distinction of A when A is the PX controller (thus, 1st/2nd person): it is ∅ when A is singular and en when it is plural. TABLE above shows this for G-H-nePD:ALO; TABLE below contrasts this in EB, exemplifying such dialects, with B-V-O:A, exemplifying dialects where this does not occur (cf. B-Oroz-Arbaiza in TABLE above, where also the theme-marker is invariant, but end, not e).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Variation in A number conditioned theme marker variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

²⁷ There are very curious but also very isolated forms like HNn-Ir-OIR:AI past 1.P>2.R>3.P g-(en)-i-zki-zu-te-n (≠) [1’-(TM)-3V-PL-2-PL*-PT], where te is controlled by 1.PL ergative A; little can presently be made of them.
Lüders (1993:80), Albizu and Eguren (2000:9), Albizu (2002:15f.) propose that that en of EB and its congener is a realization of [plural] of the A PX controller under ED. Fernández and Albizu (2001:ft. 7) specifically propose that it spells out the number feature of T checked by A; that is T-A Agree for number. ED forms like \textit{g-en-it-u-en} \([1'\text{-TM-PL-v2V-PT}] \) \(1.P>3.P\) would thus be spelling out two number probes: PL \(i\) being \(v\)'s [number] probe valued from 3.P O, and \(en\) being T's \(\phi\)-probe valued to plural from 1.P A, which has itself valued \(v\)'s [part] probe to give the PX \(g\) \([1]\).  

This is an attractive idea, but it must be substantiated, for as APPENDIX TM details, the theme marker can be sensitive to any property of the agreement complex, and is subject to vast dialectal variation. Thus, the EB pattern could equally be interpreted as sensitivity of the theme marker to the fact that PX is \(g\) and \(s\), or that it is controlled by \([1']\) and \([2]\) (vs. \([1]\) and \([2F]\)), rather than making reference to their concomitant [plural] distinction.

Luckily, the proposal can indeed be supported, although the details involve a comparison of a large number of dialects, and they are given separately in APPENDIX TM. The support lies in an implication. Some dialects treat 1.PL, 2.R, 2.P O/S(O') as lacking [plural] for the purposes of controlling the PL morpheme, which is a spell-out of \(v\)'s [number] probe; C1 argues that this means that their morphosyntactic features are \([1']\), \([2]\), \([2, PL']\), and lack [plural]. One such dialect is B-V-O:A; its data are given in TABLE. Where EB in 3.S>\(\alpha\) combinations has the PL marker \(it\) controlled by 3.PL O as well as 1.PL and 2.R/PL O, B-V-O:A only has it appear when O is 3.PL. Correspondingly, B-V-O:A lacks the theme-marker distinction for 1/2.S vs. 1/2.P, 2.R ergative A is PX controller in \(\alpha>3.S\) combinations, where EB has \(\emptyset\) vs. \(en\). The systematic nature of the implication: 1/2.P, 2.R fail to trigger PL \(\rightarrow\) 1/2.P, 2.R fail to be distinguished from 1/2.S by the theme marker indicates that the same property of 1/2.P, 2.R is responsible for both, namely absence of [plural] feature. This seems to be the situation, among dialects in the corpus, in B-V-O:A, B-V-O:O, B-Sa-pB:PE, B-Sa-pE:PE, B-V-O:G, B-Sa-pM:A, B-Sa-pA:l, B-Sa-pl:G, B-Sa-pE:G, B-Sa-pM:G, B-V-O:1, B-Sa-pA:G, B-Sa-pEc:U, B-Sa-pEc:B, G-H-U:A.  

\textbf{TABLE: 2V present in B-V-O:A}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>ERG</th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>dau</td>
<td>dau</td>
<td>do(g)u</td>
<td>dosu</td>
<td>dosue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>ditu</td>
<td>ditu</td>
<td>ditut</td>
<td>ditusu</td>
<td>ditussue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>naisu</td>
<td>naisue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>gau</td>
<td>gaue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>gaisu</td>
<td>gaisue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29. No evidence for the internal structure of T's \(\phi\)-probe, if any, exists.
29. Thus there are dialects with contrasts for SPX controller such as 1.S \textit{nindabilan} vs. 1.P \textit{ginabil\'tzan}.
30. The implication is not two way: there are dialects where class-markers do not distinguish \(gu\), \(zu\), \(zue\) from \(n\), \(h\) but PL does
2R sau sauə sauət sauəgu - -
2.PL sauə sauəiʔ sauət sauəgu - -

Since under ED the [plural] of the PX controller, ergative A, does not value v's [number] probe, as this is always valued from O, it must enter into the agreement system in some other way -- through φ-Agree with T, as Femández and Albizu proposed. This under-determines how the theme-marker comes to be sensitive to this fact, for it certainly does not mean it is a spell-out of T's [plural] feature (it is also sensitive to tense, first/second cycle, etc.); but that is secondary to my concern here.

The occurrence of T-A φ-Agree in ED contexts has an important consequence. Laka (1993:54) points out that ED does not affect auxiliary selection, and Rebuschi (1983), Albizu (2001, 2002) show that the relevant auxiliary selection in Basque is not due to thematic properties but to Case/Agree properties (see XN), namely the presence of [ergative] agreement. [ergative] here is equivalent to saying that there is a φ-probe on T (that finds a goal), or perhaps somewhat more accurate given long-distance T-Agree with non-ergatives in (26).

On the other hand, I have not been able to conclude anything about T-A Agree for A's [part] features, namely those that value v’s [part] probe, in ED contexts. C5 shows that in general, T can Agree with a goal for person, for this functions as a repair strategy for v-S failure to Agree for person (the Person Case Constraint); but whether further this occurs in an ED context is simply unclear.\(^{31}\) Overt morphology is little guide, given that the SX series does not seem to reflect φ-Agree but rather X-movement, as discussed above, which need not be triggered by Agree for person (Agree for number, for example, would suffice).

3.5 The Tense Condition

Across the Basque dialects, ED is restricted by the Tense Condition, (27), exemplified in TABLE. The meaning of non-present here is situated in the three-way partition between present, past, and irrealis (or tenseless) features that are relevant to the agreement system, conditioning on the one hand the choice of default PX (d, z, l resp.), and on the other ED (XN; Laka 1993). The actual use of the combinations of these features with others (potentiality contributed by the morpheme ke; subjunctive; etc.), are a different matter and not here relevant.\(^{32}\)

\(^{31}\) The crux is the analysis of forms with loss of ED, like 2V past z-i-o-zu-n [X?/2?-√3V/3-2-PT] used under AD for 1V 3.S+>2.P to license [part] of 2.P in G-Tol (KE): if ED is really not occurring here, rather than being masked morphologically, the T-A agreement must be for [part].

\(^{32}\) For example, the hypothetical past conditional in apodoses ("If Patxi had come", Maddi would have seen him", G:§3.5.4.7.2) uses in different dialects irrealis + ke combined with the perfective participle (ilas i luke), past + ke
(27) **Tense Condition**: ED occurs only in non-present contexts.

TABLE: ED, default, and tense features for 2V auxiliary root *ezan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>d-e-za-ke</td>
<td>d-e-za-ke-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-TM-√2V-POT</td>
<td>X-TM-√2V-POT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past (-n)</td>
<td>z-e-za-ke-en</td>
<td>n-e-za-ke-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-TM-√2V-POT-PT</td>
<td>1-TM-√2V-POT-PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis</td>
<td>l-e-za-ke</td>
<td>n-e-za-ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-TM-√2V-POT</td>
<td>1-TM-√2V-POT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This limitation on ED is parochial to Basque and not a characteristic of the ED pattern elsewhere, for example in Georgian or Itelmen. Within Basque however, it is entrenched: some dialects lose ED within a subset of the Tense Condition, but in almost none does ED transgress it into the present. The only exception that I am aware of occurs in G-Bu-O:O, shown in TABLE. The exception is *nezaik*, 1.S/P>2.P(>3.S), with clear coding of A by PX n [1] rather than SX [t].

TABLE: 3S* present in G-Bu-O:O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ERG</th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>3.PL</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>dero</td>
<td>deroi</td>
<td>derot</td>
<td>derogu</td>
<td>derozu</td>
<td>derozai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>dero</td>
<td>deroi</td>
<td>derot</td>
<td>derogu</td>
<td>derozu</td>
<td>derozai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>dura</td>
<td>durai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>durazu</td>
<td>durazai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>dura</td>
<td>durai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dura/durazu</td>
<td>durazai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>dezu</td>
<td>dezai/dezu</td>
<td>dezu</td>
<td>dezai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>dezai</td>
<td>dezai</td>
<td>dezai/nezaik</td>
<td>dezai/nezaik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In G-Bu-O:O there is a virtually complete reduction of 1.PL.DAT forms to 1.SG.DAT, and this also occurs for 1.P>2.P+, including *nezaik* though not for other 1.PL.ERG forms. The structure of *nezaik* is n-e-zaiI [1-CL+√3V-2+PL'], beside the expected dezait/ dezai't/榛ai' (nezai and dezai/dezaigu come from different consultants). With present *nezaik* one may compare past 1.S>2.P>3.S *nezain*, 1.P>2.P>3.S *nezain* (beside *gendezain*).

The G-Bu-O:O dialect (or even idiolect) is isolated, but it is the product of the competence of a native speaker. In view of the ED pattern cross-linguistically, there can be a deep condition

\[ (ikusi zueen), or past combined with the prospective participle (future-in-the-past, *ikusiko zuen). \]

\[ The choice of the root *ezan* is expository: all these forms occur from other roots, but some are frequent in EB only from *ezan; thus *duke* like *dezake*, but the former is a now literary/archaic future in EB. \]

\[ The 2VPPr paradigm under leismo of 1/2 O, and the 3VPPr paradigm, largely share the same forms, in particular the form in question. \]

\[ The singularity of this form corresponds to the situation of Basque in G-Bu-O:O, a "language death" situation. The data was collected in 1980 in the locality of Olazagutia (variety Burunda, sub-variety Olazagutia-Ciordia), from (my translation) Josefa Galbete Ondarra, 82 years of age (VIII-31), an Olaztiar and one who has always lived there. Husband: Florencio Vicente Galbete -- deceased --; with him always in Basque; his father was Ramón Vicente, Muniai de la Solana'koa, only erikaldu [non-Basque speaker -MR]." (Y-G-II-219) For the dialect in general:
between the Tense Condition and ED; in view of G-Bu-O:O, but far less clearly given the limited nature of the evidence, there might not be anything deep to the embedding of ED in a Basque-like system that links it with the Tense Condition. Its remarkable stability parallels the stability of the three-way default prefix distinction (present $d$, past $∅$, irrealis $l$) across time and dialects. It also parallels the distribution of "heavy" theme markers containing a consonantal element, which are restricted to the non-present context, although within it, they may be absent in any particular dialect (like ED may be, given its loss), and they certainly do not correlate with ED (occurring even in $3>3$ combinations; see APPENDIX TM). The choice of default and the tense-sensitivity of the class marker (in general, and the distribution of the "heavy" forms) are normally treated not as something deep, inescapable about the non-present, but rather as accidental though simply encoded as allomorphy to the feature specifications for tense. I suggest ED is like these tense-sensitivities too: the Tense Condition is a development with diachronic roots (see XN), accidental as a constraint on ED, yet easily encodable, and one that has for that reason simply remained stable.

