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Introduction

1.1 Dative agreement and dative displacement

In most dialects of Basque, including the standard literary varieties and EB, an agreeing dative O' controls SX agreement morphology. Because of the Person Case Constraint, the absolutive O2 of such constructions is always the non-[participant] 3rd person, so it can only control PL morphology, and PX morphology is either default or controlled by [participant] A under ergative displacement when its conditions are met.

In some dialects however, 1st/2nd person datives can or must control both the PX and PL agreement morphology. Remarkably, such PX/PL controllers retain dative case. The phenomenon is thus similar to ergative displacement ED, whereby an ergative A controls PX morphology if there is no [participant] O controller, also while retaining ergative case. It is also different, for dative O controls both PX and PL, and it controls PL regardless of the plurality of the absolutive, while ED's (and presumably, DD's) control of PX depends on the fact that the absolutive is not a possible PX controller. In contexts where ED and DD can both apply, either may end up as PX controller, descriptively. Fernández (2001:152) coins the name dative displacement (datiboaren lekualdatze) on ergative displacement (ergatiboaren lekualdatze), and I abbreviate DD.

There is considerable variation as to when DD applies. To take a concrete example, in B-Lek (HEE, Fernández), DD is obligatory in the 3V present paradigm for 1.S/P datives, (1)a, where the historically expected non-DD forms existed three quarters of a century earlier. It remains optional in the past. Furthermore, it is impossible for datives in the 1V' paradigm, or for datives that are not 1st person, (1)b. Along each of these parameters, and more, there is variation.

(1) a. Zukiniri jtabakua ke mon j-a-zu / *d-o-ta-zu
   You gave me the tobacco. (Fernández 2001:150-1)
   b. (Nik) (zuri j) tabakua xekarri d-o-t-su
      I brought you tobacco. (Fernández 2001:155)

There is another phenomenon in Basque that relates canonical dative and absolutive agreement. This is leismo, whereby transitive O1 controls dative agreement morphology on the verb, (2). It is unconnected in origin with but now present in some of the same dialects as DD, as well as in many others, so that minimal contrast with DD may be observed. A striking difference between leismo and DD is that in leismo, case is affected: the O1 must become dative to participate in leismo. In Lekeitio, it is optionally available to human O1's:

(2) a. pro sij ikusi s[i a-itt j u-ti]
   I have seen you. (Hualde et al. 1994: 126)
A deep difference between the two phenomena persists as the investigation goes deeper. *Leismo* seems to be related to non-*leismo* in the way manner other close paraphrases are, e.g. *I entered (into) the room*, perhaps to involve literally an applicative construction for O1. DD seems related to non-DD merely in how far φ-Agree can penetrate a dative. Among the consequences is that one expects *leismo* to feed DD, as will turn out to be correct (XN).

DD combines aspects of applicative constructions in a remarkable mixture that sheds light on the mutual relationships and indeed the core properties of structural and inherent Case, φ-Agree, and applicativity. The most striking property is that O’ of applicative constructions controls the same agreement as O1 of transitives, absolutive, but unlike O1 it gets inherent case, the dative. This is a rare phenomenon (setting aside syncretisms where one cannot decide), though it does recur, for example in Itelmen and Georgian. Another important characteristic of DD is that O2 turns out to control a second, unique, dedicated [number] agreement, not found outside of DD contexts. This too occurs elsewhere, though not normally coupled with the first phenomenon: Southern Tiwa, Wchiita, and Nahuatl. Finally, DD is subject to an incredible amount of micro-variation, some of which I will show to be systematic, some arbitrary, so it is a test-bed for understanding how syntax limits and implements micro-variation.

This chapter undertakes the two-fold task of constructing a theory of case and agreement where DD can be understood and whose properties DD in turn helps to understand, and of the modes of parametrization of such a system and its limits. The inquiry is pursued in the context of a system that has other agreement displacements comparison with which is illuminating, and whose related properties such as applicativity are sufficiently well understood.

DD has not gone unremarked in the descriptive and theoretical literature, though the remarkable testimony of three DD areas (Oiñae, Burunda, and Echarri-Aranaz), that will play a large role here in understanding DD, nearly has been. The most lucid cross-dialectal description is Yrizar’s, Y-D-II:359ff. ten years later in Y-L-17ff., both on what will be called below the northern group: an area of interface between G, L, and nHN dialects, around Irun, Hondarribia, Hemáni, St. Jean de Luz, Sara. A brief lucid note on DD and leismo is also Arejita (1984).

It is for this northern group that DD is earliest recorded. The first comparative grammarian of Basque, Larramendi, mentions it in early eighteenth century in Donostia (REF), and the dialectologist Bonaparte in his mid-nineteenth century seminal dialectal investigation of the Basque verb pays particular attention to the phenomenon, especially in what below will be called the northern DD continuum (see Sagarrazu’s 1994 review of earlier observations on DD and *leismo* in the Hondarribia area). In the first half of the twentieth century it has been discussed by Bähr and Lafitte for Labourdin in the northern continuum (Bähr 1926:373, Lafitte p. 296, 307), and by Azkue for the very distinct Bizkaian dialect of Lekeitio (II:539§ 770, II:576§ 810). These works mostly treat the phenomenon as an aberration: Larramendi calls it *solecismo*, Bonaparte *idiotisme marin* or *la faute de nau* (nau being the DD form of dit 'he has it to me'), Lafitte *solecisme de la côte*, and while Azkue gives it no name he does not speak of it with favour.

The second half of the twentieth century sees typically cursory reports that can often be geographically correlated with earlier ones and permit an inquiry into the evolution of the phenomenon. In Hondarribia, Holmer (1964:87n161) observes the phenomenon, Artola (1981:300) offers a brief expressive testimony to it as a characteristic of Hondarribia Basque, Etxaburu (1981:308) is a lengthier description with excellent examples, and Letamendi and Sagarrazu (1992:528) add others. Recent descriptive works on other dialects of the northern zone add to this: for Oyartzun, Fraile and Fraile (1996:111ff.), Zuazo (1997:413), and Haddican
For Lekeitio, seventy years after Azkue, Hualde et al. (1994) (and Fernández 2001) offer an excellent description of the phenomenon; it has progressed, (4), but it remains isolated among the neighbouring dialects. Northern dialects separated from the northern DD continuum (Ezpelette, Milafrango) offer a handful of forms in recorded sources with DD, among them a precious datum as if accidentally noted by Trask (1981:294) (C4:DBL).

The only generative work on DD is that of Beatriz Fernández and colleagues, on Lekeitio and the northern group: Fernández (2001, 2002, 2004), Fernández and Ezeizabarrena (2004). These works constitute at the same time some of the most important descriptive work, seeing the data in new ways and asking new questions, as is the way of generative grammar. Many of the generalizations that ensue will be seen to have been first expressed or implicit there, as will some of the theoretical turns.

1.2 The form and dialectal distribution of DD

The Y corpus was constructed from Yrizar's work to be comprehensive with respect to DD: each dialect that shows DD was taken, and all the dialects surrounding it were then entered into the corpus, whether or not they have DD, sometimes extended for other reasons (leismo, ED loss). The result is 104 dialects of which 45 have DD, bolstered by the inclusion of data from selected dialects not in the Y corpus (e.g. B-Lek (HEE)).

(4) DD dialects according to dialect group:


Bizkaian 2: Lequeitio (Lec-Azkue, Lec-HEE).

---

1 The exception are a handful of DD forms in Western Low Navarrese dialects of Ustaritz (Zuraidane and Espelette), Y-BNw-00 and Zuazo (1999), and one form for Milafrango (Trask 1981:294); here the DD forms alone have been taken into account.
These groupings seem to form four dialectal continua of DD that I will refer to as the northern group (L, nHN, G 1), Burunda (G 2), Oñate (B 1), and Lekeitio (B 2). They are geographically non-contiguous, and between them DD is independent in mode of formation and diachronic pattern, which is not to say that it has always originated independently. The modes of formations and the starting point of DD are indicated in TABLE.

The northern group DD dialects, belong though they may to the separate L, nHN, and G dialect groups, are contiguous, and the DD here seems to reflect a single pattern. It begins with literal substitution of the 2V X>1.S forms for 3V present X>1.S+>3.S forms, it is DD here that is most wide-spread. The earliest records of dialects that had at the end of the twentieth century virtually full DD, like L-Ai-p:A, L-S-p:A, show DD only its beginnings in the fieldwork of Bonaparte more than a century earlier, L-Ai-p:B, L-S-p:B. However, even then L-L-p:B already has virtually complete DD. I will suggest in XN that DD began in a dialect where 3V and 2V formations alike made use of the root -u-, now characteristic of L, so that the pattern in the present was 3.S>1.S nau, 3.S>1.S>3.S daut. From here, it extended to dialects where 3V makes use of the distinct root -i-, characteristic of G, so 3.S>1.S>3.S is dit. The spread of DD forms of type nau from daut to dit dialects did not change the root, spreading not just anomalous agreement but also the actual forms, adding a new 3V root -u-.

The Burunda / Echarri-Aranaz, which are contiguous, and the two Bizkaian DD areas are not contiguous with each other or with the former group, and the principles of DD formation are very different.

DD in Lekeitio began with 3V present 3.S>1.S/P+>3.S forms of the type d-o-s-ta [X-[DF-1], d-o-s-ku [X-[DF-1']] and replaced them with 2V present 3.S>1.S/P types n-a-u [1-TM-√2V], g-a-itt-u-[1'-TM-PL-√]. This mode of formation and point of origin are identical to the northern group, and this may have served as a model. However, the actual forms were not imported. The phenomenon, recorded in Lekeitio as beginning among the young when Azkue was writing in the 1920's, has not spread to any localities around it (Hualde et al. 1994:00).

In Burunda, DD began with 3V present X>1.P+>3.S, so at a different point than in the preceding groups. Here again the 2V present X>1.P served as a model, with certain qualifications that will be discussed in XN.

Finally, the Oñate group differs markedly from all preceding, and as far as I know it has never been discussed in connection with DD. The starting point here is the past, not the present: 3V 3.S>1.S+>3.S (3V here does not distinguish 3.S and 3.P absolutive O2). The phenomenon has kept to the past. Still more striking as a difference is that these forms were not replaced by a form of 2V past, nor some formation from the 2V present. Rather, the 3V forms were kept as a base, and the PX corresponding to the dative was added, giving an entirely new formation where dative control of the PX under DD is doubled by its canonical SX morphology. Such forms appear in the northern and Burunda groups as well, and they have their analogues for SX doubling of ergative when it controls PX morphology. Their history there is not easy to divine, but in Oñate it seems clear doubling occurred from the beginning. There is no trace of them in Lekeitio, and since Azkue records the forms at the beginning of the phenomenon there, it seems they are not a necessary step in the development of DD.

2 At first sight the apparently complete absence of doubling with 1.S dative and the restricted distribution of the phenomenon to certain forms of sufficient morphophonological "weight" (e.g. gaituzki gut) in the northern group might speak for their novelty, but the undeniable existence of the completely anomalous form nature, with DD + DAT doubling in 2.F>1.S+>3.S present (Trask 1981:294), is striking.
TABLE: DD groups, points of origin, and modes of formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DD group</th>
<th>Origin in</th>
<th>3V</th>
<th>2V</th>
<th>3V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mainly L</td>
<td>1.S.D pres.</td>
<td>d-a-u-ta</td>
<td>nα-a-u</td>
<td>nα-a-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[X-TM-√2V/3V-1]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V/3V]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V/3V]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly G</td>
<td>1.S.D pres.</td>
<td>d-i-ta</td>
<td>nα-a-u</td>
<td>nα-a-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[X-√3V-1]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekeitio</td>
<td>1.S.D pres.</td>
<td>d-e-u-s-ta</td>
<td>nα-a-u</td>
<td>nα-a-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>[X-TM-√DF-1]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V/3V]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V/3V]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>[X-√3V-1']</td>
<td>[1-TM-PL-√2V]</td>
<td>[1-TM-PL-√2V]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echarri-Aranaz</td>
<td>1.S.D pres.</td>
<td>d-uu-ta</td>
<td>nα-ie-</td>
<td>nα-ie-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>[X-√3V-1']</td>
<td>[1-TM+√2V]</td>
<td>[1-TM+√2V]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oñate</td>
<td>1.S.D past</td>
<td>*o-s-taα-n</td>
<td>nα-indd-u-en</td>
<td>nα-o-s-taα-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>[√3V-DF-1-PAST]</td>
<td>[1-TM-√2V-PST]</td>
<td>[1-√3V-DF-1-PAST]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have little to offer about the origin of DD. In Lekeitio, DD seems to have arisen at the same time as the formation of the past tense paradigm on the basis of the present tense, from Azkue's description, and so belongs to a more general restructuring of the verbal system. Fernández and Ezeizabarrena (2002:00) observe that in Labourdin where DD is prevalent, the dative independently tends not to agree and so is "weaker" in this respect than elsewhere (XN); yet this is not true of the other DD areas.

The neighbouring Spanish and French dialects have a dative-accusative syncretism in the 1st/2nd person, where DD occurs in Basque, and this may play a role (Holmer 1964:87n161). For the 3rd person, where DD does not occur but leismo in Basque does, the Spanish dialects have the leismo and leismo/laismo phenomena that pull in different directions, the former extending dative clitic forms to O1 and the latter accusative forms to O' (see Fernández-Ordóñez 1999 for an overview). Basque leismo is not in origin connected to DD, though it does occasionally interact with it. Bonaparte's investigation in the mid-nineteenth century puts it mostly in Southern High Navarrese; among contemporary varieties it affects some dialects in almost every major dialectal area. It is not present in the Oñate DD group. In the Burunda group, earliest sources (1920) have leismo alone in most of the dialects (G-Bu:A-I, G-Bu:O-I, G-Bu:U-I), and only G-Bu:B:I has DD starting in 3VSPr with leismo already complete in 2VPt; notice the tense difference of the two phenomena. Lekeitio has both DD and leismo in 1994 (Lec-HEE). The northern group has varying degrees of leismo; in Inun and Hernani leismo applies to different cells in the 2V and DD in the 3V paradigm in such a way as to virtually construct a single paradigm for the two, while in the Labourdin DD dialects like those of Sara and Arcangues there is no leismo at all.

4 In Echarri-Aranaz, the origin is, it seems, in 2R/2.P>1.S>3.S/P present n-ie-zu [1-√2], etc.; it does not extend beyond these values of the ergative, for which no forms with present 1.SG dative are known, although it does extend to 1.PL dative.
1.3 **Explananda and theory**

The issues of interest raised by DD can be separated into three groups: DD form, syntax, and parametrization. Two overarching goals arise. One is to understand the syntax of DD and the form of the agreement complex under DD, given the theory of syntax - morphology relation in Basque elaborated in here. The other is to develop the tools to handle the incredible range of DD variation found in the corpus, and in the reverse, to understand which variation belongs, and how, to the morphosyntactic components and the limitations of this system with respect to variation, and which is merely a matter of surface spell-out -- irreducible allomorphy, readjustment, etc.

1.3.1 **DD form**

The salient properties of DD forms are listed below. The morphology referred to in them can be exemplified by 3V auxiliary 3.S>1.P+>3.P forms with and without DD in the northern and Oñate DD groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE: 3.S&gt;1.P+</th>
<th>DD, non-DD and 2V in northern and Oñate groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3V non-DD</td>
<td>Oñate, past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-a-u-zki-gu</td>
<td>[X_{px}-TM-\sqrt{2V/3V}-PL-1'_{sx}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-i-t-i-u-zki(-gu)</td>
<td>[l'_{px}-\sqrt{3V}-DF-1'-PT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-i-o-s-ku-i</td>
<td>[1'-PX-LM-PL-\sqrt{2V/3V}-PL2-(1'_{sx})]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V</td>
<td>g-i-ndd-l-u-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1'-TM-\sqrt{2V}]</td>
<td>[1-TM-\sqrt{2V}-PT]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) $PX$ is controlled by O' dative (XN).
(ii) $PL$ is controlled by O' dative. Thus O' dative behaves like O1 absolutive, and not like A ergative in ED, which controls PX but not PL morphology (Fernández 2001:154f.; XN).
(iii) DD often produces agreement complexes that look like 2V forms, and this is the generalization in the descriptive and theoretical literature. However, (i) and (ii) alone do not predict this, and it is strikingly wrong for some dialects (Oñate) and accidental for others because 2V/3V forms are not otherwise differentiated. Most dialects further show arbitrary divergences between 2V and 3V-DD forms. (XN)
(v) The dative flag DF, and the suffixal morphology canonically controlled by the dative, may be missing under DD, or it may/must double the PX/PL morphology, just as happens with ED: these are $DD + DAT$ doubling forms (Fernández 2002; XN, C4:DBL).
(vi) There is partial $DD$, whereby 1.PL dative controls PX/PL morphology corresponding to 1.SG dative (XN).
A consideration of the form of DD agreement complexes shows that DD cannot be reduced to agreement syncretism of dative-absolutive controlled agreement, just as it certainly cannot be reduced to Case syncretism among the controllers since they retain dative vs. absolutive case morphology. The reasons for this lie in the non-reducibility of 3V agreement complexes with DD to 2V agreement complexes: the PX and PL are the same (i, ii), but the root need not be and the whole form often is not (iii), DF and SX agreement may be present when the controller of PX/PL is a dative under DD but not when it is an absolutive (v), and there may be extra morphology not found in 2V forms (v). These considerations are strengthened by the fact that most DD dialects have non-DD forms in systematic or arbitrary portions of the paradigm, where a dative controls "canonical" dative morphology such as SX and DF that the dative continues to control under DD, while also gain control of PX and PL. So DD is really about a regular agreeing dative, in a normal construction, gaining control of the canonically absolutive-controlled PX/PL morphology, as syntactic tests will confirm: it is an agreement displacement.

1.3.2 DD syntax

DD syntax two can be broken up onto different key issues around which the discussion will turn. These properties are to follow from the theory of DD as agreement displacement in the syntax.

(i) Case. One of the most startling facts about DD is that O' keeps dative case, thus producing a non-canonical case-agreement pairing (Fernández 2001; XN).[^5]

(ii) Applicativity. The retention of dative corresponds to the retention of applicativity properties of the DD controller, exactly as if it controlled canonical dative morphology. Among applicative-like behaviors are the control of regular applicative dative morphology (DF, SX), and the limitation of S/O2 absolutive to the 3rd person by the Person Case Constraint. (Fernández 2001:148, 151, 2001:152n3; section 00). (XN)

(iv) Syntax vs. morphology. XN will demonstrate, quite directly, that the occurrence of DD has a syntactic consequence, rendering acceptable a configuration that is not so without it.

(v) Interaction with ED. Both DD and ED compete for control of PX, and in contexts where the Tense Condition permits ED to occur, they interact. To a first descriptive approximation, it is not clear which one will occur (Fernández 2001:160f., Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2002:00). Interestingly, it does not occur that the dative control PL alone (under DD) and the ergative control PX (under ED). This requires explanation, since it is a hallmark characteristic of ED that in 1/2->3.PL contexts, the subset of the 1/2->3 ED contexts where ED occurs yet O is plural, it is always O that controls PL while A controls PX (C2).

1.3.3 DD variation

Any property of the agreement complex can enter into the characterization whether a particular feature combination in a 3V paradigm shows DD or not, and the distribution can be entire arbitrary. At the same time, there is a class of factors that condition DD systematically, not

[^5]: Unlike the facts of agreement, this is not something that is absolutely certain for every dialect with DD in the Y corpus, because sometimes the data are not there. Very often however, such data do exist in the sources which Yrizar has included (e.g. Etxaburu 1981, Artola 1981), whether or not he mentions them; in every case, the PX/PL controller under DD is indeed dative. The impossibility of the absolutive specifically is usually not reported, but I have verified for HN=Ir-R (AI).
arbitrarily. A major goal of this chapter is to identify such factors, and to present a theory where the fact that precisely these factors can systematically influence DD (mostly) follows from the syntax of DD. The systematicity is a side-effect of insensitivity of the arbitrariness of the lexicon that is characteristic of morphosyntax; the remaining arbitrary patterns arise because of the capricious specifications of vocabulary items. Systematic conditioning factors for DD are:

(i) \( \phi \)-features of the dative \( O' \). Virtually all work on the subject has remarked that \( \phi \)-features of the DAT are a primary determinant of the applicability of DD (XN). In all dialects, a DD O’ dative must be 1/2 person (Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2002). (5) shows a typical situation for 1V’ (dative-absolutive psych-verb) \( gustatu \) 'like', in IFg: the dative experiencer triggers DD when 1.SG, not when 2/3.SG; for 3V cf. (1), (3) above.


(iii) There does seem to be systematic sensitivity to Tense in certain dialects, unlike what Fernández (2000:148, 153) concludes, though certainly she is right that there is no such universal patterns as the Tense Condition on ED (XN).

(5) a. Bai, \( neri \) gustatzen n-a-u baiñanere \( aittonari \) ez \( d-i-o \) gustatzen.
   yes, me.D liking 1-TM-√2V/3V but my grandfather.D not X-√V/3V-3 liking
   Yes, I like it, but my grandfather does not like it. (Etxaburu 1981:309)

b. \( pro \) txakoliña gustatzen \( d-i-zu \)?
   you.DAT txakoliña liking X-√3V-2
   Do you like txakoliña [type of wine]? (Etxaburu 1981:309)

These factors stand in contrast to other factors that could be thought to play a role, but do not; among the striking ones are (XN):

(i) \( \phi \)-features of the A ergative.
(ii) \( \phi \)-features of an allocutive.
(iii)(less clearly) plurality of the (necessarily 3\textsuperscript{rd} person) S/O2 absolutive.

These kinds of factors typically form patterns of DD distribution within and across dialects. Yet below will also be found a great deal of clear arbitrariness. This is not (in the general case) an artifact of data collection that has not paid sufficient attention. The descriptions of dialects included in the Y corpus make this highly unlikely, and it at any rate cannot be a factor in specialized works such as Fraile and Fraile (1996), Agirretxe et al. (1998), and Hualde et al (1994), where DD is paid particular attention to, and the same type of distribution is found. In G-H-nePS:ALO for example, from Agirretxe et al. (1998), the sole form to show DD in 3VS past is 3.P>1.P>3.S (and not say 3.S>1.P>3.S etc.). Yrizar notes himself the arbitrary role adding allocutivity may have (Y-Dial-II-361f.). The matter can be verified with native speakers of DD dialects. (6) gives some data with showing such arbitrariness for AI (HNn-Ir). For this speaker, 1.S.DAT can participate in DD in the present and past in the context of a 3.S.ERG, but in the present only in the context of a 2.R.ERG. There is nothing for it but to take the data as they are, and construct a theory that can deal with both patterns and arbitrariness, and explain why the potential patterns occur where they do.
1.3.4 A snapshot of the theory

An outline of the theory I develop can be given with reference to FIGURE, which gives a regular applicative construction with a dative PP applicative object, common to DD and non-DD constructions. The core elements are:

A. Some property of the dative PP determines whether the DP within it may control clausal φ-Agree, giving DD, or not, giving normal behavior of inherent case. This PP transparency is modulable according to the φ-features of the DP.

B. Locality and cyclicity assure that if the PP is transparent, the dative controls the φ-probe of \( v \); neither O2/S nor A (if there is one) can.

C. If the DP does control the φ-probe of \( v \), which is normally responsible for absolutive assignment to S/O2, a second [number]-probe on Appl licenses O2.

This proposal makes the loci of parametric variation for dative displacement the P head of DAT PP, and the Appl head that selects the dative in its specifier. Combined with a restrictive theory of selection, it delimits potential syntactic properties that can affect dative displacement, and that are therefore expected to have a systematic influence on dative displacement. For example, little \( v \) directly selects Appl, so different types of little \( v \) can select different types of Appl, namely those that have an extra φ-probe to license the second object or not. Other syntactic properties, such as the TP-level allocutive agreement, are not expected to do so.

FIGURE: DD syntax

This theory and its consequences will be developed gradually in XN, leaving for XN an account of the remainder, that is of the specific spell-out of the syntax where resides also
arbitrary variation due to lexical properties of vocabulary items. The next section first takes a slight departure to outline the properties of Basque applicativity.

2 Dative case and dative agreement

2.1 Applicativity

In Basque, dative arguments of predicates can have a variety of semantic roles systematically associated with the dative, such as goal, benefactor (G:4.1.5), possessor (G.4.1.6), experiencer, animate causee (G:4.8), implicative dative (XN) some of which are obligatory for the meaning of a some predicates; there are also predicates like the unergative jardun 'continue' or the unergative / unaccusative jarraitu (jarraiki) 'follow', which select a dative argument whose interpretation that does not fit these categories. All have the same morphological structure with respect to dative agreement, including the dative flag and agreement morphology; thus, multiple readings are available:

(7) a. proeskutitza iritsi zai-o.
    me.DAT letter.D.ABS arrived √1V'-3
    The letter got to him. / His letter arrived to its destination. (G:4.1.6)

b. Jonepatatak jaitsi d-i-zki-t.
    Jon.ERG me.DAT potatoes.D.ABS descended X-√3V-PL-1
    Jon took down the potatoes on my interest. / Jon took down my potatoes. (G:4.1.6)

In the most common situation in non-DD dialects, all such dative arguments are required to control SX morphology on the agreement complex of finite clauses. Elordieta (2001) argues that such agreeing datives with transitives appear in the applicative construction. These have the properties in (8); I extend the characterization to agreeing datives of dative-absolutive psych-verbs, though here the absolutive eventually becomes the subject (C5):

(8) Properties of applicatives
   (i) C-command: A-positions: O' dative asymmetrically c-commands O2/S absolutive for A-position tests such as binding and scope; A ergative asymmetrically c-commands O'.
   (ii) Inherent case: O' bears a case distinct from the absolutive of O1, namely the dative.
   (iii) Applicative agreement: O' dative controls SX agreement morphology in finite clauses.
   (iv) Case/Agree: O2/S gets absolutive case and PL agreement in regardless of the presence of O', but the Person Case Constraint prevents it from controlling PX ([participant]) agreement; there no such interaction between O' and A.
   (v) Applicative types: Both transitives and unaccusatives can be applicativized, but multiple applicatives are impossible.

Following Elordieta (2001), I adopt the view that that O' dative is introduced into the structure by a clausal functional head, Appl, in such a way that it is c-commands O2/S and is c-commanded by A, (9). This is the "classical" type of applicative, for which a recent overview is available in Anagnostopoulou (2003); it contrasts with the kind of applicative construction described by O'Herin (2001, 2002) for Abaza, where applied object seem to start out lower than core arguments (see C5). Among the applicative constructions which fit property (i), the
literature reports vast cross-linguistic variation on all the remaining properties: see Baker 1988ab, 1996, 1997; Alsina and Mchombo 1990; Bresnan and Moshi 1990; Alsina 1996; Marantz 1993; Pesetsky 1995; Legate 2002; Pykkänen 2003; Anagnostopoulou 2003; McGinnis 1998, 2001, 2005, McGinnis and Gerdt 2003; Ormazabal and Romero 1999, 2001, 2003. Obligatory O’ datives of verbs like give show properties different from optional applicative objects in languages like Georgian (Harris 1981) or Choctaw (Davies 1986). I will assume that these too are introduced by Appl, though they often have different properties (e.g. Rooryck 1988 for French). The requirement for the dative is clearly part of the lexical entry of the verb, and the applicative object can be identified with the required argument via a meaning postulate in the verb’s lexical entry, of the type explored by Chierchia (1984) for restructuring.

(9) a. Applicative transitives:  T \[v \[ApplP O'.DAT Appl \[vp V O2.ABS]]]]

b. Applicative unaccusatives:  T \[v \[ApplP O'.DAT Appl \[vp V S.ABS]]]]

An illustration of the hierarchichal A-position relationship of O’ with A and O is the binding of the clause-bound, non-subject oriented bere buru ‘his head’ anaphor, (10). This test unambiguously diagnoses A > O’ > O c-command among base-generated A-positions, in contrast to for example O > PP c-command, regardless of surface order (see C2). (Elordieta 2001:78-82). Superiority in wh-movement, both single and multiple, gives the same results (Elordieta 2001: 95f.). Quantifier scope and quantifier-variable binding (Elordieta 2001: 86-93, 82-6 resp.) are fed by local scrambling of O over O’, which creates new scope-taking possibilities for O, without destroying those available to O’. Criterial Ā-movement, of the focus or wh type, does not affect any of the tests indicating O’ > O relations, regardless of word order.6

(10) a. *Nik 〈Mirenj 〉[berej bururari]k erakutsi n-i-o-n argazietan
    I.ERG Miren.ABS her head Miren.ABS showed 1-√3V-3-PT photos.D.in
    *I showed herself Miren in the pictures. (Elordieta 2001:80)

b. Mireneki lagunarij [bereij buruajk erakutsi d-i-o\$.  
    Miren.ERG friend.DAT her head.ABS showed X-√EV-3
    Miren showed (her) friend herself. (Elordieta 2001:80)

A significant question is to what extent applicative O’ with different interpretations indicates a different applicative structure with the same basic, say a different applicative head. It is not easy to say, and probably not directly relevant here. The salient properties of applicatives are those given in (8), indicating position and behavior with respect to the Case/Agree system, and those are shared by all. Particularly interesting in this respect is that there are no combinations of multiple agreeing datives with different interpretations (G:4.8, Albizu 2001:49), though as will be seen below an agreeing dative + a non-agreeing dative for some interpretations (not all, e.g. not causee), arguably a low non-applicative PP, may indeed combine; Adger and Harbour 2003 discuss a similar state of affairs in Kiowa. For example the causative of a causative is impossible, though the agreement complex coding such a double dative is not itself illegitimate, as in (11) (equally with the meaning We made thee give it to him/her).7 However, the absence of multiple

6 This means local scrambling cannot feed Ā-movement, a familiar situation: see Grewendorf and Sabel (1999).
7 The causative construction at hand is the classical type: the A causee of transitives, and in some dialects the animate S of unaccusatives as well, is dative and behaves as an O’ (e.g. for the Person Case Constraint), while the properties of embedded O are not affected; the (inanimate) S of unaccusatives remains ABS and triggers ABS
aplicatives do not have mutually incompatible structures, e.g. all using the same unique Appl head between v and V. In Baker's (1988) classical approach it followed from Case theory, and below it will follow from the syntax of dative agreement.

(11) a. \( \text{pro}_i \text{pro}_j \text{pro}_k \text{pro}_m \) \( \text{eman} \) \( *\text{arazi} \) \( \text{g} \)-\( \text{en-izk}_m \)-i-\( o_j \)-na\( k \)-n
we.ERG him.DAT thee.DAT them.ABS given CAUS 1'-TM-PL-DF-3-F-PT
*We made him/her give them to thee. [RECHECK]

b. \( \text{pro}_i \) \( *\text{Kepari}_j \) \( \text{umee}_k \) \( \text{jarraitu} \) \( d-i-o_j/e_k-t_i \)
I.ERG Kepa.DAT children.D.DAT followed \( X-\sqrt{3V-3/3+PL'-1} \ X-\sqrt{3-3+PL'-1} \)
I followed (Kepa's) children. (AI)

Properties that go beyond those in (8) are not necessarily uniform for Basque applicatives, but it is not clear what to make of any distinctions. An example is control of the subject of secondary predicates. The dative agent causee of synthetic causatives can do so; other O' datives cannot (G:4.2.6). Either structural or interpretive relations could make O' agent causee salient. In some recent work the ability to control a secondary predicate subject is diagnostic of a "high" applicative, with the structure in (9), and contrasts with a "low" applicative where Appl is the complement of V, the dative still in its specifier but now with O2/S as complement of it rather than of V (Pylkkänen 2002, Legate 2002, McGinnis 2001, 2005, McGinnis and Gerdts 2003). However, the proposed correlates of the high-low split do not line up with the properties of Basque applicatives. In particular, all Basque agreeing datives show the same properties for Case/Agree and the same ban on multiple applicatives.⁸ Provided this can be made to follow, making some applicatives high and others low in Basque will keep the same hierarchical relations, and do no harm to my discussion.

2.2 Theta-related and quirky datives

The case borne by [Spec., ApplP] in Basque is dative. C1 has shown that ergative and absolutive can be borne by non-thematic positions that are the target of raising and long-distance agreement, including when the source of raising and the controller of agreement is within another full CP, and that can be occupied by an expletive. There are no dative non-thematic positions for raising or filled by expletives.⁹ A dative is assigned under selection only. Independently, C2 has discussed the fact that a dative-bearing DP is not visible for controlling either PX or PL morphology on v, and in ED contexts, a [participant] bearing dative does not interfere with cyclic expansion and v-A Agree for [participant].

This indicates that the dative is a theta-related Case. I use the term theta-related Case for all morphological case marking whose identity depends on the local relationship of a DP to its selector, whether canonical for a theta-role or idiosyncratic (Woolford's 2006 lexical and inherent Case). It stands in contrast to structural Case, which is assigned to a DP by a functional head that does not select it, often at a potentially unbounded distance. The hallmark of theta-

---

⁸ Low applicatives are supposed to restrict O1-like behavior to O' and disallow multiple applicatives, while high applicatives are supposed to give to O and O2 both equally O1-like behavior and allow multiple applicatives.

⁹ For verbs like irtzi 'consider', entzun 'hear', that take an ECM subject in the dative, see XN; as discussed there, it does not modify the conclusions here.
related Case is that it does not alternate with the embedding of the selector of the argument that bears it under different functional architectures such as raising and ECM, and that it cannot be borne by non-thematic elements such as there-type expletives, unlike structural Case.