The matter of encoding the Tense Condition itself is secondary to this claim. The rest of this section is dedicated to an examination of the one proposal that it might be a deep property of ED, that of Laka (1993) relying on correlation with overt tense/mood, and extensions along that line relying on Phillips's (1993) and Hale (2001), and pinpointing where they seem untenable. In the system proposed here, it seems simplest to me that the parameter that yields ED in the non-present is encoded as a selection of $T$ for the $φ$-probe specification of $v$. In the non-present, $v$ has the $φ$-probes discussed so far, the independent $[π → local → part]$ and $[number]$ probes, which can accordingly Agree with different goals. In the present however, the former probe is just $[π]$. Since any DP values both of these, and some internal argument is a DP, neither will ever be available for Agree with $A$. In other words, in the present $φ$-probe of $v$ is like in English or French.

Yet I stress that this is only one way of understanding the Tense Condition. It meets a desideratum that other implementations should meet: namely, capturing the pivotal role played by features of Tense (here as selector of $v$), and the irrelevance of other features in the agreement complex in systematically conditioning ED (see section for discussion of ED loss).

Laka (1993) proposes that the Tense Condition on ED is deep, not accidental. As discussed in XN, ED for her is downward Move α of a the ergative X$^0$ in the mapping from S-structure to PF, and the trace of the moved element is subject to the Empty Category Principle applying at that level. Specifically, the clitic starts out adjoined to $T$, and its trace must be head-governed by a head with phonological content (originating in or ending up in $T$): "either the past tense...

---

35 Yet I stress that this is only one way of understanding the Tense Condition. It meets a desideratum that other implementations should meet: namely, capturing the pivotal role played by features of Tense (here as selector of $v$), and the irrelevance of other features in the agreement complex in systematically conditioning ED (see section for discussion of ED loss).

36 One can envisage, for example, that $T$ selects a $v$ with the same $φ$-probe always, but present $T$ selects a $v$ that will itself select some element as its first specifier (below $A$) that values $[part]$ and blocks it from seeing $A$ (Rezac 2003:168n11). On the other hand, an alternative that cannot work in anything like the model proposed here is that only in the non-present are $3^o$ person goals values of $[part]$, for that would require a selectional dependency between $T$ and the complement of $V$.
morpheme or the modal morpheme or the conditional morpheme" (p. 53). The generalization the she captures by this, and the prediction of the approach, is that in ED there must be a head with phonological content, and (less difficult to evaluate) where ED fails it is because there is no head available as governor (present, and imperative, the latter not so clear, see XN).

The proposal is not quite this simple though; the potential head ke appears in forms both with and without ED, as TABLE shows. In Laka's formulation, the follows because ke can raise to T, to become the head-governor of ergative X's trace, only if T is featurally empty, and this occurs only in the irrealis; the present tense is specified as +present (and past is +past) (cf. p. 47, 60n28). The complexity then comes from the fact that present tense is featurally there and blocks ke from raising to T to enable ED, but it is phonologically null so that it cannot itself enable ED; the past tense is overt both phonologically and featurally so it always enables ED, and the irrealis null in both ways, so it is up to the presence of ke to enable ED.38

However, Gómez and Sainz (1995:265) point out the problems of forms like (ba)n-u [(if-)1-\sqrt{2V}][if]I had it], that seem to have no overt head at all and yet ED occurs. Generally, the entire Irrealis row in TABLE can occur without ke. Typically, this is in protasis of conditionals and the prefix ba- 'if' is always present. This prefix itself has no significant relationship to the agreement complex or restrictions on its tense, and so on; it can prefix to any form in TABLE, e.g. ba-d-u-t [if-X-\sqrt{2V}-1] 'if I have it'. This alone makes it a difficult candidate for one of the heads that licenses/enables ED like ke.39 More seriously, there are forms that have ED only and not even this prefix. The clearest type, with no further affixes, is rare; it occurs systematically with the Old Bizkaian verb and auxiliary egin 'do'. Thus one gets, in the sixteenth century, ED in bare forms expressing an eventual sense in escondu n-e-y [1-TM-\vegin ] 'je l'attraperai' ('I will get him'), corresponding to l- default, artu l-e-ydi [X-TM-\vegin ] 'tomaria' ('he would take it') (cf. present d-a-i [X-TM-\vegin ] 'he will do it', past e-gi-an [TM-\vegin-PT] 'he did it'); Lafon (1-43ff., 452ff., II-78ff., 1955:346).

A second type equally persuasive, but more difficult to lay out (and thus that the reader might want to skip), are hypothetical subjunctives of the type l-e-za-n [X-TM-\sqrt{2V}-that] 'so that he have it' also observed in Gómez and Sainz (1995).40 These exist in the eastern dialects (and EB) beside the present subjunctive type d-e-za-n [X-TM-\sqrt{2V}-that] 'so that he may have it', past azan 'so that he may have had it'; see G:§3.5.4.9.3. The subjunctive uses the relative complementizer izer-n, which deletes the preceding tense affix -n, so the presence of the latter cannot be detected; however, the default prefix can be used to infer its presence or absence. In lezan, the default is l; and this default is not compatible with past tense, which requires z: so there are no *l-u-ke-en [X-\sqrt{2V}-PO T-PT] as (formally) past of l-u-ke, but rather z-u-ke-en (consult TABLE). Hence in lezan, there is no (deleted) past -n. At the same time, the default prefix l (and z) in 3>3 combinations is a indication that ED must occur in corresponding 1/2>3 combinations: thus corresponding to l-e-za-ke [X-TM-\sqrt{2V}-PT] in TABLE is n-e-za-ke [1-TM-\sqrt{2V}-PO T], and

38 Laka's discussion here is distributed over two portions of her article, and this may have given rise to a misinterpretation. Gómez and Sainz (1995:265) raise as an argument against Laka's proposal the contrast between dezakegu 'we can have it', genezake 'we could have it' for ED; yet these would be for Laka simply present vs. irrealis. There is no reason to bar ke from present. So Lafitte's (p. 285) nemanake is ambiguous in the same way, as present potential with no ED 'il peut m'amener', or as irrealis with ED 'je le ramènerai'.

39 The best one could do, I think, is to claim that ba- is suppressing -ke, which licenses ED, so a form like banu is in fact < banuke. This seems not unreasonable; forms like banuke do in fact exist in several western dialects (G:§3.5.4.7.3, ex. 97, 98), where they do have the function of standard banu.

40 These are not as a mode of formation restricted to the roots *edin, *ezan, though that is where they are alive: cf. Lafon's obratzen huen (qui) opérât and his discussion thereof (Lafon I-44ff., II-83ff.).
there is no */z-e-za-ke-t [X-TM-V2V-POT-1] (or for other roots: *luke, *nuke, *luket, *zut…). So a form like 3>3 lezan implies the existence of non-past l>3 nezan, which indeed occurs in the same usage as lezan. But if nezan does not contain past -n, only the relative complementizer -n (which is itself completely outside the agreement complex and the tense system and compatible with anything), nezan has ED with no other overt functional head of the tense/mood system.

These are all forms where ED occurs without another phonologically overt head; if rare, they exist within a type of Basque that shows ED with no important differences from other periods and dialects. To them may be added phenomenon of a different sort: many Basque dialects drop the final -n of the past (Azkue II:584/§822ff., Gómez and Sainz 1995:247n16), with no effect on ED, creating a new system with no overt head to license ED. The same challenge as applies to Laka's proposal applies to other attempts to cash in on phonological overtness, either of T (Fernández and Albizu 2001: sections 4, 6) or of the theme marker (Rezac 2004a:114n94). I will not review these here; both are far less articulated and find problems far more plentiful than Laka's proposal. I conclude that there can be no connection of ED with an overt tense/mood head.

It should be noted at the outset that if Laka's correlation of ED with an overt head could be maintained in some form, even indirectly, it raises various possibilities that need not depend on the ECP. For example, an overt head could facilitate ED by assuming that A is the argument of another head H, so that v-to-H raising is necessary to expand the search-space of v to Hp, and this raising is motivated by the presence of overt affixal material in H (the Stray Affix Filter). Two further ideas have been made in the literature for correlating agreement displacement and (typically) overt heads, Phillips (1993) for Yimas and Hale (2001) for several languages, that I will review to illustrate both the possible ways to go, and their unsuitability to Basque for now.

In Yimas, the leftmost agreement slot in the agreement complex is satisfactorily filled either by a head of the left-peripheral (T/C) system, such as ant- 'potentially', or by agreement morphology controlled by the absolutive. If neither is available, the slot must be filled by agreement morphology using the absolutive form but controlled by another argument (ergative), thus, through agreement displacement (see XN). The resemblance to Basque the PX slot is clear, with default prefixes analogous to the T/C heads. Phillips names the requirement that the Yimas slot be filled the Yimas Extended Projection Principle (YEPP), and analyses it as follows:

(28) I interpret these alternations [displacement to absolutive] as the consequences of a requirement of the Absolutive assigning head I₀, which must be satisfied by S-structure. The requirement is that I₀ stand in some local relation to a nominal category, and there are two ways in which it can be satisfied. The first is if an NP occupies the specifier of IP, presumably entering into an agreement relation with I₀, and triggering an Absolutive agreement prefix […]. The second is if I₀ raises and incorporates into a higher 'nominal' head - assuming that the nominal inflection suffixes associated with many of the modal prefixes discussed above reflect the nominal nature of these heads. (Phillips 1993:00)

Adapting this to Basque would necessitate a change in point of view that seems ad-hoc. In Yimas, the T/C head that satisfies the YEPP occurs independently with absolutive agreement following it, if the conditions for both are met; it is only when the latter is absent that the head counts for YEPP (through I₀ raising to it), and only when even such a head is not available that agreement displacement occurs. In Basque, the candidates for these heads are the default prefixes, d (present), z/∅ (past), l (irrealis). One could then start with the idea that the insertion
of the present $d$ into the structure at around the area of $v$ is what blocks ED in the present, say (in the present conception) as a intervener for [part], and very schematic suggestions to this effect have been made (Albizu and Fernández 2001, Rezac 2003:168n11). Yet it is a crucial insight of Laka's (1993) proposal is the default prefixes are not independent contentful heads of the tense/mood system, but last-resort defaults, for they are restricted to contexts where there is no absolutive controller for the PX, and when ED is available no ergative controller either -- unlike in Yimas.

Hale (2001) develops an approach to a class of agreement displacement phenomena that are somewhat different from those of ED (see XN): (i) the canonical relationship between DP $\alpha$ and head $H_1$ is severed; thus, (ii) a non-canonical agreement between $\alpha$ and another head $H_2$ obtains; which (iii) may affect other DPs that would canonically or potentially relate to $H_2$. The guiding intuition is that (i), severing of the canonical $\alpha$-$H_1$ relationship, comes extra non-agreement morphology in $H_1$ that suppresses its agreement. The approach thus lends itself ideally to -- and is inspired by -- agreement displacement that correlates with the addition of morphology that signals the displacement, like the "spurious antipassive" marker of Chukchi.