I assume theta-related Case is selection by a predicate or predicate-related functional projection such as Appl for a specific PP, here one headed by the dative P. A distinction is sometimes made between quirky and inherent Case in that the former has the P or case morphology adjoined to the DP and remains a DP, while the latter is a genuine PP (Stowell 1989). For Basque too, an agreeing dative is typically treated as a DP, with the ergative and absolute, and a non-agreeing dative as a PP, along with other PPs and suffixal cases, to express in part the very agreeing -- non-agreeing dichotomy, in part different binding properties (Albizu 2001, Elordieta 2001:64ff.). Such proposals are meant to entail that a DP with an adjoined case particle behaves as a DP for binding, scope, etc., while a DP within a PP cannot c-command outside. However, the desired distinction simply does not exist empirically. Genuine, semantically heavy P's such as English about are invisible to c-command for all these purposes, whatever may be the explanation: see Pesetsky (1995: 172ff., 228ff.), Phillips (1996: 44ff.) for overviews, and specifically for the to experiencer of seem, see Chomsky (1986: 183, 1995: 304), Kitahara (1997: 63ff.), and especially McGinnis (1998a: 201ff.). The same holds true of visibility to A-movement. TABLE summarizes the behavior of the experiencer of raising seem in different languages. The experiencer is throughout a DP with selectionally-determined case morphology or adposition. The degree of fusion varies from full word-like independence of P to full attachment. However, this does not correlate in any way with the experiencer's visibility to A-movement, its "quirkiness" (see XN).

TABLE: Lack of correlation between morphophonology and syntax for seem experiencers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties of experiencer</th>
<th>PP (In between)</th>
<th>&quot;Case-marked DP&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible to φ-Agree</td>
<td>English seem + to DP</td>
<td>Greek fenete + se DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must attach to each conjunct</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most attach to each modifier</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portmanteau with stem</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* The dative must attach to each conjoined bare pronoun and or demonstrative, but not DP.

This kind of data brings home on independent grounds the irrelevance of the morphophonological properties of the case/preposition to syntactic behavior, here the visibility to φ-Agree. All theta-related case is a PP with different P's differing in their morphophonology; the quirkiness property is orthogonal. I will assume therefore that the dative applicative object of Basque, the agreeing dative, is a PP headed by a dative P selected in [Spec, Appl].
Theta-related Case falls into two varieties in terms of its syntactic behaviour: ordinary and quirky. Ordinary theta-related Case is simply completely invisible to the φ-Agree and A-movement system. In English, the experiencer of *seem, like all other PPs, cannot control subject agreement on the verb. If there is no further potential agreement controller, sentences like (12)a fail, and Lasnik (1999: 134) argues that this is because the φ-probe of T encounters no matching φ-set in its domain. Adding one rescues the construction, as in (12)b. The experiencer of *seem in Icelandic presents a well-known minimal contrast with that of English (McGinnis 1998ab, Schütze 1997, Boeckx 1999, Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003). It also bears theta-related Case, a dative typical of experiencers; but unlike the English to PP, it is capable of undergoing A-movement, and this ability lets sentences like (12)a survive in Icelandic, satisfying the "associate requirement" of the φ-probe of T, for example in (12)c with the experiencer moved to satisfy the EPP. In this, it is quirky. It is not visible only to A-movement, but also, to some extent, to φ-Agree, if such diagnostics as the binding of subject-oriented anaphora, being PRO, and the definiteness effect rely on φ-Agree (on which see respectively Reuland 2001, Landau 2001, and Chomsky 2000: 149 notes 90, 93; for quirky datives in Icelandic on these diagnostics, see the review in Sigurðsson 2002, and for the definiteness effect, McGinnis 1998a: 51). At the same time, it cannot value the φ-probe of T; there is no Agree with a quirky dative.

(12)  a. *There seem/seems to them, that someone left.
    b. There seem, to them to be some books on the shelf.
    c. Mér virðist/*virðast tænd [að þeir lesi bókinan].
       me.DAT seem.SG/*PL that they.NOM read the.book.ACC
       It seems to me that they read the book. (Boeckx 2004: 28)

There is another correlate of quirkiness that is easier to investigate for Basque: only DPs with quirky theta-related Case, and not those with normal theta-related Case, create the Person Case Constraint effect mentioned in C0 and discussed in C5. In (13), the presence of the experiencer of *seem in Icelandic prevents the verb from agreeing with a lower 1st/2nd person nominative, would it could without the experiencer. In the English translations, no such effect is found (this is more obvious in their present perfect version which must have have, rather than 3.SG has).

Recent work on the Person Case Constraint views it as coming from the visibility of a DP with quirky theta-related Case like the Icelandic dative to φ-Agree, which behaves in such a way as to block Agree with a lower DP in person, though it does not itself value a φ-probe (Taraldsen 1995, Boeckx 1999, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, C5).

(13)  a. Henni haði / hóðu, fj fundist [þær, vena dugleggar]
       her.DAT had.3.SG/3.PL found they(PL).NOM to.be industrious.
       They had seemed to her to be industrious.

   b. Henni haði / hóðu, fj fundist [þið, vena dugleggar]
       her.DAT had.3.SG/2.PL found you(PL).NOM to.be industrious.
       You had seemed to her to be industrious.

       (Sigurðsson 1996: 39; my annotations and translations)

Basque datives create the Person Case Constraint for absolutive-controlled agreement. Here a contrast arises with non-agreeing datives that gives good cause to introduce them. Some Basque dialects allow some of the same interpretations as have agreeing datives to be borne by non-
agreeing datives, in some contexts, which vary according to such parameters as pronoun vs. non-pronoun (Lafon 1961:412f., contrast Azkue II:770:§538), canonicity of the interpretation relationship (Ortiz de Urbina 1994), and mood/tense of the clause (Lafon 1961:418). These non-agreeing datives make an instructive contrast with agreeing datives, for they behave as if they were simply PPs outside the core argument and Case/Agree systems, like regular oblique PPs such as -tzat 'for' phrases. Referring to the applicative properties in (8), they (by definition) do not control SX agreement (iii), do not interfere for v-absolutive [participant] (PX) Agree in the Person Case Constraint (Albizu 2001:49) (iv), (14)a, (14)b, and are compatible with agreeing datives such as the agent causee (G:4.8.2.3) (iv), (14)c.10

(14) a. proi you.ERG poliziarrij, police.D.DAT prok me.ABS eraman *n-k-z-a-i-o-j-zu-e- / %n-k-a-u-zu-e,. brought 1-TM-√3V-3-2-PL' 1-TM-√2V-2-PL'
You brought me to the police (PCC obviation; Artiagoitia 2001:405)
b. */??Ni Miren i Miren.DAT baldarra seemed 1-TM-√1V'-3
I seemed maladroit to Miren. (Albizu 1997, note 16)
causativa of ditransitive; G:4.8.2.3) m (guri).1
The Church makes us give money to the poor. (Causative of ditransitive; G:4.8.2.3)

Further insight into non-agreeing datives may be had from contexts where they are not possible, where only an agreeing dative will do (cf. also Joppen and Wunderlich 1995). One are experiencers of psych-verbs, so even for speakers who have non-agreeing datives there seems to be no good version of (14)b, and the verb is restricted to 1st/2nd person absolutes. Another is the agent/animate causees of the synthetic causative. Accordingly, while causativization of a ditransitive is possible by putting the goal in a non-agreeing dative, (14)c, causativization of the causative of a transitive, which like a ditransitive has the ergative - dative - absolutive case array, is not possible (G:4.8.3). Basque is not alone here. Georgian as often behaves in a stunningly similar manner as Basque, for the Person Case Constraint, multiple applicatives, and causees, with the Basque agreeing dative corresponding to Georgian agreeing dative, and a non-agreeing dative to a vis 'for' PP in the modern language, but to a non-agreeing dative in older stages of the language (Harris 1981: chapter 5; 83ff., 99ff., 284-5n6). The same patterns occur in French, more masked (Postal 1990, Postal's 1989 Fallacy Constraint).

The non-agreeing dative does not seem to participate in the applicative construction (cf. Joppen and Wunderlich 1995). It relates to the applicative construction perhaps in the same way that the prepositional to-construction of English does (Ormazabal and Romero 1998, 2003), much as Baker's (1998ab, 1996) proposal and its extensions for a different class of applicatives, where the applied object does not have theta-related Case, mapped the DP complement of a P to [Spec, V+P].11 However, aside from a general discussion of such relationships in XN, I have no more to say about it here.

10 As with non-agreeing datives outside of these contexts, it is not clear when contexts where multiple agreeing datives are impossible, and which would favour non-agreeing datives, actually allow them. Among two speakers I have consulted, only the one who allows a non-agreeing dative independently allows a Person Case Constraint context to be "repaired" by a non-agreeing dative; for causatives of ditransitives, G:4.8.2.3 suggest a non-agreeing dative goal is "usually" available, but contrast Albizu (2001:48f.), Trask (1981:294).

11 Elordieta's (2001) hierarchical tests show for Basque that if the prepositional construction is mapped to the applicative construction by dative A-movement over O2/S, as Ormazabal and Romero propose (deriving from
By contrast, the agreeing dative is in the applicative construction, and it does seem visible to \(\phi\)-Agree in whatever way quirky theta-related Case is visible to \(\phi\)-Agree, if the evidence of the Person Case Constraint may be believed. This is the direction I will take. Yet neither the ordinary nor the quirky kind of theta-related Case actually values the \(\phi\)-probe of T from the \(\phi\)-features of its DP. Schütze (1997: 40ff., chapter 4) argues that this is the interaction of theta-related Case and \(\phi\)-Agree in general. Rezac (2006) surveys the cross-linguistic evidence supporting the tendency, stated in (15).\(^{12}\)

(15) **Case Opacity**: A DP with theta-related Case may not value a \(\phi\)-probe.

Case Opacity is cross-linguistically common, and it fits the non-DD Basque dative. There is evident tension between the visibility of quirky-theta-related Case to \(\phi\)-Agree, and its inability to actually value a probe, its apparent defectiveness. In the course of this chapter, I will propose a theory to from which both Case Opacity and the notion of defectiveness will be derived, in the context of developing a theory of Basque DD datives, which are a striking counter-example to Case Opacity. Up to then, I will assume the basic conclusion of much recent work on quirky DPs: they do enter into the \(\phi\)-Agree relation, in some way, although they fail to value (or fully value) the \(\phi\)-probe. Cashing out on this opens a way of understanding the nature of dative agreement and its contrast with Agree that is the topic of the next section.

2.3 Agreeing datives and quirky displacement

The Basque applicative dative cannot value the \(\phi\)-probes of \(v\) and T, as has been discussed: neither in canonical contexts, where it fails to control PX and PL agreement on \(v\), nor in with raising-to-ergative *seem* verbs where it is not available for long-distance Agree or for (copy-)raising by the \(\phi\)-probe of T (C1). On both diagnostics, it contrasts with ergative and absolutive, and this is one of the aspects of its behavior captured by Case Opacity. Yet it does control agreement morphology on the verb. In this section, I will argue that the source of this agreement morphology can be identified as an \(X^0\) displaced from the dative into the agreement complex following a defective Agree relation between the \(\phi\)-probe of \(v\) and the dative, of the type that characterizes quirky theta-related Case.

The Agree relation between a probe and a goal may but need not be followed by movement of the goal or a larger category containing it. If the moved goal is an \(X^0\), its movement to the target, also an \(X^0\), will put two \(X^0\)'s in a phrase-structurally local relation: a clitic or an agreement affix attached to say the verb in T(ense). As movement, this brings the interpretable feature of the goal to the target, and they are visible there at LF. The moved \(X^0\), containing a \(\phi\)-feature bundle, is naturally pronoun-like: clitics count as pronouns for the Binding Theory (Zubizarreta 1998: 107ff.), for weak cross-over (Suñer 1988, Anagnostopoulou 2003: 207ff.), and so on. This kind of pronoun-like agreement is a consequence of Agree + \(X^0\) movement. This is further discussed in C4:DBL.

\(^{12}\) Schütze (1997: 41) calls this the **Accord Constraint**: "A nominal projection and a predicated-related head cannot check each other's case- or phi-features except via Accord. That is, both sets of features, case and phi, must be checked at once." Here Accord corresponds to Agree. I do not put things quite this way because strong evidence has accumulated since that Agree with a Case-bearing DP that has already Agreeed for the same features is possible, at least sometimes (Potsdam and Polinsky 2001, Branigan and MacKenzie 2001, Carstens 2001, 2003, Bhatt 2006).
The X₀ that moves may be part of a larger structure within which φ-features are shared. For example, it may be the D head of a DP or a "big DP". This is the proposal developed by Uriagereka (1995), Anagnostopoulou (2003: chapter 4), among others, for the most clear type of pronoun-like agreement: the clitic doubling of DP arguments in Romance and Greek. The result of these mechanics is a valued φ-probe + a moved D (clitic) + a stranded DP. If there are morphological resources to spell out all the pieces separately, the result looks like subject clitic doubling in colloquial French and Northern Italian dialects, or complementizer agreement plus subject clitic doubling in West Germanic dialects, (16). Such transparency need not be expected though -- spell-out of the φ-probe or clitic may be null, or their shared φ-features be spelled out using one piece (see C4:DBL).

(16) da-n אל k_i κομ π-en
that-1.SG-I(clitic) 1.NOM come-1.SG (West Flemish; Zwart 1997: 138)

As noted, DPs bearing quirky theta-related Case are visible to φ-Agree without seeming to value a probe. In this case the DP or its D head may still move. If it is an X₀ that moves, there arises pronominal agreement in the absence of a φ-probe valuation. The theory makes this prediction, provided that there are conditions such as Case Opacity that block valuation upon matching. Anagnostopoulou (2003: chapter 4) empirically demonstrates its correctness through a paradigm that I will call it *quirky displacement*. A DP with quirky theta-related Case is visible to φ-Agree, and to the A-movement that occurs as a consequence of it, but it cannot value a φ-probe because of Case Opacity. An example of such a DP is the experiencer à Marie / lui of the matrix verb sembler 'seem' in (17), diagrammed in FIGURE. Because à Marie is visible to the φ-probe of T, it cannot be ignored for locality reasons, and the first occurrence of Agree stops at it. No Agree with the lower DP Jean, and its subsequent A-movement, is possible, as (17)a shows. If the experiencer is a simple D (+ P spelled out as dative case morphology), it may as an X₀ move to adjoin to the (verb in) T as a clitic through this first Agree operation. This gets it "out of the way" (see C5: note for discussion of "out of the way" of what), and a second Agree operation across its vacated position with Jean is now possible, here followed by A-movement of Jean to create (17)b.

(17) a. ?*Jean, semble à Marie [t_i avoir du talent] *locality
Jean seems to Marie to have talent
Gianni seems to Piero to do his duty.

b. Jean, lui_j + semble t_j [t_i avoir du talent] ∨quirky displacement
Jean her.DAT seems to have talent
Gianni doesn’t seem to him to do his duty. (French, Anagnostopoulou 2003: 38, 40)
This is a resume. The full range of quirky displacement phenomena subsumes cases where the quirky Case intervener moves out of the way as a full DP to [Spec, TP], as in Icelandic ((12)c: thus Chomsky 2000: 130f. and subsequent work, reviewed in Rezac 2004: chapter 2); as the D head possible of a larger dative DP, giving cliticization and clitic doubling in Greek and Romance (see Anagnostopoulou 2003: chapter 4); or likewise, but forming an affixal attachment to the verb, giving rise to agreement, though not Agree (Basque, below). The French example shows quirky displacement enabling A-movement of a lower nominative, but in the other languages it can also be seen to enable long-distance φ-Agree with an in-situ nominative. It is the correlation of dative cliticization and remote agreement with a nominative that suggests both occur through the same φ-probe. The quirky displacement phenomenon depends on the existence of quirky theta-related Case, unable to value by Case Opacity but visible to φ-Agree. I will return to deriving this property in XN, once the tools to understand Case Opacity and its parameterization are in place. In the mean, quirky displacement proves to be exactly the right mechanism to understand the agreement morphology controlled by the dative in non-DD dialects of Basque.

Basque applicative datives show the typical quirky Case interference for person φ-Agree known as the Person Case Constraint, without valuing a φ-probe. This suggests an analysis of dative agreement morphology in terms of quirky displacement. The proposal receives strong support from the following generalization, which in turn itself is further independent support for the existence of quirky displacement (Rezac 2004: 84ff.):

(18) Dative dependency generalization: Dative agreement morphology controlled by dative DP is contingent on φ-Agree with an absolutive DP in the same clause.

The correct interpretation of (18), I suggest, is that dative agreement morphology comes about through quirky displacement of a dative X0 between v and the absolutive goal of v's φ-probe, as in FIGURE, and it is not the reflex of an autonomous Agree operation. If it were, it should not depend on whether v has φ-Agree or not. The proposal is that it is not. In FIGURE, the φ-probe of v enters into some Agree relation with it, but evidently the dative does not fully value it, since the φ-features of the dative DP are not reflected in PX/PL morphology, and the number of a farther absolutive is reflected in the PL morphology. The dative-controlled SX morphology is not a reflex of valuation of a probe, but rather a displaced X0, a D-head, a "clitic", and contingent on an independent probe to displace it. There is a strong parallel with quirky displacement: it is the contingency of one type of phenomenon (cliticization, SX morphology) on...
another (agreement with a nominative, presence of an absolutive) that suggests the same φ-probe is responsible for both. A remaining desideratum would be to bring this combination of visibility to the φ-probe(s) of $v + SX$ morphology that characterizes the dative into correlation with the valuation of the φ-probe(s) of $v + SX$ doubling that characterizes ergative and dative displacement in some forms; such will be the final system (XN:concl).

FIGURE: Standard Basque dative agreement

This argument presupposes that a dative is not an adequate goal for one of the φ-probes of $v$, so that without an absolutive goal, the φ-probe(s) of $v$ are not around to displace the dative $X^0$ to yield SX morphology. The particular proposal developed in XN and in C5 is that it lacks a value that would be visible to the number probe of $v$. The number probe of $v$ requires another goal. If there is not one, the presence of the number probe would crash the derivation. I suppose further that there is no variety of $v$ in Basque that has the person and not number probe; no such variety of $v$ is independently attested, and as primary Case/Agree locus, $v$ perhaps necessarily has both for principled reasons (unlike say a participle). The entailment is that if there were a dative to provide a goal for both the φ-probes of $v$, the dative dependency generalization disappears, as will be seen below.

The dative dependency generalization cannot be investigated on the basis of simple predicates. Basque as many other languages has unergatives with only a dative object, like *jardun ‘continue’, but these have a (typically) covert theme argument corresponding to the absolutive (cf. Hale and Keyser 1993, Dobrovie-Sorin 1998). However, complex predicate and raising constructions can be so constructed that no potential goal for $v$’s probe is present. From them, the generalization can be established, on the basis of observation due to Artiagoitia (2001ab) and Albizu and Fernández (2002, forthcoming) (see note 00 below).

The first case to consider are complex predicates based on the modal verbs behar ‘need’ and nahi ‘want’ in one of the constructions available to them, where their complement is a lexical verb in the perfect participle form, bidali ‘sent’ in (19) (Ortiz de Urbina 2003: §3.5.6, Albizu and Fernández 2002). The modal brings an ergative external argument (needer / wanter), which is obligatorily identified with the silent highest argument of the lexical verb, regardless of its theta-role or the verb’s transitivity: external argument of transitives, internal argument of unaccusatives. Remaining applicative or direct object arguments of the lexical verb are obligatorily coded on the agreement complex shared by the modal and lexical verbs, as if the two were a single clause. Their free positioning (gonbidatuei in (19)) also indicates transparency of the union.

(19) Aitorrek, [i] goni bitak bidsi behar/nahi d-i-zki-ej / *d-u gonbidatuei,

20
These properties suggest a fully restructuring construction of the type discussed in Wurmbrand (2001). The modal verb brings the functional architecture, including a v as selector of external argument and Case/Agree locus for internal arguments, and the lexical verb brings just the predicate material that projects the internal arguments: itself and any applicative head. The two end up sharing a single functional architecture. The lower verb’s highest argument is lexically interpreted through the external argument brought by the modal verb (Chierchia 1984). The result is shown in (20), where Agree/Case relationships are subscripted and argument selection is superscripted.

\[
(20) \left[ \text{TP} \text{ergative, Ti} \left[ vP_{i,j} \right] \left[ \text{VP need/want} \left[ \text{VP/AdjP V^}\text{akk} \text{(dative}_k \text{) (absolutive}_j \text{)} \right] \right] \right]
\]

This characterization has one exception (Ortiz de Urbina 2003, Albizu and Fernández 2002): if and only if the embedded verb is unaccusative, it may not select a dative argument here, as in (21)a (contrast (19)). Two options are available if a dative is present. First, the dative agreement may simply be missing, (21)a; such non-agreeing datives are available to some speakers, arguably non-quirky PPs like English for PPs, and are not relevant here. Second, a different restructuring construction may be deployed, where the modal verb behaves more functionally and does not bring its own external argument. Instead, the lexical verb’s arguments show the same theta - Case/Agree relationship they would if there were no modal, so the theme/patient of unaccusatives (interpreted also as the wanter/need) is absolutive.

\[
(21) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{i.\text{ERG}} \text{ he.DAT approach need/want } X-\sqrt{3}V-3-1 / X-\sqrt{2}V-1 \\
& \text{I need/want to get close to him.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{I.\text{ABS}} \text{ he.DAT approach need/want } 1-\text{TM}-\sqrt{1}V^{1-3} \\
& \text{I must/want to get close to him. (G: §3.5.6.1, Albizu and Fernández 2002)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{they.\text{ERG him.DAT liked need } X-\sqrt{3}V-3-\text{PL'}} \\
& \text{They must appeal to him. (MD)}
\end{align*}
\]

This is an instance of the dative dependency generalization (18), and its explanation accounts for this behavior. The complement of behar/nahi is missing a syntactic representation of its highest argument, which is lexically identified with the external argument brought by behar/nahi. If the lexical verb is transitive or unergative, (22)a, there is an inessential argument DP, the object, available for φ-Agree with v, through which it gets absolutive Case. This φ-probe also brings along into the agreement complex the dative agreement morphology as an X₀ displaced from the dative on the path between v and the absolutive. If the lexical verb is unaccusative, however, (22)b, the theme/patient DP is missing because it is lexically identified with the external argument of behar/nahi, and there is no other DP with structural Case to value v’s φ-probe. If the verb projects a dative argument, (22)c, the dative dependency generalization predicts that dative agreement with it is impossible, since there is no φ-probe on v to move the agreement morphology. A φ-probe cannot be gratuitously present on v with no goal to value it
(cf. Lasnik 1999: chapters 4, 6, Bošković 1997: 134, Chomsky 2000: 125-7). The alternatives in (21) are clearly consistent with dative dependency generalization.\footnote{Albizu and Fernández (2002) view the contexts as follow as involving movement of a DP from one position (e.g. theme of unaccusative) over a higher dative (e.g. its or a higher experiencer) to end up with ergative case/agreement (e.g. subject of behar/'need'), and propose that locality makes the dative interfere in this relationship. The semantic alternation is fine if targeting an absolute case/agreement position because dative and absolutive final positions are equidistant. However, C5 will show that movement past a dative to an ergative case/agreement position is perfectly fine, in the absolute displacement phenomenon that happens to independently replicate exactly the configuration they are concerned with, so the dative is equidistant to the final ergative position as well (whatever the exact mechanics adopted).

Albizu and Fernández (forthcoming) argue the proposal is inadequate. They depart from the assumption that semantically unaccusative verbs base-generate the theme as object of V even if they take the ergative-dative case-frame typical of applicative unaccusatives (cf. jarden 'continue' in the text). They point out that such verbs are perfectly fine in these contexts with matrix ergative-dative agreement like diot, diote in the examples, so that the generalization is that only those semantically unaccusative verbs that do not allow the ergative-dative case frame independently do not allow it under behar/nahi. They develop the condition as a morphological one against including dative and ergative agreement on the same head, V, something that will occur only with unaccusatives but not with unergatives where there are two heads, T for ergative and V for dative. On my account, their observation follows immediately if they are treated as being structurally unergative, and the unaccusative-unergative distinction is purely formal; C1 has assumed as much based on arguments like those Baker (1996) has advanced for Mohawk, e.g. ergative/absolutive alternation for the agent of horrokatutu 'to fight' (< borroka 'a fight'), and the absence of any semantic correlate for ergative even in transitive predicates. (Their examples of ergative-dative unaccusatives are western variants artem 'go out', igo raise of absolutive-dative irten, igo elsewhere, the locution halio izan 'be worth to', form some speakers merezi 'be worth to', and the oscillating ergative/absolute-dative benhid izan 'be the same to'. Neither approach can explain that their observation confirms the literature offers the example of a verb fotu 'tie to' that is absolutive-dative but under behar gets ergative-dative.

However, Fernández and Albizu (forthcoming) raise a far more serious problem for their earlier approach, and one that transfers to the present one. The absolutive-dative case/agreement frame verbs that are subject to the restriction on embedding under behar/nahi are both those that in C5 are analyzed as involving projection of arguments as DAT>ABS, like the psych verbs gustatu 'please' and iruditu 'seem' and ABS>DAT, like the motion verbs harbitu 'approach'. In the latter, the dative is below the theme argument and should not interfere for any relationship with it -- and indeed, in the Person Case Constraint, it does not. The simplest would be if ABS>DAT verbs embedded under behar/nahi were not allowed to have the special P head discussed in C5 that allows them to introduce a law agreeing dative, but I have no independent evidence for this.}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Transitive: \([TP \text{ergative}, \text{Ti}_v^j \text{ TP}_v^j \text{need/want} [\text{VP/App P}_v^j \text{V}_v^j \text{dative}, \text{absolutive}]]\)
\item Unaccusative: \([TP \text{ergative}, \text{Te}_v^i \text{ T}_v^i \text{V}_v^i \text{need/want} [\text{VP}_v^i \text{V}_v^i]]\)
\item Unaccusative+Dative: \([TP \text{ergative}, \text{T}_v^i \text{V}_v^i \text{need/want} [\text{VP/App P}_v^i \text{V}_v^i \text{dative}, \text{absolutive}]]\)
\end{enumerate}
usage, but it is fine, indeed required, with the closely related raising-to-absolutive psych-verb *iruditu* 'seem to, think, consider', (23)c (q.v. further C5).

(23) a. Drakulak (niri) beldurak ematen d-i-tj.
   Dracul.ERG me.DAT fear.D.ABS giving X-√3V-1
   Dracula frightens me. (Artiagoitia 2001b: ex. 33)
b. Jonek (*proj) zintzoa ematen d-u/*d-i-tj.
   Jon me.DAT honest.D.ABS seeming X-√2V/*X-√3V-1
   John seems honest (*to me). (Artiagoitia 2001a: ex. 58, 59)
c. Jone/*Jonek proj zintzoa iruditzen *d-i-tj / zai-t.
   Jon. ABS:*ERG me.DAT honest seeming X-√3V-1 √1V'-1
   Jon seems honest to me. (Artiagoitia 2001a: ex. 58, 59, 2001b: ex. 29a)

This pattern is predicted by the dative dependency generalization (18). The dative experiencer of *seem* can control dative agreement just in case the matrix verb also has a φ-probe on \( v \) and there is a goal for it (a DP that raises, copy-raises, etc.). If there is no such goal, there is no φ-probe on \( v \), and dative agreement cannot appear either. Reduction of the ban on raising-to-ergative + dative experiencer to the dative dependency generalization, and its explanation in terms of quirky displacement, provides substance to Artiagoitia's (2001a) suggestion that the culprit here is deactivation of \( v \) as a Case/Agree locus in these constructions. Viewing dative agreement morphology as due to cyclic displacement explains why it should be contingent on the φ-probe of \( v \).

There is a striking confirmation of the dative dependency generalization that comes from dative displacement, where the dative non-canonically controls PX and PL morphology, reflecting the φ-probes of \( v \), beside optionally its canonical SX morphology. Dative displacement has as effect only this change in controller-agreement relations; there is no concomitant change in case morphology, and as well be seen below, applicative structure, or hierarchical relations. However, there turns out to be a syntactic effect, and it is one predicted by the dative dependency generalization (18); it is shown in (23). Adding an experiencer to a raising-to-ergative *seem* verb is impossible, (23)a, and as discussed it is rendered possible by a different raising-to-absolutive construction, (24)b. Yet it is also possible for the raising-to-ergative verb if the dative experiencer is coded by absolutive agreement where DD is permitted, (24)b, as the generalization predicts.iii

(24) a. ?*Haiek nekatuta z-e-u-d-ela inruti z-i-da,te-n (neri).
   they.ERG tired X-TM√be-PL-that seemed X-√1-PL-2-PT me.DAT
b. ?Haiek nekatuta z-e-u-d-ela inruti z-itzai-zki,da,-n (neri).
   they.ERG tired X-TM√be-PL-that seemed X-√PL-1-PT me.DAT
c. ?Haiek nekatuta z-e-u-d-ela inruti n-j,a-u-te-n (neri).
   they.ERG tired X-TM√be-PL-that seemed 1-PL-√PL-2-PT me.DAT
   They seemed to me like they were tired. (AI)

The nature of this diagnostic is of general interest for the study of agreement displacement. No syntactic effect has ever been found for the ergative displacement phenomenon, for example. This has led to two types of conclusions. On the one hand, that it is a change in \( v \)'s [participant] Agree relations only, and though φ-Agree is narrow-syntactic, because it is the valuation of
uninterpretable φ-features, no consequence for hierarchical relationships, thematic relationships, and so on, is expected, nor is one for case morphology because Agree relations of v and T remain unaffected. Indeed, no such consequences are found. This has on the other hand led also to the conclusion that agreement displacement is not syntactic. The two points of view have been contrasted in C2. Dative displacement, like ergative displacement, also has no consequence for case morphology, structure of the construction, thematic or hierarchical relations. Yet here there exists a phenomenon that independently depends solely on whether a φ-probe can find a goal. Dative displacement provides it with one, and that in turn licenses the dative experiencer of seem raising-to-ergative seem verbs, which requires agreement, like other applicative datives.

The dative dependency generalization in raising brings to fore an issue that I have skirted so far: why an applicative dative cannot survive as a non-agreeing applicative dative in contexts where the dative dependency generalization rules out dative agreement. All other applicative datives also require agreement, but this is plausibly motivated by the need of a lower DP to receives absolute Case from v and thus for the dative intervener to move out of the way through quirky displacement; yet contexts where the dative dependency generalization rules out dative agreement are precisely those where this consideration play no role, for there is no lower DP for v’s φ-probe. Indeed, Anagnostopoulou (2003: 00) raises the same problem in a different context: in Spanish applicative constructions require dative clitic doubling, including in contexts where in Greek this is optional, namely in applicative transitives where Case-licensing is available for the accusative with or without quirky displacement (whatever the explanation, e.g. equidistance or alternative Case licensing means). It seems that some applicative datives simply require displacement of the $D(\pm P)^0$ that turns into agreement or clitic under quirky displacement. This makes sense if they always come into the structure as "big DPs" with this $D^0$, and the $D^0$ has particular attachment properties that do not let it survive in-situ but require that it end up in the agreement complex. Thus, an applicative dative requires a displacement mechanism for the "clitic" that is a part of it, and thus φ-Agree by v. This is the view of SX morphology I will develop in C4:DBL. When the dative experiencer is coded by DD, this displacement is not evident, for the dative does not always control SX morphology, as in (24)c; yet it can, and I will suggest in C4:DBL that the failure of doubling morphology to appear for DD and ED is epiphenomenal, a matter of the spell-out of multiply-coded φ-features, and always occurs in the syntax.14

The occurrence of the dative dependency generalization in raising construction is particularly telling. The generalization is reminiscent of the behaviour of low applicatives, where an applied object requires a lower object (Pylkkänen 2003; cf. Baker 1988ab, 1997, Marantz 1993); and of the behaviour of the common type of causative where the causee is dative if and only if the causativized predicate is transitive and thus there is a lower object as well (e.g. Baker 1988a: 161ff.). However, in the raising examples here the dative DP is the argument of a different

---

14 There remains an issue specific to dative experiencers in raising-to-ergative constructions. Since for these raising constructions there is φ-Agree between the T of the seem verb and a lower DP within its CP argument, one might expect this φ-Agree to license the dative experiencer agreement morphology that lies in between by quirky displacement, incorrectly. I have proposed in C1 that the CP argument of these verbs is in fact base-generated in [Spec, vP], so the dative experiencer is below it, and not on the T-CP φ-Agree path. There seem to me to be independent advantages to this. Alternatives could consist in exporing a difference in the ability of T and v to effectuate quirky displacement. The φ-probe of T could be weaker (there is little morphological evidence for its composition), or T might fail to provide a landing site for dative X’s, though (or because?) it provides one for ergative X’s, while v (directly or through selecting Appl?) does. I have not found a way of capitalizing on such ideas that is not just an encoding of the facts.
predicate, the raising *seem* verb, than the goal of φ-Agree, which belongs to the embedded predicate. Thus the dative dependency generalization cannot have its source in any direct, local dependence of the dative on the lower object, as in Pylkkänen's (2003) approach to low applicatives where the applied object is the theme's specifier.

The dative dependency generalization is explained instead by applying Anagnostopoulou's (2003) approach to dative clitics to Basque dative agreement. A dative cannot itself value a φ-probe, so it does not license a φ-probe on v. Only if another DP is around to do so, and v thus has a φ-probe, can dative morphology arise, through quirky displacement of an X0 from the dative between v and its goal. It remains to be explored whether the idea can prove useful for restrictions on applicatives and causatives as well.