However, Basque ED has no such morphology (a different question from whether potential ED contexts have such morphology, Laka’s proposal addressed above). Non-present ED and non-ED contexts do not differ in the richness of their suffixal tense/mood morphology, e.g. past canonical 3.S$\rightarrow$1.S $n$-ind-u-en [1-TM-$2V$-PT], ED 1.S$\rightarrow$3.S $n$-u-en [1-$2V$-PT]. As this example illustrates, if they differ in the form of theme markers, it is typically the non-ED context which is phonologically richer; however, the range of variation in theme markers is so vast in any case that no generalization about their overtness can be drawn not only for ED, but also for potential ED (Tense Condition) contexts (see APPENDIX, TM).

Resuming all this, Basque ED cannot be linked to any other property overtly realized in the Basque agreement complex. Even weakenings of the correlation with overtness, as on Phillips's approach, do not seem to lead anywhere interesting. As all the proposals above show, the existence of such a correlation in a strong or weak form would be attractive because it would provide an independent explanation for the Tense Condition that does not rely on simple stipulation of the type that I have suggested above. Yet at present, attractive as the ideas are, they seem to be wrong for Basque ED, and a less interesting parametrization to be in order.

3.6 Number agreement and its non-displacement

It is a striking property of ED that it affects the person features, not number: $v$ is valued from 1/2 A if O is not 1/2, but it is never valued from plural A if O not plural. Theories of ED normally captured the fact 1st/2nd/3rd person distinction relevant for ED by making only 1st/2nd persons in the relevant sense; here, only 1st/2nd persons are [participants]. However, theories of $\phi$-features that make available such a characterization normally make available also a feature that captures plurals and leaves out singular, e.g. [group].

Interestingly enough, this asymmetry in ED is not unique to Basque. The Itelmen ED pattern, discussed in XN, shows exactly the same behavior: the O agreement slot acquires its 1/2 person features from A if it is 3rd person, but it never acquires the plural features of A regardless of its own number. Within Itelmen, this is supported by the neat contrast that if there is no O

41 The role of the Yimas heads is not due simply to their overtness, so nothing prevents the postulation of a phonologically null head with the same effect, like the Bizkaian past default $\emptyset$ for $z$ of other dialects.

38
(morphological unergatives), the O agreement slot acquires both the 1/2 person and the plural features of A.

The asymmetry between person and number is not surprising insofar as the variation in the sensitivity of a φ-probe is given by the syntactic visibility of various segments on a φ-feature geometry, as in the approach here (Béjar 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2004). In (29) I given again the Harley and Ritter (2002) universal φ-feature geometry that forms the basis of the geometry adopted here for Basque.

As discussed above, the sensitivity of Basque to the 1/2-3 contrast follows from v's φ-probe possessing a [part] node as a probe, but not its dependance; Mohawk, which has a 1-2-3 contrast, possesses both the [part] node and its [speaker] node dependant as syntactically visible probes, while English which makes no contrast between 1-2-3, has neither [part] nor its dependants as probes.

(29) Feature-geometry

```
Referring Expression (− Pronoun) [RE]
  π
    |  Individuation [number]
    |  local Group Minimal Class
    |  participant [part]
          Speaker    Addressee
```

It is expected that sensitivity to features other than those on the π branch can be similarly modulated, namely sensitivity to number and to class (including gender). It is an interesting property of the feature geometry that if the number probe in Basque (and Itelmen), though called here [number], is [individuation], as has so far been assumed, then any DP is matching goal. [Individuation] subsumes not just plurality, that is [group], but also the property of class/gender, and perhaps also the very property of being non-plural, that is the default [minimal], although its mandatory presence for singulars is not clear. There are no DPs analogous to 3rd person DPs lacking [part] that would lack [individuation]. This could be an accidental property of the feature geometry whose use to code the non-displacement of number agreement is mechanical. Yet, I suspect it is in fact deep: the [individuation] node is what corresponds to the referential index of Williams (1980), the index/name of the variable assignment function in Heim and Kratzer (1998), the name as it were of a DP -- what individuates it (Rezac 2004a:00, 2004b, 2006). It is indeed a part of the classical intuition about φ-features that they are referential indices or variable names. If so, a DP truly cannot lack [individuation] in the same way it can lack [participant]; and [individuation] is a legitimate choice for subset of the φ-feature geometry spelled out as PL.

Just like languages can modulate the articulation of [π] to give various sensitivities to the "person" probe, from English to Basque to Mohawk, they might be expected to modulate the articulation of the [individuation] dependant. This would be the case for languages that unlike Basque and Itelmen treat only plurals, not singulars, as matching goals for their "plural" probe.

---

42 Here slightly simplified to omit irrelevant dependants of the dependants of [individuation], and omitting as well the [local] feature between [RE] and [participant] posited in XN.
studied in Béjar (2003). The relevant probe would be a probe for [group], not for [individuation], and only DPs possessing [group] value it.

There is an independent indication that each DP in Basque is a matching goal for number agreement, including singulars. This comes from the dialects studied in C3 where 1st/2nd person O' (applicative) datives are matching goals for v's φ-probe; so in (30)a, the O' guri controls the PX and PL on the agreement complex, neither of which could it do in non-DD dialects like EB. These dialects often develop a second number agreement morphology, PL2, controlled by the lower O2 absolutive; this is zki in (30). C3 argues that this is the overt spell-out of a [number] probe on the applicative head Appl and that Agree between it and O2 is needed to Case-license O2. The point of relevance is that this second number probe / PL affix appears even when O' dative is singular and O' itself does not allow the farther one to value the [number] probe of v, yielding n-a-it-u [1-TM-PL-\sqrt{2}V] in (30)b.

This is a rare context in Basque where a situation can be arranged that v has two DPs in its complements that are both potential valuers. Apparently, the singularity of the closer one does not allow the farther one to value the [number] probe of v, yielding n-a-it-u [1-TM-PL-\sqrt{2}V] in (30)b.

(30) a. (proi) (guri) (sagarrak) eman g-a-it-u-zki.
   he.ERG us.DAT apples.ABS given 1'-TM-PL-\sqrt{2}V
   He gave us apples.

b. (proi) (guri) (sagarrak) eman n-a-u-zki.
   he.ERG me.DAT apples.ABS given 1-TM-\sqrt{2}V
   He gave me apples. (constructed for L-Sara; see C3 for details)

The same argument can be drawn from number agreement under Ā-movement, discussed in C1, but with unclarities. The argument works in transitive constructions, with an ergative subject. It follows on observations made by Oyarçabal (2004: note 13). In (31), plural the operator corresponds to a temporal adjunct, "in those places". This can control plural agreement, as in (31)b; but the requirement is that the verb locally associated with the relevant agreement complex not take an object, not even a singular one, in fact not even just the generally null object of undergoatives like bazkaldu 'lunch' in these sentences. Oyarçabal gives another example that I omit for simplicity showing that if there is an object, Ā number agreement is possible only if the structure is distorted from the normal and the typically absolutive object ends up dative (not a potential PL controller). This follows if any O, including singular, prevents the number probe of the next higher v from looking past it to the lower [Spec, vP] to see the plural Ā element.

(31) a. [Urtean zehar e, bazkaldun (\textit{it})-u-en] ostatuak zerrendatu zituzten.
   year.in through lunched 1-TM-(*PL)-\sqrt{2}V-that hostels.D.ABS they listed
   They listed the hotels (where) they lunched-*PL throughout the year.

b. [Urtean zehar e, bazkaldun genuela] segurki z-e-ki-zki-te-n ostatuak ...
   securely X-TM-know-PL-PL'-PT
   (They listed) the hotels (where) they knew-PL for sure that they lunched throughout the year.

43 For example, Georgian dialects where O may control the number suffix (Hewitt 1995:129-131, Harris 1981:chapter 15, 301-2n5). This and other cases often present interesting complications, and a general pattern that the [group] probe always seems to be on T, not on v, so they never show the ED pattern for plural anyway.
Finally, restructuring constructions are consistent with this. As discussed in C1, Etxepare (2003) demonstrates that an unaccusative restructuring verb must turn transitive in order to support both its argument and agreement with and Case assignment to an argument of its non-finite complement. In (32)a, auxiliary switch from auxiliary indicating absolute assignment (1V) to one indicating ergative-absolutive assignment (2V) is obligatory if the $g_u$ argument of the embedded verb is to be agreed with. The auxiliary switch is probably dictated simply by the need of two arguments for Case, but at any rate it turns out not to permit situations where $v$'s number probe would pass through its S singular argument and Agree remotely with a plural O of a restructuring argument. As pointed out in C1, constructions with exactly this apparent shape, including double absolute assignment, do occur, but under completely unstudied circumstances and going contra the evidence of the former type, as in (32)b.

(32) a. $pro_1 [e\ g_\ u_j\ ezagutzen]\ hasi\ z-e-n\ /\ g_1-in-t_j-u-en$
   they.ABS/ERG you.ABS bull-fighting walked X-$\sqrt{1V}$-PT 1'-TM-PL-$\sqrt{2V}$-PT
   (He came out from a coma and straightway), he started to recognize you. (Etxepare 2003: 171)

b. [(Iohan Apezaren eremuan diren uharte miresgarrien)
   $pro_1\ izenak_k\ ematera\ ]\ n_1-oa-z_k-x-ki-\ u_j\ pro_1$
   you.DAT names.D.ABS to.giving 1-$\sqrt{go}$-PL-DF-2
   I am going to give you the names of the wondrous islands that are in the wilderness of Iohan the Priest. (Septentrio, Autelio Arkotxa, Albertania 2001, p. 89)

3.7 The invisibility of datives

The dative is completely invisible to ED: the person values of the O' dative, canonically coded by SX, neither value $v$'s [part] probe (reflected as PX), nor do they in any way interfere with its valuation from A, (33)a. 44 This latter point contrasts with what the O' dative does to the [part] probe of $v$ with respect to Agree with O2/S, which it blocks, (33)b: this is the Person Case Constraint, introduced in XN and discussed in XN.

(33) a. $pro_1\ zuri_j\ pro_j\ eraman\ d-i-zki-xu-t\ /\ n-i-zki-xu$
   1.ERG you.DAT them.ABS brought  X-$\sqrt{3V}$-PL-2-1  1-$\sqrt{3V}$-PL-2
   I brought them to you.

b. *$pro_1\ zuri_j\ pro_j\ eraman\ n-(a)-i-xu$.
   1.ERG you.DAT me.ABS brought 1-TM-$\sqrt{2}$
   He brought me to you.