The types of agreement morphology that are treated by the quirky displacement mechanism have all received alternate treatments in the literature. One one end of the scale lie proposals to fully assimilate such morphology to φ-Agree, and often, the corresponding dative of the controller to the structural Case of φ-Agree controllers in the respective languages, nominative in Spanish and Greek, absolute and ergative in Basque: cf. Franco (1994) for Romance clitics, Cheng and Demirdache (1990), Fernández (2001) for Basque dative agreement, and more generally the style of approach to clitics and movement of Sportiche (1996). The asymmetries in Basque between dative and ergative/absolute that have led here to the conclusion that the former is theta-related while the latter are not have been addressed from this point of view. The dependence of nominative agreement in dative cliticization in Romance and Greek, and of dative agreement on the φ-probe of v in Basque, receive no direct explanation, though they can and have been treated differently (see Albizu and Fernández 2002 on the latter).

At the opposite end of the scale are proposals, developed particularly for Spanish, that the dative clitic is the applicative head (between v and VP) itself, agreeing with the dative, which either moves into its specifier from the prepositional construction (Ormaizabal and Romero 1998, 2003) or is base-generated there (Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003). There is a great deal of attractiveness in this general idea. It can suitably differentiate dative agreement in Basque from ergative and absolute agreement, for neither version of the theory requires that dative agreement (dative clitic in Spanish) be the spell-out of φ-Agree between Appl and the φ-features of the dative DP: there may be defective φ-Agree that leads to X0-movement between Appl and the DP that moves to [Spec, ApplP], or the X0-movement may be due to base-generation. There are ways of working out the idea that so that it explains, as well as quirky displacement does, the obligatory cliticization of the applicative dative to permit T-nominative agreement across it in Romance and Greek: the dative clitic attached to Appl, moved or not from the doubled dative, comes to be equidistant to Appl, and through it to v and to T; the doubled dative's φ-features are either removed with the clitic if it moves from it as in quirky displacement, or it is itself somehow render equidistant to v/T through the doubling clitic. Finally, the proposal is adaptable in general to suffixal agreement in Basque, provided whatever attaches the dative-controlled SX to Appl from the dative, e.g. base-generation, can also attach the ergative-controlled SX to v.

However, this kind of proposal does not seem suited to explain the dependency of dative agreement on independent Agree by the φ-probe of v, the dative dependency generalization (18). The essential ingredients asked for by an explanation of this generalization is that dative agreement be contingent on the success of the Agree relationship between the φ-probe of v goal, suggesting that dative agreement in the first place has no mechanism to attach it independent of this φ-probe, and in the second place that the dative though attached through this φ-probe does
not count as satisfying its need for a goal. Quirky displacement achieves these requisites, at the expense of introducing the mysterious notion of defectiveness, that is of visibility to φ-Agree without valuation. However, this will be reduced in XN to simply valuation for 3rd person and defectiveness eliminated; the [individuation] probe of v, unaffected by a quirky intervener with only 3rd person, passes to Agree with a lower DP, and failure to find one renders non-convergent derivations where v has φ-probes but no such goal.

In general, this approach to dative agreement in Basque makes use of two sources of agreement morphology: the spell-out of a valued φ-probe, and X\textsuperscript{0} movement of or out of its goal. Both may be combined, as in (16). In Basque, dative agreement gives reason to analyze SX morphology as X\textsuperscript{0}-movement dependent on v’s φ-probes, which have different controllers for the [participant] and [individuation] nodes that PX and PL spell out, if any. Generalizing the proposal that SX realizes X\textsuperscript{0} movement, ergative-controlled SX (16) is X\textsuperscript{0}-movement out of A.ERG due to T-A Agree, but independent of the valuation of T’s φ-probe and its spell-out, and independent also the v-A Agree under ED. Dative displacement will add a further configuration like (16), for v. I return to considering the interaction of SX morphology as X\textsuperscript{0}-movement with valued probes in general in C4:DBL.

With this, an understanding of the case and agreement of non-DD datives in Basque is in place. They are DPs with quirky theta-related Case, that is PPs visible to φ-Agree as 3rd persons but not able to value, introduced into [Spec, ApplP]. The agreement their control, analogous to the dative clitics of Romance and Greek, is due to X\textsuperscript{0}-movement of a D+P\textsuperscript{0} element from [Spec, ApplP] into the agreement complex, contingent on the φ-probe of v, and thus on its ability to find a goal to value it. In the next section I return to the main topic of this chapter, dative displacement and its datives.

3 DD: Principles and Parameters

3.1 The syntax of DD

The syntax underlying DD must be similar enough to non-DD so that the DP controlling absolutive-like agreement be interpreted as the applied object and bear dative case. Moreover, it seems fairly clear that DD datives are in the applicative construction. XN has mentioned two contexts where applicative datives are required, and non-applicative datives are impossible: experiencer of psych-verbs and causatives. In both contexts, DD datives are fine:

(25) a. Bai, neri\textsubscript{i} gustatzen n-a-u baïn\textsubscript{a} nere aitonari\textsubscript{j} ez d-i-o\textsubscript{j} gustatzen. Yes, me.D liking 1-TM-√2V/3V but my grandfather.D not X-√-3 liking Yes, I like it but my father does not like it. (HNn-Ir-H, Etxaburu 1981:309)

b. pro\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{j} iridi’cen n-a-u. me.DAT it.ABS seeming 1-TM-√ It seems to me. (HNn-Ir-H, Holmer 1964: 87:n161)

c. pro\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{j} pro\textsubscript{k} pro\textsubscript{m} eman arazi n-j-a-u-taj\textsubscript{k}-i you.ERG me.DAT him.DAT it.ABS given caused 1-TM-√-DF+1-M You made me give it to him. (LNe-Villefranque, Trask 1981: 294)
The form nautak of (25)c has not only DD of neri 1.SG.DAT, where it controls PX; it also has doubling of neri by canonical dative flag and SX morphology controlled by the dative, giving the DF+SX ta. The presence of the dative flag is indicative of the applicative construction, perhaps the realization of Appl itself as discussed in XN; the presence of the SX morphology is indicative of X\(^a\)-movement from the dative in addition to the valuation of the φ-probes of \(v\). In XN, I will show that the inclusion of the dative flag, overt or covert, is in fact universal in DD, despite occasional appearances to the contrary. The presence of the dative flag is therefore a direct indication of the presence of the applicative construction. Doubling of the dative by SX morphology appears to be widely available and constrained only by surfacy, non-syntactic factors; a likely hypothesis is that it always occurs, that its absence is a consequence of an independently occurring reduction during spell-out of multiple exponence of φ-features (XN, C4:DBL).

As with non-DD applicative datives, only one is allowed. Thus, it is not possible to causativize the causative of a transitive; in the lower causative, the agent is encoded as an applicative dative, and an additional applicative dative cannot be added through further causativization. Nor can an applicative dative coded by SX be combined with a separate dative coded by PX/PL through DD (RECHECK).

(26) EXAMPLE

Direct tests to probe the structure of DD datives, of the type deployed by Elordieta (2001) for agreeing non-DD datives in Basque, are hampered by the fact that DD occurs only with 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) person. This turns out to lead to a level clash for A\(^\text{c}\)-movement of the dative or binding of the overt neure buru 'my head' anaphor, both available only at a formal level for my consultants. A\(^\text{c}\)-movement of the absolutive O\(^2\) is not impeded, (27), as it is in many Bantu languages that treat O', rather than O\(^2\), as O\(^1\) for agreement/case (Nakamura 1997). Furthermore, quantifier-based tests are severely restricted by keeping to 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) person datives. Yet using a dative of the type you each with pro-dropped you coded only by agreement (Huwartado's 1984 unagreement), it can be demonstrated [RECHECK] is that there is indeed a site for the theme to be interpreted for the purposes of quantifier-variable binding below the DD'd dative, (28). This is a diagnostic of the applicative construction in Basque (Elordieta 2001: 82ff).

(27) a. Ze bokata\textsubscript{a} pro\textsubscript{a} pro\textsubscript{j} eman n\textsubscript{η}-a-zki\textsubscript{z}-zu\textsubscript{z}? what sandwich.ABS you.ERG me.DAT giving 1-TM-PL-2
What sandwiches did you give me? (AI)

b. [[(Neri) eman n-a-zki-\textsubscript{z}-u\textsubscript{n}] bokatak]\ onak d-ira.
me.DAT given 1-TM-PL-2-that sandwiches.D.ABS good.D.ABS X-be+PL.
The sandwiches that you gave me are good. (AI)

(28) EXAMPLE

In sum, DD datives are applicative datives as non-DD ones are, with the same case, applicative architecture, hierarchical relationships, and restrictions due to applicativity. Both DD and non-DD datives are PP headed by the dative P\(_{\text{dat}}\), selected by Appl in [Spec, ApplP]. The difference between the two types of datives does impact the syntax, as has been seen in XN, but the difference is solely in whether the dative values the φ-probes of \(v\).
3.2 The theory of theta-related Case

In this section I will develop a theory of theta-related Case and its interaction with φ-Agree. The foundation lies in understanding theta-related Case as a PP shell around a DP, or more generally, as some XP that contains the DP. PPs are the natural choice adopted in XN, and they have an independently justified property that is crucial here: they are known to be opaque domains to narrow-syntactic dependencies, such as wh-movement. In current parlance, PPs are phases. It follows that a DP within a PP is not visible to φ-Agree outside the PP. Normally, theta-related Case is a barrier to φ-Agree, deriving Case Opacity from the general opacity of PPs.

However, the opacity of an XP depends on its head X, and properties of X can modulate it, for example by permitting successive-cyclic movement. I will take advantage of this to modulate the opacity of PPs to external φ-Agree. Specifically, exploiting the PP - CP parallelism hypothesis, I suggest P may itself have a φ-probe that Agrees with the DP within it, in the same way that C is known to allow a φ-probe that agrees with a nominative DP in its complement. The result of this P-DP φ-Agree is visible to φ-Agree from the outside; effectively, a φ-probe on P transmits the φ-features of its DP complement to the outside of the opaque PP domain. The presence of a φ-probe on P thus makes the PP seem transparent. However, the transparency is derived, and it is the probe on P and its content that determine what P Agrees for with the DP, and thus how the DP's φ-features are transmitted to the outside world.

The following are the core theoretical elements more explicitly:

(29) a. DPs with structural Case are just DPs, with their interpretable φ-features on D(P).
   b. DPs with theta-related Case are contained within PPs, where P is a phase-head.
   c. The P-head of a PP is susceptible to variation in the presence and content of a φ-probe.

The φ-features of bare DPs are visible to φ-Agree from the outside; if they are the arguments of a clause, then to clausal φ-Agree. However, a DP within a PP is in an opaque domain, one that is typically a barrier to the Case/Agree, A-movement, and Ā-movement. Abels (2003), building on Riemsdijk (1978), proposes that PPs are phases in the sense of Chomsky (2000, 2001):

(30) Phase: … \[XP \ldots X [YP \ldots]\] (boxed: domain that is opaque outside XP)

A phase is an XP, for some X, that constitutes a barrier for narrow-syntactic dependencies between the complement YP of X and the larger context containing X. X and [Spec, XP] are not contained within this barrier; they are said to be at the edge of the phase. Consequently, properties of X, such as a trigger for movement to [Spec, XP] from within the complement of X, can circumvent the barrierhood of XP for YP. If PP is a phase, a DP that is (within) the complement of P is invisible outside the PP. Since theta-related Case is a PP, a DP within it just like a DP within any PP is invisible to an external φ-probe.

Making a PP a phase is a stipulation, since it cannot be said that there is a widely accepted explanatory theory of which domains are phases and why. However, the fact that PPs are opaque

15 Abels establishes a generalization that the extraction of the object of a P is only possible if movement through the edge of the PP phase is possible. That in turn depends on whether there is an extra category between P and the extractee, because the movement of the complement of H to the specifier of H is impossible.
domains, though ones that may be selectively unlocked, is solidly grounded (see the references above). The eventual minimalist goal is to understand why this should be so, for example along the lines of Uriagereka (1999ab), who argues that certain domains are opaque because they are subject to spell-out motivated by the requirements of the interface, and after spell-out syntax sees them as unstructured terminals. Whatever the explanation will be, opaque domains PPs are, and I mean no more than this when I call them phases.

The "escape hatch" for DP's φ-features is a φ-probe on P. The possibility of a φ-probe on P is expected if PP for nominal predicates parallels the CP for verbal predicates, P corresponding to C, as proposed for example by Cardinaletti and Starke (1999: 183ff.), Kayne (2000: chapters 14, 15), and earlier work on prepositional complementizers of the English for, French de, à type; cf. also Travis and Lamontagne (1992), Szabolcsi (1994), Bernstein (2001). It is a familiar and parametrically-varying property of C that it can agree with the clausal subject, which may independently agree with (T +) the verb. One example is complementizer agreement in West Germanic dialects (recent overviews: Zwart 1997: 136ff., 256ff., Hoekstra and Smits 1998, de Vogelaer, Neuckermans, and Vanden Wyngaerd 2002, Carstens 2003, van Koppen 2005), such as n on da in (31).

(31) Kpeinzen [da-ni-kikimorgengoa-n].
think.1.SGthat.1.SG-1(clitic)1.NOMtomorrowgo-1.SG
I think that I will go tomorrow. (Lapscheure (West Flanders), de Vogelaer, Neuckermans, Vanden Wyngaerd 2002)

It has been proposed that the complementizer agreement morphology, n distinct from the subject doubling clitic k, is the result of φ-Agree by C (Watanabe 2000, Carstens 2003). This is effectively demonstrated by van Koppen (2005). She shows that nominative subjects which do not uniquely determine the value of a φ-probe, such as conjoined DPs, may control different agreement values on T and C. In (29)a, C agreement is with the left conjunct, while T agreement must be with the whole conjunct; the dichotomy is an instance of the commonplace left-conjunct agreement option for following conjuncts vs. full-conjunct agreement requirement for preceding conjuncts. Two independent φ-probes Agreeing with the nominative, one on C and one on T, correctly predict this, while a single φ-probe and feature-sharing between T and C (Zwart 1997, 2001, cf. Miyagawa 2004) does not. A clinching argument is that it is possible to have long-distance C-nominaive agreement, (32)b, although for adverbs generally block such a relationship for reasons that may have to do with their nominal status (Carstens 2003, cf. Chomsky 1995: 331-2 and note 104 thereto) and seem to behave like 3.sg. DPs.

(32) a. … daβ-bsd/jsj [du; und d'Maria]j an Hauptpreis gewunna hab-dsj.
that-2.SG/PLyou(SG) and the Maria the first.prize won have-2.PL
That Maria and you have won the first prize. (Bavarian; van Koppen 2005: 43)

b. a-ni een enkele keer de aardappels; overkoken
if-3.PL asingle timethespotatoes; over.boil
…if once in a while the potatoes boil over. (De Panne Dutch, van Koppen 2005: 179)

16 The lack of Condition B between the matrix subject and C-agreement in (31) suggest that C-Agree here does not represent any LF-interpretable content of the nominative on C, or that it and the clitic k are within a binding domain separate from that of the matrix clause, unlike what is proposed by Watanabe (2000) in his treatment of switch agreement in other languages through C-Agree.
Extending a φ-probe to the P head of PPs is expected under PP-CP parallelism. Together with the phase-hood of PPs, it designs the picture in (33). PP and CP are opaque domains, and the complement of P and C can only be rendered visible to external processes through P/C φ-Agree, or through movement to [Spec, PP/CP]. I discuss C-Agree as a mechanism to render visible the φ-features of the nominative subject to φ-Agree in a higher clause in Rezac (2004: chapter 3, forthcoming); from now on I will keep to PPs.

(33) a. \[PP \ldots [P_{(φ=i)} \ldots ]_{phase}]\]
b. \[CP \ldots [C_{(φ=i)} \ldots ]_{TP \, DP; \, T_{(φ=i)} \ldots t_{i \ldots }}_{phase}]\]

Case Opacity of theta-related Case arises in the unmarked situation, when P lacks a φ-probe. If P has a φ-probe, it is valued from the DP through Agree. This is the option that leads to agreeing datives in Basque dative displacement. If there is a φ-probe, P Agrees with DP, and v can Agree with P. In order for this to follow, a higher clausal φ-probe, in Basque that of v, must be able to Agree with the Agree-valued φ-probe of the phase-head P. This is expected. Within phase theory, P belongs to the next higher phase, that of v, and deletion of its Agree-valued φ-probe has not yet taken place (see further Rezac 2004: 199ff., Legate 2003; cf. Sigurðson 1993).

This is the basic mechanism that implements both the normal invisibility of the φ-features of a DP with theta-related Case to external φ-Agree (the opacity of the PP shell), and their manifestly possible but rarer visibility (a φ-probe on the P head). The latter is resumed in FIGURE. Agree occurs between v and P, and between P and DP. Direct Agree between v and the DP is impossible, for by the time v would attempt to Agree, the DP is within the (circled) portion of the PP phase that is spelled-out upon the completion of the PP.

FIGURE: φ-Agree with a dative PP

In this system, nothing prevents X′-movement from co-occurring with φ-Agree between v and the dative. This should give rise to DD, whereby the φ-features of the dative value the probe of P and that the probe of v, and regular SX morphology for the dative, as in dialects without DD. Such DD + DAT doubling does indeed occur. Concrete examples are in (35), with minimally different DL and non-DL forms in the same dialect (involving a tense difference) or closely related dialects; the examples demonstrate that as in non-doubling DD, dative case is retained.

(34) 3F>1.S++>3.S present in typical Labourdin:
Non-DD: d-a-u-ta-k [X-TM-\(\sqrt{-1}\)-F]

DD: n-a-u-k [1-TM-\(\sqrt{\cdot}\)-F]

DD + DAT: n-a-u-ta-k [1-TM-\(\sqrt{-1}\)-F]

\[(35)\]
a. harek\(_i\) nerj\(_i\) sagarra(k)\(_k\) emun d-o-s-t\(_{\text{no DL}}\) / n\(_j\)-o-s-t\(_{\text{DL}}\)/n\(_k\)

he.ERG me.DAT apple(s).ABS given X-\(\sqrt{-DF}\)-1 1-\(\sqrt{-DF}\)-1-PT

He has/had given me apple(s). (B-V-O, Deba ibarreko aditz-taulak, p. 5)

b. Nik\(_i\) zur\(_i\) sagarrak\(_k\) eman d-a-u-zk\(_k\)-tzu\(_i\)\(_{\text{no DL}}\) / z\(_j\)-a-u-zk\(_k\)-tzu\(_k\)-t\(_i\)\(_{\text{DL}}\)

I.ERG you.DAT apples given X-TM-\(\sqrt{-PL}\)-2-1 2-TM-\(\sqrt{-PL}\)-2-2-1

I have given you apples. (Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2004)

The parallel is exact with ergative displacement + suffixal doubling of the ergative discussed C2, and to the combination of C-Agree + C-clitic doubling the nominative subject in West Germanic examples like (31). I investigate the conditions that govern such doubling in C4:DBL. In a nutshell, as with ergative doubling under ED, there are no syntactically generalizations to be made here; what tendencies there are occur on the basis of spelled-out forms. The overall picture suggests a possibility where DD is normally doubled by SX morphology, so that with DD as with non-DD, \(X^0\)-movement of the dative occurs, and this is not a relevant difference between the two constructions; absence of doubling is a matter of general tendency at spell-out to suppress multiple coding of the same φ-set. This is indeed the minimal picture expected on the theory, since nothing in the transparency vs. opacity of the dative PP entails blocking of the amenability of the PP to \(X^0\)-movement.

This derivative status of \(v\)-DP Agree going through P has as consequence that properties of P should be able to modulate the transparency of the PP. One possibility would be a language where some P’s are transparent and others not. In Rezac (2006), I suggest this is the case in Nepali (Bickel and Yādava 2000), where dative but not ergative subjects can control agreement, though both seem theta-related. Another possibility is modulation of the φ-Agree relation between P and DP, for example by modulating the "richness" of the φ-probe of P. This gives a major tool for the parameterization of DD, and one with the correct properties, which I develop in the next section.

The heart of the theoretical proposal made here is that DPs "with" structural Case have their φ-features visible to external φ-Agree because they are not in an opaque domain, while those with theta-related Case do not because they are. The actual categorial choices have been made for convenience in the case of DP (rather than KP, etc.), and in the case of PP because PPs provide an opaque domain known to be subject to theta-related and arbitrary selection, and because PP-CP parallelism plays a role in suggesting a φ-probe on P. The guiding intuition is that the defining property of DPs with structural Case is the absence of potential functional architecture above a certain point; pushing the PP-CP parallelism, they are like ECM TPs. This makes them transparent because they are incomplete, to φ-Agree for example, while CPs/PPs are opaque and complete. Another way of capitalizing on the difference is to derive the Case Filter from the structural deficiency of bare DPs. This is the proposal of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), and with a different mechanism, Rezac (2003).

For PPs in general, one would expect to find P’s that overtly manifest their φ-Agree with their DP complement: agreeing adpositions, like agreeing complementizers. These occur; however, arguments comparable to van Koppen’s argument that West Germanic complementizer agreement is φ-Agree have not been presented for adpositional agreement. In one case, the
agreeing prepositions of at least some Celtic languages, there is reason to believe that the agreement morphology reflects post-syntactic P-pronoun merger (see Jouitteau and Rezac, in press, for an overview and references). More promising are the agreeing postpositions of Abaza (O’Herin 2001, 2002), where unlike in Celtic P-agreement is compatible with an overt controller; an example is wara waraq ‘for you’ in (36)a. O’Herin argues that the agreeing postposition in (36)a is the source of verbal agreement with an applicative object, as r-z in (36)b. Specifically, the independent agreeing postposition can incorporate into the agreement complex, where it is spelled out as an applicative morpheme (z) + agreement with its DP complement (r). There are a number of advantages to his analysis; it explains why in Abaza diagnostics indicate that even in applicative constructions the c-command relations are theme > applied object, a traditional stumbling block for reducing applicatives to adpositional constructions elsewhere, and why multiple applicatives as in (36)b are possible.\(^{17}\)

(36) a. sara bilet wara_i waraq y-ya-s-aw-d
   I ticket you 2sm-for 3si-PV-1s-find-DYN
   I found the ticket for you. (Abaza, O’Herin 2002: 219)

b. y-[la-ca]_A-[r-z]_B-[a-la]-h-c^p-a-t’
   3si-3sf-COM-3p-BEN-3si-INST-1p-do-DYN
   We did it [with her]_A [for them]_B [with it]. (Abaza, O’Herin 2002: 229)

An ideal example to clinch the analysis proposed here would be a transparent spell-out of an agreeing dative of the Basque dative displacement type, as agreeing adposition + clausal φ-Agree with it; it remains to be found.

Most dialects have no DD; some have DD throughout; but for most with DD dialects, whether DD occurs depends on virtually any property of the agreement complex, and similarly for non-DD, the two "modes of formation" often coexisting to express the same meaning. This sensitivity to any property of the agreement complex or the structure that gives rise to it is not the expected picture if the above considerations are on the right track. Yet, as has been discussed in XN, it is common for the Basque agreement complex to have arbitrary gaps, and here belong arbitrary gaps in DD and non-DD alike, particularly frequent here since DD is an innovation of fairly recent origin and spreading. However, the arbitrary gap mechanism provides just that: gaps that are arbitrary from the viewpoint of internalist syntax, though motivated perhaps by such properties as frequency of use, complexity of spell-out, and so on. Thus, the predictions of DD syntax must be attenuated: the primary and secondary loci of DD parametrization referred to above should give rise to systematic patterns in DD distribution. The arbitrary gap mechanism should give rise to arbitrary gaps to these patterns. At the same time, one may also perhaps expect of the arbitrary gaps patterns of the kind just mentioned, based on frequency of use for example; and if the arbitrary gap mechanism is implemented by conditions on spell-out, one may expect patterns based on individual vocabulary items. I return to this in XN.

The following sections undertake the investigation of the properties that give rise to systematic patterns of DD. The goal is one the one hand descriptive, to sort out the factors that do create systematic patterns from those that do not, and on the other theoretical, to see to what extent the proposed syntax accounts for why the factors that create systematic patterns should and others should not do so. The journey proceeds first by demonstrating that the φ-features of

\(^{17}\)Glosses from original: \(s\) singular, \(m\) masculine, \(i\) irrational/inanimate, \(p\) plural, PV preverb, DY\(N\) dynamic, COM comitative, BEN benefactive, INST instrumental. The annotations are mine.
the dative are unique among agreement controllers in having a systematic effect on DD, XN. This fits the proposed syntax of DD, which locates the availability of the phenomenon, the transparency of the dative PP, in the properties of the dative P, specifically in its φ-probe. XN develops theory of how dative PP transparency can select different datives according to their φ-features. Along the way, DD in two other languages will be encountered in XN, Itelmen and Georgian, that fills in a crucial gap Basque DD, that of 3rd person datives. From the tools needed to render PPs selectively transparent, a theory of quirky theta-related Case as a minimal variety of transparent PP emerges in XN. XN turns to another property of the DD syntax in FIGURE that is a primary locus of parametric variation: it shows that there is φ-probe on Appl, needed to license O2/S, and its presence that may be selected by \( v \) makes transitivity a secondary locus of parametric variation. XN pauses over the theory of selection and its limits in constraining the factors that may enter into parametrizing DD syntax, so that for example properties of other agreement controllers like the ergative properly turn out to be too far to do so, as they should be intuitively, and as they are empirically. XN ends the development of the theory of DD syntax by investigating its interaction with ergative displacement on the one hand and with allocutives on the other, the two forming a single topic because they bring to the fore the role played in accounting for the properties of DD by feature-relativized locality in a derivational syntax.

3.3 Φ-sets in DD: Systematic and arbitrary patterns

The first potential locus of variation to investigate is the properties of the dative itself, namely the φ-features of the DP in the dative PP shell. Since transparency of the PP is effectuated by P-DP φ-Agree, it may be expected that the φ-features of the DP can be a locus of syntactic parameterization of DD, though the precise mechanism remains to be developed in XN. This will indeed turn out to be the case. The demonstration requires laying out a large body of data, and the very same exposition can also be used to show that the φ-features of the ergative DP, when there is one, do not have a systematic effect, as might be expected given the proposed syntax of DD since the ergative stands in no direct relationship to the dative PP. The difference is striking.

The tables that follow lay out the role of the φ-features of O'.DAT, and by implication also of A.ERG if there is one, in DD, for applicative transitives. Applicative unaccusatives will be considered later. Only dialects in the Y-corpus are given in the tables, and among them only those that do have some DD; other data is added as relevant. O2 may be singular or plural, and this constitutes one potential independent variable in DD; tense may be present or past, and this constitutes another. This creates for each dialect four contexts or "subparadigms" of the applicative transitive to consider, for each of these independent variables may be potentially expected to block DD: 3VSPr (present, O2=SG), 3VPPr (present, O2=PL), 3VSPt (past, O2=SG), 3VPPt (past, O2=PL). Lacunae occur in the data; these are noted * after a dialect if it has lacuna(e) in a particular sub-paradigm, and ‡ if it has lacuna(e) in other subparadigms (sometimes even missing entirely). Lacunae are ignored in the categorization of a dialect. 18

18 Doubling is another factor that enters into the syntax and spell-out of a verbal agreement complex, but not one that is relevant to the patterns investigated here. This is easily demonstrable from a brief synopsis of where doubling occurs per sub-paradigm. Where DD occurs throughout the sub-paradigm, where there is (virtually) no doubling when O2=SG and is on the contrary prevalent when O2=PL, so it does not related to DD as such. Where DD occurs partially, there is no doubling for 3VSP and 3VPPt, for 3VSPt there is in the B-V-O: A, B-V-O:I, B-V-O:G, and B-V-O:O dialects, and for 3VPPr, G-Bu:B:I, G-Bu:U:S, and L-S:U:T, and L-L-nB:A have some doubling. This doubling/non-doubling distribution does not correlate with dative-based patterns; I investigate doubling itself in C4:DBL.
The starting point in the exposition is TABLE, which gives dialects where DD is present throughout any particular sub-paradigm. For most of these dialects, DD is present throughout; these are in italics. Dialects with an underline have in addition to DD one or more non-DD forms in the subparadigm where they are italicized.

(37) Dialects with DD throughout a subparadigm

3VSPr: \(L-L-sA:S\), \(L-L-sB:S\), \(L-L-sH:A\), \(L-L-sU:S\), \(L-L-p:A\), \(L-L-nG:S\), \(L-L-p:\mathcal{B}^\#\), \(L-S-p:A\), \(L-S-S-D\), \(L-S-U:T\), \(L-Ai-p:A\), \(L-Ar-p:A\), \(L-Ar-A:A\)

3VPPr: \(L-L-sA:S\), \(L-L-sB:S\), \(L-L-sH:A\), \(L-L-sU:S\), \(L-L-p:A\), \(L-L-nG:S\), \(L-L-p:\mathcal{B}^\#\), \(L-S-p:A\), \(L-S-S-D\), \(L-Ai-p:A\), \(L-S-A:A\), \(L-S-S-D\), \(L-Ai-p:A\), \(L-Ar-p:A\), \(L-Ar-A:A\)

3VSPt: \(L-L-sA:S\), \(L-L-sB:S\), \(L-L-sH:A\), \(L-L-sU:S\), \(L-L-p:A\), \(L-L-nG:S\), \(L-L-p:\mathcal{B}^\#\), \(L-S-p:A\), \(L-S-A:A\), \(L-S-S-D\), \(L-Ai-p:A\), \(L-Ar-p:A\), \(L-Ar-A:A\)

3VPPr: \(L-L-sA:S\), \(L-L-sB:S\), \(L-L-sH:A\), \(L-L-sU:S\), \(L-L-p:A\), \(L-L-nG:S\), \(L-L-p:\mathcal{B}^\#\), \(L-S-p:A\), \(L-S-A:A\), \(L-S-S-D\), \(L-Ai-p:A\), \(L-Ar-p:A\), \(L-Ar-A:A\)

The remaining dialects that have DD somewhere have non-trivial distribution thereof. The tables first go through dialects which, within any particular sub-paradigm, offer a pattern of DD based on the \(\phi\)-features of the dative DP, that is to say those where for a particular combination of a sub-paradigm and dative \(\phi\)-value DD is complete (TABLE A), and then take up in detail dialects that lack such patterns (TABLE B). Table columns indicate sub-paradigms, table rows indicate \(\phi\)-features of the dative; a dialect is listed in all cells where it belongs: Two annotations to dialect names are used to indicate at a glance the distribution of DD beyond this. + indicates that beside having complete DD for the \(\phi\)-value of the dative in the subparadigm where it is listed in TABLE A, a dialect also has occasional DD for other \(\phi\)-feature combinations in the same sub-paradigm; the complete paradigm is taken up in TABLE B in that case. Bold indicates that the dialect has no such arbitrary DD outside the rows (dative \(\phi\)-values) where it is listed in any applicative transitive sub-paradigm, so that the dative \(\phi\)-values for which it is listed in TABLE A are the only ones for which it ever has DD. Finally, underlining gives indications about non-DD: a dialect that has a single underline in TABLE A has some additional non-DD forms, and a dialect that has a double underline has both DD and non-DD forms throughout, for the sub-paradigm – dative \(\phi\)-value combination where it is listed. Notations for lacunae are as above.

### TABLE A: DATIVE-BASED PATTERNS OF DD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dative (\phi)</th>
<th>3VS present</th>
<th>3VP present</th>
<th>3VS past</th>
<th>3VP past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SG (HN)</td>
<td>(HN-IR) (R), (HN-JR) (H), (HN-J) (O), (G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL (G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.SG/PL \(B\) | \(B\) | \(B\) | \(B\) | \(B\) |

1.SG \(HN\) | \(HN-J\) \(O\) | \(HN-J\) \(O\) | \(HN-J\) \(O\) | \(HN-J\) \(O\) |
The annotations permit immediate identification of patterns based on the ϕ-features of the dative O': when the independent variable of tense and the plurality of O2 are controlled for (within each subparadigm); globally, and to what extent the distribution is "clean", limited to the particular ϕ-values (in the subparadigm, lacking +, or globally, in bold). The existence of such patterns follows from the theory of DD proposed here. However, TABLE A in conjunction with TABLES B, C also permits the identification of patterns of DD based on the ϕ-features of the ergative, if any. The + annotation in TABLE A indicates that a particular dialect in a sub-paradigm has not only DD throughout particular dative ϕ-value(s) but also elsewhere, and this might translate to an ergative-based pattern; those dialects that are missing such an annotation naturally do not have an ergative-based pattern, since for any ergative, datives outside the rows where they are listed in TABLE A lack DD.\(^{19}\)

TABLES B and C give the DD paradigms for all dialects that for any particular sub-paradigm have DD that does not consist of a simple pattern describable by giving the ϕ-features of the dative that undergoes DD, as done in TABLE A. TABLE B is for those dialects that do also have such a pattern, listed in TABLE A, and TABLE C for those that do not. The dialects are arranged according to columns defined by sub-paradigms, as above, and rows that indicate for what dative ϕ-values DD occurs at all. Within each cell, dialects fitting that description are given in their own mini-tables. These have each four rows, for DAT 1.SG, 1.PL, 2.SG, 2.PL (no DD occurs for 3rd person DAT's), and six columns, for ERG 3.SG, 3.PL, 1.SG, 1.PL, 2.SG, 2.PL. Here the entry + indicates that the ERG-DAT-O2 combination has only DD, ± that it has both DD and non-DD, and - that it has DAT only; X are impossible combinations of arguments, 0 are lacunae. Annotations after dialect names are as above.