There is a first point to be made about the invisibility of the dative to ED, and it is of considerable importance: it is hard to treat by purely morphological approaches to ED-like phenomena. Dative agreement is normally linearly situated between PX, the position in question,

44 In dialects that show loss of ED, the paradigm earliest affected tends to be the 3V paradigm containing 1st/2nd person datives. However, as APPENDIX ED-LOSS discusses, the tendency to affect the 3V rather than the 2V paradigm by ED loss is a usage fact relating to sequence, as ED loss tends to start out in least used parts of the paradigm, like other arbitrary gaps, and perhaps the contrast between 3rd and 1st/2nd person datives, both of which are signalled by overt person markers in the SX field, is to be attributed to this.
and the canonical realization by SX morphology of the ergative controller that under ED controls of PX (sometimes doubled by its canonical realization). This ordering is not absolute in the dialects, and there are arbitrary exceptions, but it is a clear preferential tendency (see XN). Furthermore, both the dative and the ergative make use of the same SX morphology. If ED in Basque is treated as a case of, for instance, allomorphy, or of feature copying in the morphological component from the SX to the PX morphological slot (see XN on Itelmen), it is hard to see why dative agreement morphology or features should be invisible in this way.

The syntactic approach is better off here, though it also faces a challenge: the (agreeing, or applicative) dative is demonstrably between A and O2/S hierarchically, and it behaves together with these for some diagnostics of visibility to the φ-Agree system in general. However, there is an important property that sets off the dative from the ergative and absolutive: it bears inherent case, while the ergative and absolutive can be borne by non-thematic DPs, and the agreement morphology it controls is always on its "local" agreement complex, while that of ergative and absolutive can be controlled by a remote goal, even in a different clause (C1). The dative agreement morphology is, like all SX agreement morphology, due to X0 movement (cliticization), not to φ-Agree valuation, whether it comes from dative or ergative (C3).

C3 demonstrates these points, and develops a theory whereby the dative is a PP that cannot value v's φ-probe, having no values for [part] or [number] as a PP. For the same reason, it does hinder Agree between v's [part] and A. Empirically, the theory makes the right cuts and has correct predictions. Conceptually, it exploits the insight of Nichols (2001): if Person Hierarchy phenomena, of which ED is one, are implemented through the syntax of the Case (Agree) system, one expects arguments with inherent case to be invisible to them. The differentiation of an agreeing O' dative from the core A-O-S system of agreement, with other striking parallels with Basque, are also found in Yimas: see XN.

In dialects where 1st/2nd person datives control PX (and PL), also studied in C3, PX/PL control by dative under DD naturally pre-empts control by ergative. In these dialects, for the purposes of φ-Agree, the dative behaves exactly like O/S. Its O/S-like behavior extends fully to ED contexts as expected, and it blocks ED as it values v's [part] probe.

The final point to be addressed, then, is the apparent visibility of (normal, non-DD) datives to φ-Agree in (33)b, where they do block [part] Agree past them. This, the Person Case Constraint, is not relevant to ED, so I must let the phenomenon be developed in C3 and particularly C5. Keeping to the minimum that at present must seem ad-hoc, I will propose (following Béjar and Rezac 2004) that the dative PP is specified for a φ-feature, [RE-local]. This is insufficient to deactivate [π → local → part], and of course [individuation], the [part] and [number] probes of v; thus, [part] is free to Agree later with A under ED. However, the dative does halt the [part] probe as it is a subset of it, and prevents it from seeing a more distant matching goal, though it has no effect on the latter. The dative is thus a partial intervener of the type discussed in XN, visible to φ-Agree, but with insufficient structure to value the φ-probe of v in Basque.

3.8 ED loss, imperative, and covert ED

In a few dialect groups in the corpus, ED is lost partially or nearly wholly, leaving a subset of ED forms within well-defined or arbitrary subsets of the original ED distribution. TABLE exemplifies this phenomenon from a sub-paradigm three closely-related dialects (with a three-quarter century gap between the first and the two others) arranged in order of progressive ED loss. As can be seen, whereas the first dialect has ED exactly as expected, the second begins to
replace some ED forms by forms where PX is default and the ergative is coded by SX, as in the present, and the third carries this out nearly completely. Among the new forms there is variation whether the form of the PX is the one the dialect normally uses for the past, s-, or present, d-.

TABLE: ED loss in B-Berm across three dialects

Legend:
Dialects: (1) B-B-wA:A; (2) B-B-wA:O; (3) B-B-p:E.
* -- forms formed like (from) the present by adding past -en, in bold if they keep the present default -d, in italics if they replace it by past default s-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASS ERG</th>
<th>Dial.</th>
<th>3.SG</th>
<th>3.PL</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>seuen</td>
<td>eubien</td>
<td>nauen</td>
<td>genduen</td>
<td>senduen</td>
<td>senduen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>seuen</td>
<td>seu(b)ien</td>
<td>neuen</td>
<td>gendun</td>
<td>senduen</td>
<td>senduen/suen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sauen*</td>
<td>saui en*</td>
<td>neuer/doten*</td>
<td>dun*</td>
<td>sun*</td>
<td>suien*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sitxusen</td>
<td>naitxusen/nehxan</td>
<td>gendxen</td>
<td>sendxen</td>
<td>sendxesan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>seitxusen</td>
<td>seitxusien</td>
<td>naitxusen/nauxen</td>
<td>sendxen</td>
<td>sendxesan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-t(xusen*)</td>
<td>disen(*)</td>
<td>dotxasen*</td>
<td>dusen*</td>
<td>susen*</td>
<td>suien*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I undertake a study of this phenomenon, its patterns, its quirks, and its historical development, in the corpus in APPENDIX ED-LOSS (including this dialect group); there also are discussed previous works on ED loss, particularly Hualde (2000, 2001). The theoretical tools to deal with this kind of variation, if real, are only developed in C3 for a variation in the distribution of DD that is similar but that I have studied in much more depth, since the corpus was designed to contain virtually all DD dialects, not all ED dialects. C3 returns to how those tools might be applied to ED loss.

As it has come up, I have been hedging the reality of the phenomenon. By real ED loss I mean that the forms showing ED loss have the same φ-Agree mechanics as the present: the [part] probe of ν does not Agree with A through cyclic expansion, e.g. because there is no separate [part] probe in non-ED contexts as proposed in XN. In matter of fact however, ED loss forms are not always the forms one expects if ED had been lost. TABLE shows that such forms do not always have the expected past default s; they may have the present default, and they may lack a default altogether in other dialects (see APPENDIX ED-LOSS for a more precise statement).

The alternative to real ED-loss is that ED happens exactly as in other dialects, but that it fails to be spelled out. Whereas in other dialects second cycle PX morphology, controlled by A, is identical to first cycle PX morphology, controlled by S/O, this is not cross-linguistically necessary (Georgian, Karok), and within Basque itself the difference is reflected by the theme marker. Thus, it could be that ED loss forms are spelling out A-controlled PX by other morphology. This morphology in fact (almost) never shows the expected PX dependence on the [part] value of A, that is between [1], [1'], [2F], [2]. A tentative proposal, for which APPENDIX ED-LOSS presents some more data, is that what might be occurring is a failure of the form containing the correct PX to be spelled out because the second cycle theme marker has been lost. As a result, PX is spelled out using the default morphology that is compatible with the default theme marker used in 3>3 contexts, which is never differentiated for the first/second cycle (XN).

---

45 The qualification "almost" is for partial ED loss; see APPENDIX ED-LOSS.
The proposal relies on the possibility of "covert" ED, that is ED that is never spelled out. In the rest of this section, I will suggest that the behavior of PX in the Basque imperative might receive precisely this analysis. One expected signature that would give away covert ED would be a sensitivity of PX to the ED pattern contexts, that is to the 1/2>3 vs. 3>other difference in A-O configurations. Exactly this sensitivity in the spellout of the "default" PX is a mystery of the Basque imperative. If the analysis is tenable, it resolves the mystery, presents an expected abnormal realization of ED, and strengthens the possibility of analyzing ED loss as covert ED.

The imperative is discussed in Laka (1993:51), Azkue II:662/§908ff., II:737/§979ff., III:53/§908ff., III:141/§979ff., G:3.5.4.10-11. I will use the term "commandee" for the addressee of the imperative, namely S of 1V/1V' and A of 2V/3V; the imperative requires a 2nd/3rd person commandee. Except for the default PX, the imperative looks like the present indicative, that is simply the minimal formation using PX, minimal or unmarked theme marker, and verb root: 

- **h-a-tor** [2F-TM-√come] 'come (2.F/M)',
- **eraman g-a-it-za-(t)zu** [brought 1'-TM-PL-√2V-2] 'bring us (2.R)'.

Its peculiarity is the default PX, the form the PX assumes when there is no controller, which in the present indicative is **b** (normally with theme marker **a**). In the imperative it is:

(i) **b** (normally with theme marker **e**) in 1V/1V' 3(>X) and 2V/3V 3>(X->)3 combinations.
(ii) **∅** (with the theme marker **e**) otherwise, namely in 2V/3V 2>(X->)3 combinations.

In other words, **b** occurs when S/O cannot be a PX controller because they are not 1st/2nd person, including in 3>(X->)3 contexts, but not in 1/2>(3->)3 contexts, that is the ED pattern -- granting that there are no combinations with 1st person A/commandee here. In that context, while the A (commandee) cannot control PX and is realized canonically using SX/gender, **b** does not appear, and **∅** does instead. The contrast is exemplified between 3.S>3.S **b-e-ma** [X-TM-√give] 'let him give it!' and 2F>3.S **e-ma-k** [TM-√give-F] 'give it (you, fem.sg.fam.)!'.

The conditions on the distribution of **b/∅** parallel those of default/ED: the **b** vs. **∅** distinction between imperative 3.S>3.S **bema**, 2F>3.S **emak** corresponds to non-ED default **z** vs. ED of 2nd person A/commandee here. The relevant fact is not that 2nd person A here is also the commandee, for 2nd person S in 1V forms is fully coded by PX, not by **∅**, e.g. **hator** [2F-TM-√come] 'come (thou)!', **z-a-to-z** [2F-TM-√come-PL] 'come (ye)!'. The obvious hypothesis here is that ED does happen, and it is [part]-A Agree with 2nd person A that blocks the insertion of default **b**.

An alternative would be that the insertion of **b** is sensitive rather to the relationship between T-A, for T has a φ-probe that Agrees with A and that could yield the distinction between 3rd vs. 2nd person A/commandee. However, this seems exist separately in a different (and "curious") imperative pattern in some dialects that casts the normal pattern into relief. The pattern is noted by Lafitte (280/§554, 284/§561) and Lafon (1955), though not for example Azkue in his copious discussion of the imperative. In this pattern, the **b(e)**- PX of the imperative also occurs in transitive 3->1/2 combinations (where A is **∅**), though not in 3->1/2 combinations (where A is realized by the SX/gender system): thus **bema** 'qu'il donne' vs. **emak** and not **bemak** 'donne'; **igor be-n-e-za** [send ?-1-TM-√2V] 'qu'il m'envoie' vs. **igor ne-e-za-zu** [send 1-TM-√2V-2] / **benezazu** [send ?-1-TM-√2V-2] 'envoyez-moi'. No extension of **be** occurs to 1V: there are no such forms as **bezatoz** 'come!' for **zatoz**. 46

---

46 For this reason, even in these dialects, I would be reluctant to pursue a treatment of **b** as a C-head like the relativizer **hait** etc.; however, see Oyharçabal (2000).
The pattern here is simple to state: *be* (i) no longer fills the PX position, but rather a preceding position, like e.g. the verum focus particle *ba*; and (ii) *be* insertion now depends purely on properties of A/commandee, that is it is present if A is 3rd person, and not otherwise (2nd person or no A). In this, *be* reflects the properties of the T-probe, which is present for all ERG and only for ERG, and whose valuation will reflect the 3-1/2 distinction. The fact that (i) and (ii) go together tends to support the intuition to analyze *be* quite differently when it spells out the PX position, as default PX in the absence of [part] Agree by v. This means that exactly in those dialects where *be-* comes to reflect the properties of the T-A relationship, rather than the lack of valuation of v's [part] probe, that it no longer spells out PX and appears before it.