**TABLE B: Dative-based patterns of DD + other DD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3VSPPr</th>
<th>3VSPt</th>
<th>3VSPt, 3VPPt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>G-nePS:ALO</td>
<td>HNn-Ir-p:Br</td>
<td>HNn-Ir-pV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>±±XX±±</td>
<td>±±XX±±</td>
<td>++XX++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>±±XX±±</td>
<td>±±XX±±</td>
<td>++XX++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>±±XX±±</td>
<td>±±XX±±</td>
<td>++XX++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>L-Ai-p:B†</td>
<td>L-S-U:T</td>
<td>L-S-Z:I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>±±XX++</td>
<td>±±XX++</td>
<td>++XX++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>±±XX++</td>
<td>±±XX++</td>
<td>++XX++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>±±XX++</td>
<td>±±XX++</td>
<td>++XX++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{19}\) Naturally, the hypothesis that the ϕ-value of DAT determines its transparency to DD also predicts the inverse, that it determines its opacity to DD. Patterns of non-DD DAT marking are just the complements of DD DAT marking and can be partly read off the table as such: for example, if a dialect is listed as having DD for 1.SG.DAT and lacks the + and italics annotations.
### TABLE C: DD lacking dative-based patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3VSPr</th>
<th>3VPPr</th>
<th>3VSPt</th>
<th>3VPPr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1S</strong></td>
<td><strong>G-H-</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hnn-</strong></td>
<td><strong>nePD:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>p:Y†</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1P</strong></td>
<td><strong>L-E-</strong></td>
<td><strong>G-Bu-</strong></td>
<td><strong>B:O</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2P</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2R</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hnn-</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ir-</strong></td>
<td><strong>REB†</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1P</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2P</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Not marked bold because in the applicative unaccusative paradigm 2.SG.DAT also allows DD.
The point of immediate interest about TABLES A-C is the contrast between the φ-features of the dative and those of the ergative in conditioning DD. The φ-features of the dative, as has been seen, create dative-based patterns of DD, though DD also occurs outside such patterns, for φ-feature combinations that are isolated or arbitrary with respect to the φ-features of the dative in showing DD. Into the characterization of such occurrences of DD, reference to the φ-features of the ergative is clearly necessary. However, However, a given φ-value of the ergative never determines -- permits or blocks -- DD systematically. This can be determined by inspection of the sub-tables for each dialect in TABLES B, C, with the exception of the row headed All in TABLE B to which I return directly below. There is no columnar pattern of +, -, or ±, which corresponds to a pattern of DD/DAT consistent per φ-value of ergative. The same conclusion holds without inspection for the dialects listed only in TABLE A and not TABLE B, for whatever row they are listed in, they lack DD for datives outside this row, and thus have no ergative-based pattern. The row headed All in TABLE B seems to attest to exactly the missing pattern, but this is illusory: this row documents dialects that have DD nearly throughout a given sub-paradigm, making DD the general pattern of the sub-paradigm with scattered arbitrary gaps. These sub-paradigms verge on the only other group that has DD is distributed consistently across all the φ-values of an ergative, trivially: those where DD is either present or absent in the entire sub-paradigm. What is missing in the entire Y corpus is an ergative-based DD pattern analogous to the dative-based patterns in TABLE A.21 This contrast between the role of the φ-features of the dative and ergative in conditioning DD must be captured by a theory of it.

So far, only transitives with datives have been discussed. Dative O’ also occurs with unaccusatives, and DD occurs here, but more rarely, and consideration of it does not add to the preceding picture. TABLE gives indicates the occurrence of DD and non-DD for the eight dialects in the Y corpus that have any in applicative unaccusatives; the rows are φ-feature values of the dative, and the four columns for each dialect correspond respectively to 3.SG absolutive S present, 3.PL present, 3.SG past, and 3.PL past, these being the only absolutive values recorded for applicative unaccusatives in the Y corpus and the only ones possible in most dialects (see C5). Underlining indicates that the dialect give has DD somewhere in the applicative transitive paradigm that corresponds to the unaccusative one for the same tense and dative and absolutive φ-values; more details can be seen from the preceding tables. HNn-Ir-pB and Med dialects have no corresponding data.

TABLE: DD with applicative unaccusatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-H: S</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-HM: A</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-OI: Al</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-OIR: Al</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-pO</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-RZE</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-pB</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-pM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>+--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+--</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though rare, DD with unaccusatives as with transitives shows a variety of distribution ranging from nonce to complete. With the exception of HNn-Ir-OIR:Al, the dative φ-value permitting DD are a subset of those permitting DD for applicative transitives. The dialects that have DD here all belong to the same group, and DD with datives in transitives and unaccusatives

21 Such dialects would fall into a non-existent row headed All in TABLE C listing DD arbitrary w.r.t. any DAT, or even into any row but that headed All in TABLE B, with decreasing order of persuasiveness the more DD there is throughout.
is reported for this group in sources outside the Y corpus such as Fraile and Fraile (1996); in other dialects DD is limited to transitives, as remarked by Fernández (2004: 98).

To re-emphasize the main result of this section: there are dative-based but not ergative-based patterns of DD, and a theory of DD should provide an explanatory account of why the properties of the dative, its φ-features, but not those of the ergative, can enter systematically into the parameterization of the phenomena. This desideratum seems to be intuitively met by the theory of DD proposed in XN, where the primary locus of DD parametrization are properties of the dative PP. Clarification requires a better understanding both of how the φ-features of the dative parametrize its transparency, undertaken in XN, and what kind of factors can affect this in the syntax, discussed in XN. The desideratum would not be met by a theory that takes DD to be generally available if it is at all, and codes all lacunae as arbitrary gaps, a mechanism that is independently available but that does not lead to the expectation of patterns based asymmetrically on φ-features of one of the agreement controllers.

3.4 Φ-entailments

The visibility of the φ-features of a DP within a PP occurs through φ-Agree by the intervening P. One way in which properties of P may modulate the transparency of a PP is through the quality or richness of P's φ-probe. The content of a φ-probe is an independently known point of parametric variation. A typical example is the limitations of agreement on participles in many languages to number and gender, lacking person, in systems where person is available to clausal agreement. Translated to properties of P's φ-probe, it leads to a selective or partial transparency of a PP to external φ-Agree: an external φ-probe will be able to Agree only for what the P has itself Agreed for with the DP. In this manner, one may account for variation in PP transparency based on φ-features of the dative through a mechanism that is necessarily limited to it, excluding as already desired the ergative, as well as the absolutive and allocutive (XN).

In no Basque dialect do 3rd person datives obviously undergo DD; perhaps non-obviously they do, as discussed below. Along the remaining datives, one may discern certain entailments of the form that if dative of φ-features φ' is available for DD, one of φ-features of φ'' is be so as will. For such patterns, it is not necessary to consider only dialects that have a dative-based DD pattern throughout a sub-paradigm or a dialect, since arbitrary gaps are not in themselves problematic. The φ-entailment patterns that occur in the data, and their robustness, may be determined from TABLES A, B, C of XN:

1.SG: Frequent and present in the northern group, in the Echarri-Aranaz group, and in the Oñate group. In each group, it is beside other dialects with DD in 1.SG, 1.PL DD, and it seems to be a stage in its evolution.

1.PL: Rare; for entire dialects rather than subparadigms, it is limited to the Burunda group, but here it characterizes it and shows no sign of extending.

1: Common in all groups as noted under 1.SG, and adding B-Lek, where Hualde, Elordieta, and Elordieta (1994: 124-5) report it so, as does already Azkue II:539/§770, II:576/§810 who seems to be present near the beginning of the phenomenon in this dialect.

2 DD here is rarer and patterns are not very robust, save for the very salient fact that DD of 2nd person entails DD of 1st person. Various combinations instantiate this: DD for 1.SG, 2.R in L-Ai-p:B, HNn-Ir-RZE, for 1.SG, 2.P in HNn-Ir-OIR:A1, 1.SG/PL and 2.R in L-Ar-p:H.
Some actual paradigms of DD instantiating systems with such patterns, along with some arbitrary gaps, are given in the following tables. These are to be read as explained in PRELIM; DD, which can only occur for 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person dative, is easily detected by observing where the initial consonant of the verbal form, PX, is one of \(n\) [1], \(g\) [1'], \(z\) [2], rather than default \(d\). Often both DD and non-DD options coexist for the same speaker for a particular \(\phi\)-combination.

### TABLE: DD of all 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person -- ERG > DAT > 3.SG.ABS present in L-Ai-p:A

<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>dio</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diozue</td>
<td>diozue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SG</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nau</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nauzu</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nauzue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R</td>
<td>(\emptyset), zaiteu</td>
<td>(\emptyset), zaiteu</td>
<td>(\emptyset), zaiteu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>(\emptyset), zaute</td>
<td>(\emptyset), zaute</td>
<td>(\emptyset), zaute</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE: DD of 1.SG -- ERG > DAT > 3.SG.ABS present in G-H-nePD:ALO

<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>(di)yo</td>
<td>diote</td>
<td>yote</td>
<td>(di)yo</td>
<td>(di)yo</td>
<td>(di)yosu</td>
<td>(di)yosu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>(di)yte</td>
<td>(di)yte</td>
<td>(di)yte</td>
<td>(di)yte</td>
<td>(di)yogu</td>
<td>(di)yogu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SG</td>
<td>di, nau</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>diasu, nasu</td>
<td>diasu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>digu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>digute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>digusu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>digusu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>diute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>diut, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>di, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE: DD of 1.PL -- ERG > DAT > 3.SG.ABS present in G-Bu-B:I

<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>da</td>
<td>dai</td>
<td>dat</td>
<td>dau</td>
<td>dazu</td>
<td>dazai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>daube</td>
<td>daubei</td>
<td>daubet</td>
<td>daubezui</td>
<td>daubezai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>da, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dai, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dazu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dazai, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>(\emptyset), geru</td>
<td>(\emptyset), gerubai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(\emptyset), geruzu</td>
<td>(\emptyset), geruzai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dezui, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE: DD of 1.SG + 2.SG -- ERG > DAT > 3.SG.ABS present in L-Ai-p:B

<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>dio</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diozue</td>
<td>diozue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diole</td>
<td>diozue</td>
<td>diozue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>daut, nau</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nauzu</td>
<td>(\emptyset), nauzue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>dauku, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>daukute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>daukuzu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>daukuzu, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R</td>
<td>dautzu, zaitu</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>dautzu, dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td>dautzute, (\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existence of these DD patterns calls for a mechanism that parametrically modulates a dative's ability to undergo DD, namely its transparency to \(\phi\)-Agree, based locally on its \(\phi\)-features, and distinct from the arbitrary gap mechanism which may take into account any
properties of the agreement complex. In the remainder of this section, I will suggest that the parametrization mechanism is the portion of the φ-feature geometry of a language that the φ-probe of P looks for. The mechanics depend on specific assumptions about the structure of φ-features and their interaction with the Agree. This should not obscure the more basic conclusions: the transparency of a PP to φ-Agree is systematically decided on the basis of the φ-features of the DP it contains, thus locally to the PP, and if transparency is modelled through the φ-probe of P, then variation of this kind resides most likely in interaction between this φ-probe and the φ-features of the DP that value it.

Béjar (2003) presents a persuasive cross-linguistic argument that not all φ-probes are equal, as discussed in C0, C2. Probes vary in their specification, which leads to different sensitivities to potential goals, and thus to differences among φ-probes as to what counts as a valuing goal and/or an intervener. Constraints on possible φ-probes are partially determined by φ-feature geometry: a φ-probe must be a subtree of the φ-geometry of a language, which is constructed from the universal feature geometry such as that of Harley and Ritter (2002). One type of φ-probes that Béjar explores using the geometric conceptualization of φ-features are those where the nodes logically dominating a probe in the geometry seem to be truly irrelevant. She proposes (p. 53) that probe sub-trees of the geometry need not be rooted at the root of the entire geometry; there are probes such as P = [participant] or P' = [addressee] that do not contain their dominating nodes. This allows for a probe that looks for [individuation] alone, as participles typically do, or even just for [addressee], and does not see at all DPs that do not have the corresponding node, despite having nodes dominating it.

Turning concretely to Basque dative displacement, one possible set of φ-features specifications on such a geometry that lends itself to capturing DD patterns is given in FIGURE, keeping here to the "person" side of things. As discussed in C1, distinctions among 1st and 2nd persons must be made in person for 1.SG, 1.PL, 2F (not considered here), 2R/2.PL. 1.PL and 2R/2.PL have in most but not all dialects (including those of the Oñate group with DD) a further specification for plurality number [individuation], as do all 3rd persons. The 1st/2nd-3rd person split is given by the presence of the [participant] node, and it is particularly clear in Basque, since only [participants] are capable of valuing the prefixal morphology of the agreement complex, and only [participants] undergo ED. [participant] does not include 3rd person datives, yet 3rd person datives must be distinguished as "persons" from 3rd person non-daties, because they control person SX morphology (see also XN on Itelmen and Georgian); in C0 the feature [local] has been suggested for this.

FIGURE: Basque person specifications

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
3^{rd} \text{person} & 3^{rd} \text{person dative} & 2^{nd} \text{person} & 1^{st} \text{person singular} & 1^{st} \text{person plural} \\
\pi & \pi & \pi & \pi & \pi \\
| & | & | & | & | \\
local & local & local & local & local \\
| & | & | & | \\
participant & participant & participant & participant & \\
| & | & | & \\
(addresssee) & speaker & speaker & addresssee & \\
\end{array}
\]
Operating on these feature structures, probes can isolate individual persons by the root node of their feature-geometric sub-tree. A probe rooted at [speaker] alone will see only 1st person singular and plural, for example. Under Agree, the copied value of the matched [speaker] is the entire φ-geometry. Thus as in Béjar (2003: 55ff.), Béjar and Rezac (2004), the specification of a probe performs a sorting among goals into those that match / satisfy it and those that do not, but for those that do, the full φ-value rooted at [π] is copied in the valuation of the probe. A [speaker] probe will keep the distinction between 1st person singular and plural in FIGURE; the [individuation] probe of v will also copy the corresponding [individuation] feature geometry of the dative that is not shown. The underlying reason for this is that on the goal, [speaker] is indeed contained in larger geometry, rooted at [π]: this geometry is a part of the interpretation of [speaker], each node contribute its own meaning. This point is not relevant to uninterpretable probes, which can accordingly be [speaker] alone.

Probes that pick out other datives can be read off FIGURE. Picking out a 1.SG dative alone would mean that a probe can be a conjunction such as ([speaker], [minimal]), where [minimal] is the default value of the [individuation] geometry, requiring as match a DP that has both members of the conjunction, rather than either. This is conceptually suspect; nor does the data inspire confidence in its necessity. Among the DD systems present in Basque, those that pick out all 1st person datives are common, but picking out 1.SG datives alone seems to be a transitory stage towards picking out all 1st persons as noted above, and it may be due rather to an incomplete grammaticalization of DD. In that case, 1.PL DD would have to be excluded as arbitrary gaps, gradually "enabled" with DD spreading as a change in progress.

DD for 2nd person without DD of 1st person seems robust. It would follow if 2nd persons are not in fact specified for [addressee] but the default interpretation of [participant], a possibility made available by the feature geometry (cf. Harley and Ritter 2002: 502, Béjar 2003: 45). In that case there can be no [addressee] probe; the minimal probe that includes 2nd persons is a [participant] probe, for which 1st person is a match as well. Finally, picking out 1.PL alone may also have internal reality, in that there are dialect groups that do so without a tendency to generalize to 1.SG; an [addressee] probe would do the job.

A probe rooted at [local] would pick out 3rd person datives as well. In Itelmen, 3rd person datives behave like 1st/2nd person datives in potentially controlling canonical O1 morphology, unlike 3rd person non-datatives (XN). This seems to be absent in Basque (Fernández 2001). The morphology (the prefix) and the syntax (ergative displacement) of v is sensitive only to the [participant]-bearers on the "person" side of the feature geometry. Consequently, dative displacement of 3rd person, [π → local], would not be visible if it took place (cf. Agirre 2004). Nevertheless, it can be affirmed that their [individuation] node does not undergo DD, unlike those of 1st/2nd person plural; for it is clear that the [plural] feature of 1/2.PL but not 3.PL datives controls plural agreement morphology under DD. The dialect of L-Ai-p:A whose ditransitive paradigm has been given in TABLE, illustrates this: the DD 3.SG>2.PL+>3.SG = 3.SG>2.PL form is z-a-ii-u, where it is plural morphology controlled by the dative under DD, and this it is controlled by 3.PL absolutive in 3.SG.ERG > 3.PL.ABS d-ii-u; however, ditu this is not a possible form for 3.SG.ERG > 3.PL.DAT > 3.SG.ABS (diote).

In other words, if 3rd person datives in Basque did undergo DD, they would have to do so in such a way that the probe(s) on P that permits, [π → local], is not associated with an [individuation] probe, though the probe for [π → local → participant] that sees only 1st/2nd persons is. This is not an isolated instance of such an asymmetry. There are systems that have plural agreement contingent on 1st/2nd person agreement, for example Fiorentino and Trentino.
agreement with post-verbal subjects (Brandi and Cordin 1989: 138 note 10) modern Georgian object agreement (Harris 1981: 214), and number agreement in Person Case Constraint contexts (C5, for example Sigurðsson 1996 on Icelandic). If Basque 3rd person datives do not copy the [individuation] node upon Agree with their P, their DD will never be detectable.