Consider more closely the ∅/b alternation in the normal usage in terms of ED. b is the imperative default, inserted when v's [part] probe is not valued from any 1st/2nd person goal. ED happens in the same way as in the past, with the exception that the SX/gender morphology tracking the 2nd person A/commandee is not suppressed -- an option for ED in general (XN), and particularly frequent with gender. However, the valuation of v's [part] probe from A is not spelled out using the regular PX corresponding to 2nd person A, namely h [2F] and z [2].

The possible reason for the failure of spell-out is the one already mentioned for ED loss: v's [part] probe is valued on the second cycle, uniquely in the imperative here, and there is no appropriate theme marker to be inserted into an imperative form with a v valued on the second cycle, tense/mood and 2nd cycle being both distinctions to which theme markers are sensitive. The theme marker used in the imperative is the same as for the present, a, when PX is controlled by 1st/2nd person, and distinct from the markers found here in the past and irrealis. When PX is b or ∅, the theme marker is e that is also found when PX is the irrealis and past default l, z (cf. Oyharçabal 2000). However, the present outside the imperative never has a v probe capable of a second cycle. The crucial combination, a theme marker compatible with a 1st/2nd person controlled PX and a second cycle, might well be missing in the imperative.

I have not been able to verify these speculations further, but from they seem to me like attractive ways to understand both the imperative PX pattern, and ED loss, in terms of an element that is sufficiently sensitive to the properties concerned. For ED loss, the alternative is to suppose that such forms truly lack ED, and that thus within the relevant dialects the ED pattern is broken by arbitrary gaps, up to seeming itself fully arbitrary or marginal in some of them. That invites an analysis in terms of a morphological treatment of what remains of ED here. I turn to the contrasting morphological and syntactic possibilities for treating ED in XN.

### 4 Syntactic and morphological approaches to agreement displacement

#### 4.1 Theories and predictions

The two bases of the syntactic approach to ED proposed by Laka and developed by subsequent literature are in (34).

(34)  
  a. Person-Number separation: Person and number enter into Agree with separate goals.  
  b. Underspecification: 3rd person is underspecified with respect to 1st/2nd person

I will refer to proposals the make use of these elements as syntactic approaches to the ED pattern, or as in Béjar (2003), Béjar and Rezac (2004), to person hierarchy phenomena in
general. There are other syntactic approaches to person hierarchies, each type of approach being possibly suitable to different phenomena (see comments in Béjar and Rezac 2004, note 00).

Both ideas far-reaching consequences that bear on the architecture of Agree, and on the choice between morphological and syntactic proposals for ED, once that came to be (independently) appreciated in Béjar (2000), and extended to sub-trees of the φ-feature geometry in general in Béjar (2003). I enumerate them for the ensuing contrast with a morphological approach to ED. Person-number separation entails that, from the perspective the target of the dependency, dependencies for person and number can be independent in the same way dependencies for \(wh\) and φ-features can be. The combination of person-number separation and underspecification, which allows goals not to always be fully specified for person and number, (A) entails that the two dependencies are subject to mutually independent match conditions, so a match for one does not intervene for the locality or cyclic expansion of the other, indeed one is simply not relevant for the other. From the perspective of the goal, person and number can be distributed across different syntactic positions in the syntax, where previous theories needed to distribute a combined φ-bundle in the morphology (through fission). Such distribution by a syntactic mechanism entails (B) a systematic correlation between goal feature and target position that is not the consequence of the vicissitudes of arbitrary morphological rules or vocabulary entries, like fission is. (A) and (B) are exhibited by ED.

The contrast with a morphological treatment of such phenomena is easiest made with reference to concrete analyses. The Afro-Asiatic prefix conjugation has become famous in Distributed Morphology in Noyer's (1992/1997) work precisely because it exhibits the dissociation of the features of a single φ-bundle, subject agreement, across different positions, prefix and suffix. Noyer develops a fission-based approach, and the contrasts on (A) and (B) are striking. Perhaps the most immediately obvious is (B). The distribution of the individual φ-features of a single bundle across multiple positions is due to the arbitrary lexical entries of the vocabulary items that spell-out subject agreement, sometimes spelling out the entire bundle, sometimes leading to fission.\(^{47}\) For example, [feminine] is canonically realized by the prefix \(t\), as in \(t\)-aktiv-aani [fem-write-3.pl] 'they (fem, dual)', but \(t\) is 'bled' when the more highly specified suffix \(na\) realizes [fem., pl.] at the same time, giving \(y\)-aktiv-na [default-write-fem.pl] 'they (fem, pl) write'. On this view, there is no systematic correlation predicted or expected for φ-feature - morphosyntactic position. Exponence of a feature is or is bled in one position as an arbitrary fact about exponence mechanisms (e.g., properties of vocabulary items), not features or positions.\(^{48}\) Quite independently, because vocabulary insertion in DM is through the subset principle and does not presuppose identity between the features of a morphosyntactic terminal and the features realized by an inserted exponent, there need be no coherence among the φ-bundles realized within a single position across the paradigm, such as a condition that the suffix realizes entire sub-trees of the φ-feature geometry. Coherence of both sorts is found in Basque PX and PL positions: the former is [participant], the latter [number].

(A) is exhibited by the same example, but it can be illustrated far more strikingly by looking at cases where the morphology is sensitive to the φ-features of multiple arguments in the first place. One example, considered at length in XN, is Bobaljik's (2000) treatment of Itelmen. There the suffix position is canonically controlled by φ-features of O, and prefix by those of A; but if and only if O is 3\(^{rd}\) person, the form of the O affix is also determined by the person of A.

\(^{47}\) Under some other approaches, fission would be by explicit rules (Halle and Mannanz 1993).

\(^{48}\) Cf. also Phillips 1993: section 4.1.1 for bleeding of the paucal suffix in Yimas by the fact that its source for an independent and essentially arbitrary reason cannot itself be realized.
Bobaljik proposes allomorphy of the vocabulary items realizing O to the person of A. The conceptual consequence of this treatment is that allomorphy to the person of A just when O is 3rd person is accidental, for allomorphy could just as well make vocabulary items realizing O sensitive to person of A when O is not 3rd person. The same logic holds across a variety of morphological approaches: Halle and Marantz (1993) for example treat sensitivity of certain positions in Potawatomi to A, O as due to the joint realization of the φ-features of A and O by vocabulary items inserted into a single morphosyntactic terminal, again predicting potential sensitivity to any feature of the two regardless of their mutual feature specifications. Applying the logic to Basque ED, there would no reason in these proposals why PX is controlled by O in 3>1/2 combinations, and by A in 1/2>3 combinations. One would equally expect that PX is controlled by O in 2>1/3 and by A in 1>2, or more drastically, by O in 2/1.sg>1.pl/3.sg and by A elsewhere. The syntactic approach on the other hand predicts precisely the Basque ED pattern is found, that it is not accidental: PX is sensitive to properties of A when O is 3rd person because just in that case, O is not a match for the [part] probe that PX realizes, and A can control it.

It is an important point of fact that the systems predicted by the morphological approaches do in fact exist, though Itelmen and Potawatomi are perhaps not among them (see the next section on Itelmen, and Béjar 2003 on Nishnaabemwin, an Algouan language related to Potawatomi). The Chukchi spurious antipassive is such a case, and Bobaljik and Branigan (forthcoming) emphasize the need for sensitivity of the phenomenon to arbitrary combinations of A and O φ-features. Regular transitive morphology is unavailable in the following environments: non-participial tenses *3.S>1.S, *2>1, participial tenses additionally *1>2, *1/2>3, *3.S>3. In these contexts, the external syntax, including the ergative-absolutive case marking, is unchanged, but the morphosyntax of the verb changes: a morphologically intransitive antipassive is deployed. As can be seen, the contexts and their complements are arbitrary combinations. As Bobaljik and Branigan put it, "Especially given that there is dialect variation and variation according to mood, this appears to us be an irreducible language particular property." (below ex. 38). The authors develop an insightful account of why it is the spurious antipassive that is chosen, in which a crucial role is played by the fact that a single agreement head bears φ-features contributed both by A and O, and the latter are deleted when the combination fits one of the filters. Wiltschko (2003) presents an abstractly similar analysis of inverse marking in Upper Chehalis: certain arbitrary combinations of A-O φ-features, like 2.sg/pl>1.pl, are morphologically illicit, because though belonging generally to inverse contexts they are ultimately quite arbitrary, and this results in alternative morphological spell-out that does not change the syntax. It is the arbitrariness of the relevant combinations that is the hallmark of a morphological system.

Basque dialects have their own examples of arbitrary filters, some discussed in XN. In some dialects, arbitrary subsets of 1>2>3 and 2>1>3 combinations in the 3V paradigm are banned. Others go farther: in B-Bakio, both 2.R>1.P and 1.P>2.R are banned in the transitive paradigm, but used for them are 2.R>3.S and intransitive 2.R respectively, the latter but not the former resembling the Chukchi spurious antipassive. ED also gives rise to its own set of arbitrary exceptions in some dialects (APPENDIX ED-LOSS), so that it ends up looking like it is limited to an arbitrary subset of 1/2>3 combinations. If these exceptions are real rather than a matter of spell-out, perhaps an account of ED in these dialects purely in terms of morphology is in order.


The filter violation is repaired by deletion of the agreement features of the lower argument, O, and its consequent spell-out in-situ. Independent rules of the insertion of the antipassive morphology lead to spell-out as the spurious antipassive. There are no consequences anywhere else in the syntax of such clauses.
Yet even here, there is no extension beyond the fundamental 1/2>3 context, the "inverse" context determined by the theory. In light of this, and my doubts raised about the reality of ED loss, I would lean to the view that there is, mostly, the ED pattern even in these dialects, and low-level changes in the spell-out of the system obscure it. Eventually though, sufficient evidence for ED, which is only visible in the agreement morphology, presumably disappears, and then there arises a system where morphology arbitrarily reflects of what was once a syntactic pattern, and further transmutation, including extension beyond "inverse contexts" or adding the role of number, occur, as other factors push diachronic change.

The contrast between the morphological and syntactic approaches thus turns on the internal, cognitive reality of the ED pattern, as opposed to an accident with perhaps diachronic or functional explanations -- an issue I return to in CONCLUSION. Of course, even if the ED pattern is real, suitable morphological tools may be invoked to understand this, such as Bobaljik and Wurmbrand's (1997) feature copying mechanism. Another good example is Noyer's (1992:232ff.) proposal that in Georgian, Maung, and Dakota person hierarchy (ED-like) patterns, a particular position controlled by the ensemble of two arguments, A and O, prefers spelling out whichever is 1/2 over 3 because of markedness that follows from the φ-feature geometry (or rather hierarchy). Béjar and Rezac (2004) make the point that the syntax should be given a fair shot here, and preferred, insofar as independent syntactic mechanisms can make such patterns follow as instances of regular constraints on syntactic dependencies like locality. This logic rests on the standard preference to avoid duplex accounts of phenomena; the point is invalid should it turn out that the reduction does not in fact work, that say the locality principles of syntax make predictions for the morphology that are incorrect. An important prediction of the syntactic approach, not fully demonstrated, is that agreement displacement patterns, as opposed to arbitrary systems, are precisely those that follow from syntactic principles: that patterns that are not predicted by the syntactic approach (e.g. the reverse of the ED pattern) either do not exist, or give correct evidence for a different syntactic structure, or are demonstrably non-synchronous.

In the following two sections, I turn to other cases where agreement displacement more or less resembling ED appears in the literature, particularly those that have not been the subject of a previous investigation in the approach proposed here (sc. in Béjar 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2004), and those for which alternatives have been articulated that allow for comparison to cast into relief the essentials of the present approach: the work of Bobaljik and Wurmbrand on Itelmen, Phillips on Yimas, and Hale on a variety of languages.

4.2 ED in Itelmen

Itelmen presents what looks stunningly like Basque ED, particularly like ED + doubling of ergative-controlled PX morphology by the ergative's canonical SX morphology, common in Basque (XN). The phenomenon is perhaps the most extensively analyzed example of agreement displacement within the Distributed Morphology framework, thanks to Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (1997, 2001) and Bobaljik (1998, 2000). Because of the existence of these morphological analyses and the considerations they raise, it is not possible to pass silently by Itelmen in proposing a syntactic account of Basque ED, without either extending it or identifying where the crucial differences lie. Here I undertake the former.

Itelmen S, A, O have no case morphology and thus are non-distinct; obliques, including O', do bear case markers.\textsuperscript{51} The format of the Itelmen agreement complex is:

\textsuperscript{51} In applicative transitives, either O' or O2 can control agreement in the fashion O1 does in transitives, and similarly
Agreement is obligatorily expressed by the agreement prefix-suffix combination, which cross-references the person and number features of each of S, A, O, and nothing else. The prefix cross-references A and S, in an identical fashion. If O is not 3rd person, it controls the suffix. If O is 3rd person, which Bobaljik and Wurmbrand take to be lack of person, the suffix cross-references instead the number features of O and the person (but not number) features of A. If there is no O, that is with intransitives, the suffix cross-references the person and number features alike of S. The generalization that Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (1997, 2001) establish is thus that the suffix cross-references the person and number features of O, to the extent that these exist (are specified), and when they are not (3rd person for person; no O for number), the suffix cross-references corresponding features of the prefix controller.

Intransitives apart, the generalization is the same as the Basque ED pattern for PX and PL morphology. The parallels go as far as the singular not being underspecified in the relevant way: 3.SG O does not let the number of the prefix controller be reflected in the suffix (in contrast to 3.SG S). The 1/2>3 combinations where the person of the prefix in Itelmen is cross-referenced by the suffix should be compared to those Basque forms where A controls both PX (= Itelmen suffix) and its canonical exponent in the SX morphology, that is ED + ERG doubling forms like 1.P>3.P g-en-it-u-gi-n [1-TM-PL-√2V-1-PT] for more standard genitun (see XN).

TABLE: Itelmen S, A-3.SG/PL.O morphology for class I
(derived from Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person-number</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A&gt;3.SG.O</th>
<th>A&gt;3.PL.O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPS REALIS</td>
<td>n-___čen</td>
<td>n-__če?n</td>
<td>n-__čen</td>
<td>n-__čen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>xe\n-___čen</td>
<td>xe\n-__če?n</td>
<td>xe\n-__čen</td>
<td>xe\n-__čen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG REALIS</td>
<td>t-___k(_čen)</td>
<td>t-__čen</td>
<td>t-__če?n</td>
<td>t-</td>
<td>__βum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>m-___k(_čen)</td>
<td>t-__čen</td>
<td>t-__če?n</td>
<td>t-</td>
<td>__βum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL REALIS</td>
<td>n____k(_če?n)</td>
<td>nt-___čen</td>
<td>nt-__če?n</td>
<td>nt-</td>
<td>__βu_ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>m_____k(_če?n)</td>
<td>mn____čen</td>
<td>mn____če?n</td>
<td>mn____čen</td>
<td>__βu_ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.SG REALIS</td>
<td>___č</td>
<td>____čan</td>
<td>____ča?n</td>
<td>____čan</td>
<td>____čan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>q____xč</td>
<td>q____x</td>
<td>q____xi?n</td>
<td>q____x</td>
<td>____q____in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL REALIS</td>
<td>q____sx</td>
<td>q____sx</td>
<td>q____sx?n</td>
<td>q____sx</td>
<td>q____sx?n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in applicative intransitives O’ can; this resembles the Basque phenomenon of dative displacement and I discuss it at length in section 00. Whatever the controller is, it behaves exactly as O1 of transitives, and I group these potential controllers as O.

A small set of Class II differ from the Class I verb morphology described here in adding a morpheme, usually before the agreement suffix; this in no way affects the exposition here, and I keep to Class I. Class II morphology is discussed in Bobaljik (2000).

There an exception: 3.PL A/S reals are distinguished, n for A, \_ for S (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, note 12, Bobaljik 2000, note 10, who suggests n is conditioned by simple presence of O rather than by its features).

S/O’ combinations where O’ controls agreement, as is an option, seem to behave like A\_O transitives.
Understanding the Itelmen phenomenon as an ED pattern is trivial for transitives. Putting \( v \) the [part] and [number] \( \varphi \)-probe realized by the suffix, it is valued on the first cycle from O's number and person features if O has them, which is always for [number], and from A's person features if O is 3rd person on the second cycle. The realization itself is more complex than in Basque: one can to some extent segregate the realization of [plural] as \(-\) though to some extent it has effects in the spell-out of the remainder as well, and the realization of person features is sensitive to whether they were acquired on the first or second cycle, as in Georgian or Karok rather than in Basque.

For intransitives though, Itelmen does not behave like Basque at all. If it were parallel to Basque, S would behave like O, and intransitives would have O-controlled suffix agreement, no or default prefix, and in the case of 3rd person S, some default realization of person in the suffix as well. It seems that this is how the Itelmen impersonal construction behaves (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001:§2.1): A is expressed as an oblique, O keeps being treated as O, but the prefix used and its person contribution to the realization of the suffix are (taken together) distinct from any other A. Intransitives however behave exactly as if their S corresponded to A of transitives, cross-referencing it with the same prefix (modulo note 53), and as if there were no O at all, so that both person and number of A exclusively condition the form of the suffix.

This is exactly what one would expect if all intransitives had unergative representation in Itelmen: the first cycle of \( v \)'s \( \varphi \)-probe finds nothing, the next cycle finds S in [Spec, \( vP \)]. There are no unaccusatives of the Basque type. There remains a difference with Basque unergatives as well: these show ED exactly in the fashion of transitives with 3.SG objects, that is as if there were an O with no person but number features, so that cyclic expansion does not code plurality of the unergative subject by PL morphology. That is in itself easily parameterizable in terms of the presence (or feature content) of the O of unergatives, which is there as a DP in Basque (XN) but apparently not in Itelmen. The real question is whether it is plausible that a language chooses to formally represent all intransitives as unergatives.

I believe this is so. The formal tools to distinguish S=O and S=A patterns of agreement and/or case are necessarily independent of interpretation for languages where the distinction does not fully reduce to semantic correlates such as volition/agentivity, telicity, event structure, etc.: an independence that Baker (1996:00) persuasively argues for Mohawk, one that is manifestly true for Basque (XN), and that characterizes the Split-S as opposed to Fluid-S languages of Dixon's (1994:00) terminology. Particularly relevant to the Itelmen situation is Béjar's (2003: 129-131) analysis of the ED pattern in Georgian, for she also needs intransitive S to be uniformly in the position of transitive A for \( v \pi \) probe. Languages that consistently treat S like A for case/agreement do not necessarily lack the structural unergative-unaccusative contrast. In Georgian, the intransitive subjects that uniformly behave like A for agreement split into those that receive ergative and those that receive absolutive in the absolutive (past tense) subsystem of

---

55 This is the only A exponent suffix that is not its secondary exponent in 3.O contexts, because it occurs with and right-peripheral to non-3rd person O suffix (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, note 12).

56 These bracketed forms correspond to cases where the controller is 3.O only; when the controller is 3.O1/O2, see the columns for combinations of A-3.SG/PL.O. For 3.O as a marked person, see section 00.
the language (Harris 1981: chapter 16). In Navajo where the same S–A identification is found for agreement, Hale (2001:41f.) points out that unergatives and unaccusatives seem to be differentiated by the presence of a dummy object signalled by agreement. This can be extended to Georgian; if such a dummy if found in Itelmen, it would have to lack both [part] and [number] ([individuation]) features. An alternative mechanism would be to raise the S of unaccusatives to to [Spec, vP] prior to v’s φ-Agree by some other mechanism.

If Itelmen intransitives can be handled in these terms, they offer a nice contribution to the role of underspecification in cyclic expansion, for they show that it affects [number]; only for intransitives (of all semantic types, it seems), and not for transitives with 3.sg. O, are the number features of the suffix sensitive to those coded by the prefix. As a consequence, the suffix morphology of intransitives with S of [a person, β number] is not entirely the same as that of transitives with A of [a person] and O of [3rd person, β number]; in both cases the suffix expresses the [a person, β number], and [a person] comes from A by cyclic expansion, but [β number] comes from cyclic expansion (with a second cycle effect) for the intransitive only.

There are two morphological analyses available for Itelmen: Bobaljik and Wurmbrand’s (1997) feature-copying analysis, about which as mentioned I have nothing to say in the hope that such an analysis really reduces to Agree, and Bobaljik’s (2000) allomorphy analysis, which illustrates where the difference between syntactic and morphological analyses of the ED pattern lies. Bobaljik’s proposal deploys a standard DM tool: the sensitivity of the insertion of an exponent of a terminal to properties of its context (see XN). Using allomorphy explains why, as Bobaljik proposes for allomorphy in general, the suffix is outward (i.e. upward) and not inward-sensitive to syntactic features (see Carstairs-McCarthy 2001, 2005, Adger, Béjar and Harbour 2003 for discussion). Sensitivity inwards (i.e. downward, or in the direction of the root) is, and can only be on Bobaljik’s proposal, to properties of inserted vocabulary items. In neither direction is allomorphy constrained by structural adjacency between the conditioning environment and the allomorph: Bobaljik 2000 shows this for Itelmen class morphology outward for syntactic features, and discusses Carstairs’s 1987 demonstration of non-local sensitivity inward for exponents. 57

These properties of allomorphy illustrate exactly where the difference with a syntactic account lies. An allomorphy account of the ED pattern attributes the same status to outward sensitivity to syntactic features as to inward sensitivity for vocabulary items; it does not differentiate the features to which insertion is sensitive according to the features that are being realized; and it is non-local. A syntactic account cannot directly counteract any sensitivity for properties of inserted vocabulary items; the features onto v from A are only those that O cannot provide; and it is restricted by locality to the closest goal at each cyclic stage.

In the case of Basque, only the syntactic account provides the tools needed to explain such systematic properties of ED as the invisibility of dative agreement and others that were discussed above. The morphological account in turn could provide tools to deal with those dialects where ED is being lost and more arbitrary patterns emerge. Yet even here, I have to raise reservations. In ED loss contexts, what occurs is a limitation of the ED pattern to particularly subsets of the

57 As far as I can tell, lack of adjacency follows from Bobaljik’s proposal for outward sensitivity, but non-adjacency of inward sensitivity which is for vocabulary items -- while not incompatible with the proposal or DM in general – seems more troubling (it’s like looking at the internal phonological properties when affixing, rather than at its edge or global properties). Bobaljik discusses the possibility that for the Bantu example the non-adjacent allomorphy could be by transitivity – X is sensitive to Y, Y to Z, so X to Z -- and that the Itelmen outward sensitivity cannot be reduced to this.
normal ED pattern. This limitation can indeed be sensitive to such properties as the presence of
dative agreement, lexical vs. auxiliary verb, choice of tense/mood, perhaps even choice of lexical
root. Yet the effect on ED is always simply of a restriction on its occurrence; it is never the case,
for example, that a dative comes to play the role of A in providing [part] features for
conditioning of the PX in ED contexts -- nor without first becoming a normal controller of PX in
non-ED contexts, which occurs in the DD dialects. This follows from the syntactic account, with
occurrence of ED restricted for independent reasons such as spell-out.

4.3 The cross-linguistic extent of cyclic expansion

There are many examples of what could the ED pattern in the literature; Béjar and Rezac (2004)
discuss Basque, Georgian, Karok, Erdza Mordvinian for Basque-like ED pattern, and Mohawk,
Algonquian, Kashmiri, and Dakota for more sensitive ED patterns differentiating 1\text{st} and 2\text{nd}
person. Here I will briefly consider the suitability or lack thereof of this proposal to selected
other cases in the literature, keeping to these that illustrate special properties to take into account
such as interaction with the C-system and with Ā-extraction: Yimas and (more briefly) K’ikche’.

Yimas is rife with interesting agreement phenomena, and Phillips's (1993) analysis of them
has become a classical example of minimalism and DM applied to a complex agreement
system.\textsuperscript{58} The agreeing verb codes the person, number, and class of A, S, O, generally by one
prefix each (with fission of paucal number to suffix for a 1\text{st}/2\text{nd} person argument). The prefixes
show person-based split ergativity: 1\text{st}/2\text{nd} person arguments are coded by an interior prefix
position, one set for NOM (S, A) and one for ACC (O) of which only one can surface, while 3\text{rd}
person arguments are coded by two outer and independent prefix positions, one for ABS (S, O)
and one for ERG (A). The O'-controlled DAT of ditransitives is expressed as a suffix, contrasting
with the "core" system; it is likewise outside the core system in not counting for the agreement
displacement to be discussed, which recalls the behavior of the Basque DAT, and I discuss it no
further.\textsuperscript{59} This agreement system is flanked by the "C-system": a prefixed left-peripheral head
such as negation or the relative clause complementizer, and a right-peripheral concord agreement
suffix selected by some of these heads. The following diagram resumes, with correlations among
parts of the structure are expressed by indices, and the agreement complex in bold:

\begin{equation}
\text{C-system prefix}_i - [\text{ABS-ERG-NOM}_j/\text{ACC}_j - \sqrt{V}] - \text{Paucal}_j - \text{DAT} - \text{C AGR}_i
\end{equation}

It is necessary to examine in more detail the person-based split ergativity. Phillips argues, on
the basis of asymmetries in extraction for example, that an important distinction is to be drawn
between ERG-ABS and NOM-ACC agreement. He proposes that the former are agreement,
meaning in that framework a φ-set on a clausal functional head whose specifier is a Case-
licensing position for the agreement controller, while the latter are pronouns incorporated from

\textsuperscript{58} I turn to another phenomenon in Yimas that looks like agreement displacement in C4:DBL: under the influence of
certain C-system heads, the regular agreement of a designated argument is extinguished and an agreement
morpheme specific to the C-system added.

\textsuperscript{59} There is more: like the Basque DAT, the Yimas DAT induces the Person Case Constraint, and it is furthermore
invisible for agreement by an AGR head introduced by C-system heads, of which the controllers can only be
arguments that trigger regular clausal agreement (not S/A/O: where A cannot be coded, as in 1/2.A>2/1.O
combinations, it does not control C-system AGR either). So Yimas makes a strong case for differentiating DAT
agreement from S/A/O agreement, like Basque, perhaps by the same distinction between φ-valuation and
criticization by quirky displacement proposed for the latter in XN.
their thematic positions. Conditions on incorporation, universal and Yimas-specific, derive the fact that only one argument can incorporate (because the incorporated D needs Case-licensing from V, available once only), that if A and O are both candidates only O can incorporate (locality), and that only 1st/2nd person can incorporate because these lack class features (a Yimas-specific condition). 3rd person A/O require Case-licensing and thus agreement by clausal functional heads.

This is enough to discuss the "displacement to absolutive". When the verb is prefixed with one of the heads of the C/T-system, the system works as described above, (37)a. When however the agreement system finds itself at the left periphery, there must be an ABS prefix. When the ABS prefix is independently present, that is when there is a 3.O/S argument, nothing happens, (37)b. Otherwise, the leftmost agreement prefix displaces to become ABS: 3.A.ERG if there is one, (37)c, otherwise 2.A/S.NOM, (37)d.61,62

(37) a. ka-mpu-~a-tput-n (C-head satisfies YEPP)
LIKE-3.PL.ERG-1.SG.ACC-hit-PRES
They are going to hit me. (Phillips 1993, ex. 9a; Foley 1991:266)
b. pu-n-tay (Regular ABS satisfies YEPP)
3.PL.ABS-3.SG.ERG-see
He saw them. (Phillips 1993, ex. 8a; Foley 1991:195)
c. pu-nan-tay (Displaced ERG satisfies YEPP)
3.PL.ABS-2.SG.ACC-see
They saw you. (Phillips 1993, ex. 8b; Foley 1991:198)
d. kapwa-~kra-tay (Displaced NOM satisfies YEPP)
2.DD.ABS-1.DD.ACC-see
You two saw us two. (Phillips 1993, ex. 8e; Foley 1991:206)

As Phillips points out (end of section 2.3), displacement to absolutive moves the leftmost of the ABS-ERG-NOM/ACC agreement to ABS; it never effects reordering. Under his analysis, ERG agreement is on v (Tr), and ABS agreement is on T (I) He proposes the following, which has already been discussed in relationship to the Basque default prefixes (XN):

---

60 1/2>2/1 combinations have a special status. In 2>1 combinations, 1 O is tracked by the ACC morpheme; 2 A is only overt when it displaces to absolutive to satisfy YEPP, Ξ in contexts where YEPP is independently satisfied, but syntactically there because it is tracked by C AGR. In 1>2 combinations, portmanteau forms occur for some φ-feature combinations, otherwise only 2 O ACC is spelled out; but 1.A behaves in a strange fashion that Phillips attractively analyzes by adjoining it to 2 O, 2 O projecting, which leads to fused portmanteau spell-out if such forms exist and to spell-out of 2 O only if they do not. (The strange behavior of 1.A is: (a) 1 A paucal triggers fisioned paucal suffixes only if there is a portmanteau morpheme, not when it's Ξ, (b) 1 A does not displace to absolutive, though 2 O here uniquely does not do so, as if 1.A blocked it (note 14), (c) concord suffixes always skip the higher 1 A to track the lower 2 O, which they cannot do otherwise). The end result is that in 1>2 combinations, there being no candidate for absolutive displacement, none occurs even when a head of the C-system does not satisfy the YEPP, the the verb begins with either the 1>2 portmanteau or the 2 ACC prefix (Phillips 1993, exx. 22, 23 respectively).

61 There seems to be no context where 2.O.ACC could satisfy the EPP: either there is 3.A.ERG or 1.A.NOM, or under Ā-extraction of A, there is a C-head to satisfy the YEPP (both in relative clauses and in questions which here must use a reduced cleft).

62 There is one snag: when a 1st/2nd person paucal argument undergoes displacement to satisfy YEPP, the paucal suffix, normally triggered only by 1st/2nd (thus NOM, ACC) arguments, appears optionally (ex. 30, note 18).
(38) I interpret these alternations [displacement to absolutive] as the consequences of a requirement of the Absolutive assigning head $l^0$, which must be satisfied by S-structure. The requirement is that $l^0$ stand in some local relation to a nominal category, and there are two ways in which it can be satisfied. The first is if an NP occupies the specifier of IP, presumably entering into an agreement relation with $l^0$, and triggering an Absolutive agreement prefix - this is what we see in (8). The second is if $l^0$ raises and incorporates into a higher ‘nominal’ head - assuming that the nominal inflection suffixes associated with many of the modal prefixes discussed above reflect the nominal nature of these heads. (Phillips 1993:00)

With the cyclic expansion mechanism developed in this chapter, and the $\varphi$-Agree architecture as in Basque, but keeping Phillips’s proposal about $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person incorporation, Yimas displacement to absolutive would work rather as follows:

(i) The absolutive probe is $v$, so O/S is the first goal, $A$ second by cyclic expansion.
(ii) $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person $O$ obligatorily incorporates into the verb; assume that this removes $O$ as a possible goal for $v$ $\varphi$-Agree.
(iii) $A$ incorporates only if there is no $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person $O$; in such configurations however, $3^{rd}$ person $O$ will already control $v$’s $\varphi$-probe.
(iv) If there is a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person $O$ and a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person $A$, $1/2$ $O$ is always incorporated, so it is not a possible goal for $\varphi$-Agree. In 2$>1$ combinations, $2.A$ behaves as expected: it undergoes displacement to ABS, because after $v$ finds it has no goal in its complement (1.O being incorporated), its search-space expands to include 2.A.$^63$
(v) $T$-$A$ agreement is realized as the ERG prefix, if $A$ has neither incorporated nor Agreed with $v$ under cyclic expansion.
(vi) The surface order of Yimas, ABS-ERG-NOM/ACC-V, could be derived by leaving $V$ with its incorporated NOM/ACC in-situ, and raising $v$ with its ABS agreement to left-adjoin to $T$ with ERG agreement.

This provides an account of Yimas agreement displacement that requires no assumptions specific to Yimas itself, beyond what is needed for Basque and what Phillips independently demonstrates for Yimas. Indeed, besides relying completely on his analysis of the agreement-incorporation distinction, some crucial points of Phillips’s analysis of the displacement are retained, particularly the notion of locality as governing the displacement. The main remaining problem is that quirky displacement occurs or not depends on whether a head of the left-peripheral system, such as the relative clause complementizer $m$, renders displacement to absolutive unnecessary, something that appears counter-cyclic at the $v$-level. Various proposals for a similar situation are explored in the section on Tense-conditioning of Basque ED.$^64$ The crucial difference of this proposal for Yimas cyclic expansion from Phillips is that he assumes that ABS agreement is higher than ERG agreement, and (independently) that it is specifically $1$-

---

$^63$ In 1$>2$, 1$^{st}$ person $A$ behaves independently as if adjoined to the incorporated 2$^{nd}$ person $O$, see note 60; if this occurs before cyclic expansion, there is no goal and no cyclic expansion/absolutive displacement, which is correct.

$^64$ For Yimas, there is intriguing evidence that information about eventual extraction must be available at the $v$-level: O-extraction in $wh$-questions extinguishes O ABS agreement, a situation which Phillips takes to be the norm for Â-gaps (e.g. A, S, O gaps in relative clauses). This gives rise to ERG displacement to absolutive (ex. 47). If O $wh$-movement were visible only at the C-level, this is counter-cyclic.
agreement. Making I (T) the locus of ABS agreement makes it easier to account for the blocking of displacement to absolutive by the presence of a head of the C-system, since C-T/I interactions in such matters are well known (for the EPP, which is how Phillips conceives of the underlying requirement, cf. Jouitteau 2005, Holmberg 2005, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998:00). In C5 I will explore a proposal to collapse the v-T system into a single clausal locus, making direct interaction between C and v+T simpler.

Hale (2001) analyzes four examples of agreement displacement in K’ichee’ (Mayan), Chukchi (Chukotko-Kamchatkan), Wampangoan (Algonquian), and Navajo (Athapaskan); of these, of which my interest here is only K’ichee’. In K’ichee’, there is a regular absolutive system that distinguishes A (ERG) from O/S (ABS) agreement (no case morphology). There is an antipassive where A assumes ERG agreement and O is an oblique. A morphologically and syntactically different construction, "focus antipassive", becomes available (not obligatory) whenever and only whenever A undergoes Ā-extraction. In the focus antipassive: (i) an extra morpheme is added to the verb, (ii) A cannot control ERG morphology, but O is not demoted to oblique, and (iii) whichever of A, O would normally trigger overtly spelled-out agreement controls the ABS agreement morphology -- if both would, the focus antipassive is unavailable. Hale’s proposal is that focus antipassive morphology, available in A Ā-extraction contexts, extinguishes regular ERG agreement, leaving only ABS agreement available for both A/O, which make use of it if one of them does not need overt agreement (cf. XN).

The Mayan languages, all ergative, generally block Ā-extraction of A.ERG, and some kind of detransitivization occurs: see Larsen and Norman (1979:358ff.) for a bird's-eye view, Aissen (1999), Watanabe (1996:218ff.), Tada (1993:3.3.2, p. 101ff.), Davies and Sam-Colop (1990) for recent theoretical approaches, and Richards (2001:147ff.) cross-linguistically. On an analysis that maximizes the similarities between K’ichee’ and Basque, the commonality between the two languages is that v Agrees with A just in case O does not have matching φ-features (3rd person). The difference is that this depends on Ā-extraction of A, and that it adds morphology that descends historically from the antipassive. Evidently, when Ā-extraction of A is blocked, some property P is deployed to suspend regular T-C Case/Agree relations with A (see Béjar and Rezac 2004 on one possibility for P, for the closely related language K’ekchi’). P can then play the same role that features of T play in Basque by the Tense Condition, selecting v capable of seeing A through cyclic expansion and thus Case-licensing it. This achieves the require correlation between the cyclic expansion pattern and Ā-extraction of A. The special property P or the fact that v has a richer probe that allows cyclic expansion is reflected as the extra focus antipassive morphology, retaining an essential element of Hale’s proposal.

5 The synchrony and diachrony of ED

The syntactic approach for ED pursued in this chapter, based on the economy of derivation of syntactic objects and dependencies discussed in C0, gives an explanatory answer for why the ED pattern occurs: in this type of displacement, it is the only type of pattern that could occur. The issue between such as syntactic approach and some other alternatives is about what is cognitively, internally real, not about what patterns exist in the data. Morphological approaches such as allomorphy clearly has the power to encode agreement displacement far beyond what occurs in ED, but also just ED itself; it simply does not attribute any special status to ED, any

65 See citations of discussion of Algonquian and Chukchi above. For Athapaskan, see also Rice and Saxon (1996).
cognitive reality to that pattern as a pattern. The economy-of-derivation approach syntactic approach in turn has the tools, specifically the morphology that follows it, to encode for any exceptions and arbitrary extensions of agreement displacement beyond ED. However, it attributes internal reality to the ED pattern, and this should manifest itself in its coherence, stability, cross-linguistic replication, frequency of diachronic development, and so on.

It seems to me that these predictions are met. Across the vast range of Basque dialects in the corpus, and to speak more impressionistically, the remainder assembled in Yrizar's work as well, and across the temporal extent of Basque, the ED pattern is stable. So ED loss dialect groups occur, few in general and fewer when ambiguities due to independent theme marker loss are controlled for (APPENDIX ED-LOSS); it seems to me quite possible that most ED loss is not really ED loss (XN). Diachronically, the earliest Basque sources (from the eleventh century on) present the ED pattern essentially as it is in most contemporary dialects, the only difference with contemporary forms being again the independent point of variation, theme marker form (see Orpustan 1999 up to the sixteenth century, Lafon for that century itself). In both temporal and spatial terms, ED represents a locus of stability in the Basque morphological system, in contrast to the greater variation found in other elements of the agreement system like the more recent DD agreement displacement. For Basque, these conclusions can ultimately be quantified for extremely abundant data are available, and APPENDIX ED-LOSS gives sufficient information to understand the distribution of ED vs. various types of ED loss in the corpus. Cross-linguistically, I am impressed by the recurrence of the ED pattern specifically. The recurrence of the person hierarchy pattern (Zwicky 1977, Silverstein 1976) has been better noted, and Béjar and Rezac (2004) propose that the two instantiate the same mechanisms of locality and cyclic expansion, the difference lying in the articulation of φ-probes.

Little is known about its origin and the origin of related phenomena such as default PX and theme markers, for as said, the most ancient recorded forms of the Basque agreement complex show the contemporary system. Much has been speculated. An intriguing account that ties together many earlier strands of research is Gómez (1994). The basic idea is that there was a V-initial stage of Basque, at which point the agreement morphemes were second position clitics. These clitics became the SX and gender series. V-initial languages however often have a requirement that V be preceded by some head, say a particle of the C-system (Bury 2003, 2005, Jouitteau 2005). This requirement forced one of the clitics to raise to the preverbal position, and presumably due to the structural positions of the clitics, this was typically the absolutive O/S clitic. If the absolutive was 3rd person, it had no clitic, and a tense-mood related particle was required to precede the verb. This gave the default markers present d- < *da 'now' (de Rijk 1992), irrealis l- < (h)al 'possible', past z- < ez(n) or perhaps ze, imperative b- from ba which functions as a (verum) focus prefix to the agreement complex and an emphatic particle in general (cf. Azkarate and Altuna 2001:00). In some cases however, these particles were apparently not available, so the ergative clitic was moved. The reasons why are not clear: the present clitic would always have to be available, and the past apparently only in 1/2>3 contexts. Perhaps there was no past particle, the ergative clitic moved unless it was the 3rd person Ø, and the past default z arose later to fill this gap (versus Gómez 1994:106, 113n7). Dative and number morphemes were not available for movement to the preverbal position because they arose later (Gómez 1994:107-8), and this also leads to their more variable position and realization. Phonological

66 In verb-initial languages preverbal clitics do not normally count for satisfying said requirement (Jouitteau 2005), but one may easily posit a system with weak pronouns that gave rise on the one hand to second position clitics and on the other to the relevant preverbal element.
changes such as $gu-V > gw-V > gV$ created the present differences between the PX and SX series (Trask 1977, Jacobsen 1975, Gómez and Sainz 1995, Azkarate and Altuna 2001:00).

Gómez's proposal offers a tantalizing glimpse on how a phenomenon such as ED could have arisen, with its intricate interplay of null morphology, agreement displacement for person but not number, invisibility of dative, limitation by the Tense Condition, and so on. Perhaps some elaboration of it could provide the necessary explanation of such properties. Yet, even if it were correct (and it is, in the end, simply possible scenario), considerations of change perhaps only emphasize the need for coding by deep synchronic principles. For a great many things have happened, in the observable history of Basque, since this system arose during the unobserved periods. The dative, for example, has become able to control PX/PL agreement in some dialects (C3), previously the province of S and A. Yet the invisibility of the dative to ED holds constant: if the dative controls PX/PL, it does so generally, never just in an ED context. The allocutive has been introduced, perhaps from the old implicative construction, that led to its seeming to undergo ED; yet this has been steadfastly resisted by the synchronic system and disappeared (XN). ED has not transgressed the 1/2>3 limitation, though some dialects (like Bakio or Antzuolo) independently lose O-controlled 1/2 agreement in certain contexts. Number of A has not come to control PL, though the dative in certain dialects has. And so on…

1 Also Cf. also LINGUIST List 13.1525, Nino Amiridze.; I excerpt:
I will remind you that some languages allow reflexives to appear as subjects. For instance, Basque (cf. (1), Xabier Artiagoitia (p.c.)). […]
(1) neue buruak hilko nau
  my.head-DET-ERG it.kills.me aux
Lit.: Myself kills me
"Something like my personality, the things I do and worry about... that is going to kill me"

2 "A short story by Jon Iraola Goiburu, Irahelo, winner of the 13th Mitxelena literature prize in the 12-14 years category,
iii "1110 onbaçedu/ombacendu, 1239 onbaçendu, 1237 on bazendu avaria : 'si vous trouviez bon le dîner' …. C'est la plus ancienne citation comportant un vousoiement de plièse … et un mode d'éventuel ….” (Orpustan 1999:205)
"Myriam Uribe-Elxebarria, p.c. brings up an interesting test that could decide between these possibilities: to see if in cross-clausal agreement contexts with embedded finite complements (CI), allocutive agreement of the embedded clause can value a higher probe. If it cannot, allocutives cannot agree for reasons that have nothing to do with cyclic expansion. Unfortunately, allocutives tend to be restricted to matrix contexts (CI), and within the variation that there is, it seems very unlikely that transparent clausal complements ever allow allocutive agreement, so the test cannot be run.
"Toutefois le préfixe b- a été interprété par les sujets parlants comme un préfixe d'agent dans certains dialectes et à certaines époques, car on a créé en labourdins des formes de l'auxiliaire comme benez "qu'il me...!", beneza "qu'ils me...!", begaitza "qu'ils nous...!", Bonaparte cite aussi des formes de ce type en guipuzcoan, en haut-navarrais méridional, en aezcuan et en roncalais. Ces formes ne se rencontrent pas dans les textes du XVle siècle ni dans Oihenart. Il ne semble pas que, du moins en labourdin, on les ait utilisées dans la langue courante. M. Lafitte a raison de qualifier de "curieux" (Grammaire, (§554)) le traitement par lequel "le be- caractéristique de la 3e pers. de l'impératif a été, par analogie, étendu comme préfixe de commandement à toutes les personnes." La structure de ces formes est même insolite...” (Lafitte 1955:333)