I will capitalize on this idea in developing a proposal for what quirky theta-related Case is in XN. First, however, it is instructive to have a look farther afield and see what potential examples of DD look like in other languages: Itelmen and Georgian. This is particularly helpful with rounding out the data for 3rd person datives, where Basque is quieter than might be wished.

3.5 DD cross-linguistically: Itelmen, Georgian, and 3rd person datives

Itelmen agreement has already been discussed in relation to ergative displacement in C2. I recap but briefly the salient points:

(i) There is a prefixal agreement series, Agr1, which is the primary exponent of the person and number of A, S, never O.
(ii) There is a suffixal agreement series, Agr2, which is the primary exponent of person and number of O; if O lacks person (3rd), the primary exponent of A person as well; if O lacks both person and number (putatively, unergatives – all intransitives) of both person and number of A=S.
(iii) An analysis closely parallel to Basque is possible: Agr1 is T φ-Agree, Agr2 is v φ-Agree, and the search-space of v's person probe is expanded to include A if O lacks person.

Of importance here is Agr2, by hypothesis realizing the φ-Agree of v, in applicative constructions.22 Agr2, controlled by O1 in simple transitives, may be controlled by either O2, (38)b, or by O', (38)a, in applicative transitives.23 O2 lacks case morphology, like O1 and S, while O2 bears theta-related Case case, typically dative.

(38) a. isx-enk n-zəl-aŋ-um kza kama-ŋk?
   father-LOC IMPRS-give-FUT-1.SG.OBJ you me-DAT
   Will father give you to me? (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 14b)

b. isx-enk n-zəl-aŋ-iŋ kza kama-ŋk?
   father-LOC IMPRS-give-FUT-2.SG.OBJ you me-DAT
   Will father give you to me? (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 15)

Agr2 agreement with dative O' looks like DD. Agreement with O2 could involve either a simple theta-related Case for O' where it is not visible at all to v's φ-probe, perhaps the low prepositional construction, or covert quirky displacement of quirky theta-related Case.24 The

22 Except for advancing the DD hypothesis for oblique transparency, agreeing oblique as O', and the variation in Itelmen DD, I rely on Bobaljik & Wurmbrand's (2001) analysis, including that the oblique controls the same agreement as O.
23 Obligatory goal of 'give', optional goal of 'bring', 'tell', affected theme of 'watch', causee of lexical causative 'make wear'. The class is limited and there is variation in its membership.
24 Bobaljik and Wurmbrand investigate the conditions under which O' vs. O2/S control Agr2; when both are 3rd person, the more topical of the two does; when both are 1st/2nd person either can (their ex. (38)b and note 20); and when one is 1st/2nd person then it tends to control Agr2 but the other can also even though 3rd person. This might be related to the fact that in applicative and prepositional constructions differ in the information status that tends to fall
former is indicated by the fact that the language lacks the Person Case Constraint, so that Agr2 can cross-reference 1st/2nd person O2 without any defective intervention on its person Agree by the dative O’.

Intransitives may also have Agr2 agreement with a DP bearing theta-related Case, which seems to produce the same Agr1/Agr2 combination as an applicative transitive with the same agreement, so that A>S controls Agr1 and O’ controls Agr2. The controller of Agr2 may seem to be the possessor of S, (39)a, or a locative argument, (39)b. Bobaljik and Wurmbrand mention a possible analysis in terms of a covert affectee dative of the type "My child was crying on me all night" in such constructions (cf. Borer and Grodzinsky 1986), though one can also imagine the possessor/locative to be directly transparent theta-related Case.

(39) a. ənan p’eč kəmə-nk k’ol-it-əs-kinen
   his son me-DAT come-DISTRIB?-PRES-3.OBL
   His son keeps coming to me. (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 31c)

b. nt-čaja-kinen ənnə-nk
   1.PL-drink.tea-3.SG.OBL him-LOC
   We had tea at/by him (i.e. 'at his place'). (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 33)

Bobaljik and Wurmbrand report interesting variation in the availability of O’ control of Agr2 that recalls Basque variation in DD. Their consultants have dative O’ control Agr2 easily for 1st/2nd person as well as 3rd person in transitives, but allow it only for 3rd person possessors/obliques (covert dative O’s, perhaps) for intransitives. Earlier sources however had found that dative O’ control of Agr2 was limited to 2.PL and 3.SG/PL in transitives (op. cit., note 16), while on the other hand it included 2.PL as well for intransitives (op. cit., ex. 34 and discussion).

As mentioned in XN, Itelmen unlike Basque overtly shows 3rd person DD. When O’ is not 3rd person, its control of Agr2 gives the same result as O1/O2 control of Agr2: this is DD. A 3rd person O1/O2 cannot control Agr2, and Agr2 reflects the person features of A, (40)a where this is indicated by the Agr2 gloss 1>3; the person feature is acquired by Agr2 from A through cyclic expansion as in Basque ED, if Agr2 = v as proposed in C2. Remarkably, 3rd person O’ can control Agr2 in Itelmen, and when this happens, it provides it with both person and number features, so that there is no sensitivity to the person (or number) features of A: (40)b. As Bobaljik and Wurmbrand observe (cf. their note 14), this suggests that dative O’ differs from O1/O2 in being specified for person in the relevant sense even when interpretively 3rd person.

(40) a. kma t’ye-ank t-linti-če?n pexal-e?n
   I them-DAT 1.SG-put-1>3.PL hat-PL
   I put hats on them. (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, ex. 16a)

b. kma t’ye-ank t-linti-pe?nen pexal-e?n
   I them-DAT 1.SG-put-3.PL.OBL hat-PL
   I put hats on them. (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, ex. 16b)

One way to interpret this "personhood" of 3rd person datives, still keeping it distinct from 1st/2nd person, is as in XN, where a 3rd person dative is [π → local] in terms of person, 1st/2nd

to the applied/prepositional object, according to its relationship to the left vs. right edge of the vP.
person are elaborations of \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local} \rightarrow \text{participant}]\), and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person non-dative is just \([\pi]\). The correlation of extra specification with datives obviously suggests the interpretive correlates of applicative datives known as Oehrle's effects or the possessor restriction (see Anagnostopoulou 2003: 00 for an overview), as well as the special interpretation they often lend themselves to, such as dative of address / ethical dative. The effect can be attributed to the clausal functional head Appl, which selects for applied objects that are at least \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]\), as proposed by Adger and Harbour (2003) (with different terminology); except that one may perhaps want to view it as selection for an (internalist) semantic property, as s-selection (see C5 for discussion). It might be a universal property of one kind of applied objects: the conclusions that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person datives are formally persons in a way that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person non-datives are not, though still distinct from participants, and that datives are subject to special person-like interpretive effects, recur throughout the literature (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003:270-1).

There are two important points of the Itelmen system on which I will end. First, I suggest in section that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person datives in Basque, and quirky theta-related Case in general, undergoes a kind of partial DD that transmits only \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]\) to the outside of the PP. This is not what occurs in Itelmen: 3\textsuperscript{rd} person datives control Agr2 for both person and number, while it is a core characteristic of quirky datives that their number is invisible. Second, the person specification of 3\textsuperscript{rd} person datives in Itelmen are sufficient to fully control the person probe realized by Agr2, so that there is no sensitivity to the person features of A in such a case, as can be seen from (40)b. Again, this contrasts with a quirky dative, which in Basque does not interfere with valuation of the person probe of \(v\) from A in ED contexts. In Basque the relevant person probe is \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local} \rightarrow \text{participant}]\), which is why a quirky dative, putatively \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]\), does not interfere with the control of the probe's [participant] feature by A. In Itelmen, a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person dative does; the relevant probe of \(v\) might be either \([\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]\), or the DD dative of Itelmen might in fact be more specified, for [participant], like 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person (cf. C1 on the lack of necessary congruity between morphological and semantic features).

Georgian datives also appear to show DD, including 3\textsuperscript{rd} person datives as in Itelmen. The agreement markers of the Georgian verb are given in TABLE. Case morphology is accusative in certain tense, absolutive in others, with an ergative that looks like structural Case. O' and O1/O2 bear the same case morphology in the accusative subsystem, but this morphology is retained by O' in the absolutive subsystem and when A is severed, in which case O1/O2 becomes absolutive and nominative respectively. This shows that O' bears theta-related Case, dative, and O1/O2 structural Case, absolutive or accusative according to the subsystem; accusative and dative happen to have the same expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>v---</td>
<td>v---t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø---t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-s/a/o</td>
<td>-en/es/etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relevant morphology is the plural suffixes, which all compete for the same unique position (Boeder 1979:455-6, Hewitt 1995:129-131, Harris 1981: chapter 15, and sources
whether a dative controls number agreement in Georgian seems to correlate fairly strongly with its subjecthood. The dative A of inversion is clearly a subject, as Harris (1981) shows, and it does control it, though for some speakers less than non-dative subject because it is restricted to its subjecthood. The dative A of inversion is clearly a subject, as Harris (1981) shows, and it does control it, even in that case in transitives, but can with unaccusatives.26 In both applicative unaccusatives and the inversion construction, Modern Georgian differs from Old Georgian, which treated the dative here like the dative O of ditransitives in that it could not trigger plural.

Whether a dative controls number agreement in Georgian seems to correlate fairly strongly with its subjecthood. The dative A of inversion is clearly a subject, as Harris (1981) shows, and it does control it, though for some speakers less than non-dative subject because it is restricted to doing so in the presence of 3.SG O.27 The dative O of unaccusatives is more of a potential subject than the O of transitives can ever be, where A is always necessarily the subject. Pursuing this further thought would require detailed dialectal data on these matters, and it falls beyond my scope. For 1st/2nd persons, none of these issues matter, nor does it matter if the 1st/2nd person controls the prefixal person morphology or not (which for A, O is based on the ED-pattern competition): A, S, O, O' 1st/2nd person always control the suffixal number morphology if plural.

### 3.6 Quirky Case

XN has alluded to a familiar distinction among DPs with theta-related Case, quirkiness. Some DPs with theta-related Case are completely invisible to the Case/Agree and A-movement system, like the oblique experiencer of *seem* in English and Czech; others, quirky, like the oblique experiencer of *seem* in Icelandic, do pass all the diagnostics of being visible for A-movement.
(see Sigurðsson 2002 for an overview), though the DP still cannot value a φ-probe. The distinction produces minimal contrasts such as that in (41) between English and Icelandic for the experiencer of seem, where in Icelandic the experiencer mér intervenes for A-movement of Harald, but the starred translation with to me is in fact fine in English.

(41) Jón telur [Haraldi, virðast (*mér) [ti hafa gert þetta vel]].
Jon believes Harald, to seem (*me.DAT) to have done this.ACC well

John believes Harald to seem (*to me) to have done this well. (McGinnis 1998a: 82)

Following Belletti and Rizzi (1988), Chomsky (2000: 127) proposes that quirky Case is theta-related Case with additional structural Case. The theory of theta-related Case developed here provides a straightforward means of implementing quirky Case with the correct properties, which likewise situates it between structural an theta-related Case. Quirky Case is theta-related, so it is a PP whose DP complement is inside a phase. However, it is visible to a clausal φ-probe, as its visibility to A-movement indicates, and perhaps more specifically such properties as the binding subject-oriented anaphora (cf. Reuland 2001 for relationship to φ-Agree), the ability to be PRO (cf. Landau 2000), and the definiteness effect (cf. Chomsky 2000: 149 notes 90, 93; for quirky dative in Icelandic and the definiteness effect, see McGinnis 1998a: 51). In terms of the analysis developed here, the PP is in some way transparent for the φ-features of the DP. Evidently, it is not fully transparent, for quirky theta-related Case does not allow the φ-features of the DP to value external φ-probes.

It seems that quirky DPs Agree as if they were pure 3rd person, with no value for number. Evidence for this featural composition comes from the Person Case Constraint PCC, discussed in C5. In PCC a quirky DP, like okkur in (42) (in its original position, ti), intervening between a φ-probe and a DP with structural Case, blocks person agreement, (42)b, but not number agreement, (42)a, with the latter.

(42) a. Henni\_\_haði / hð́ðu\_\_ti fundist [þær\_\_ vera duglegar]
   her.DAT had.3.SG/3.PL found they.PL.NOM to.be industrious
b. Henni\_\_haði / *hð́ðu\_\_ti fundist [þið\_\_ vera duglegar]
   her.DAT had.3.SG/*2.PL found you.PL.NOM to.be industrious

(Sigurðsson 1996: 39; my annotations)

This behaviour raises the following question: (i) why does quirky Case intervene for person-Agree but does not control the person probe; (ii) why does it not control number-Agree while a DP with structural Case that matched a person probe would; (iii) why is it person Agree rather than number Agree with a farther DP that is blocked.

Many recent approaches to the PCC begin with the ideas (i) that a φ-probe can be decomposed into a [person] and a [number] probe, capable of Agree separately, and (ii) that while as with other theta-related Case something renders the φ-features of the quirky DP inaccessible to external φ-Agree, the invisibility is not complete (e.g. Taraldsen 1995, Boeckx 1999, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rézac 2003). Taraldsen (1995: 310ff) and Anagnostopoulou (2003: 269) propose that the dative DP's [person] features are actually visible and its [number] features are not, and since the latter do not make interpretive sense without the former for 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person, valuation of an incoming [person] probe to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person ensues. The
[number] probe sees nothing on the dative, and passes by it. The invisibility of the [number] features of the dative remains a mysterious property, a defectiveness on its part.

The notion of defectiveness is an obscure addition to the theory that needs to be derived, as emphasized by Richards (2004). The dative displacement phenomenon seems to provide the right empirical and theoretical guide. Empirically, dative displacement clearly renders the φ-features of a DP with theta-related Case visible to external φ-Agree, and the visibility can be modulated according to the φ-features of the DP: 1st person datives, 1st/2nd person datives, etc. To deal with this theoretically, I have proposed that the normal opacity of a PP to external Agree is obviated by putting a φ-probe on P, and modulating the content of its φ-probe allows it to select (match) only certain DPs for Agree.

The extension that is required to deal with quirky theta-related Case is for the φ-probe on P to selectively transmit the φ-features of DPs in such a way that they all end up looking as a particular type of 3rd person DP. The necessary type may be seen from empirical considerations. Quirky Case DPs do not seem to interfere with remote number agreement across them; they block person agreement across them; but they do not themselves behave as if they were [participant] in languages like Basque, where they fail to provide a value to the [participant] probe of v, so that default PX morphology is required, and do not interfere with its valuation from the external argument under ED. These properties follow if the P of their PP shell has a probe that cannot be valued for more than $[\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]$: not only is there no probe for [individuation] features, but dependants of $[\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]$ such as [participant] are not copied either. This will give to the PP containing the DP the properties of a person-bearing but non-participant DP that has no number specification, that is, of quirky theta-related Case:

(43) Quirky theta-related Case: a PP that has $[\pi \rightarrow \text{local}]$ φ-specification on its P head, from restricted φ-Agree of P with its DP complement.

The proposed φ-Agree could be called partial Agree: the probe copies only partially the φ-content of the goal. In the context of DD mechanics, the φ-probe of P transmits to external Agree only partially the φ-specifications of the dative. The idea fits into the general line of the Taraldsen – Anagnostopoulou approach to quirkiness. Their proposal is that a quirky dative does enter into regular φ-Agree, just in a reduced way. The natural development is to effectuate the reduction through tools that the theory needs independently, so that there is no special primitive of defective Agree invoked. DD already provides a model of transparent theta-related Case; what is needed is independent justification of partial Agree in partial transparency. This does seem to be provide by Basque DD as well.

Some dialects in the Oñate group reflect 1.PL.DAT under DD as 1.SG. DD in this group is restricted to the past of transitive applicatives; there is no distinction between forms for 3.SG and 3.PL absolutive O2. I give a full paradigm for B-V-O:A in TABLE. These paradigms may be compared with the past tense paradigm of the two closely related dialects B-V-O:G and B-V-O:O (which are identical except in 1.PL.DAT) in TABLE, which have simple DD.

Regarding the forms themselves, DD in the Oñate group always involves additional doubling of the dative by regular SX morphology, an independently available process of X0-movement that may co-occur with DD and discussed in XN. This shows that the dative itself is truly 1.PL, because the form of the SX differentiates 1.SG ta and 1.PL ku regardless of whether DD occurs and whether it is partial or not. Another important fact to note about partial DD is that the PX g [1] that is supplanted by n is independently available as the spell-out of v's [participant]-probe.
valued to 1.PL. This is evident when PX is controlled by the ergative A under ED for example, as in B-V-O:A 1.P>3.S+>3.S past g-ortz-a-n [1'-3V-DF-3-PT], and in simple transitive forms like B-V-O:A 3.S>1.P past g-ðndk-ut-n [1'-TM-2V-PT]. Finally, the Oñate dialects all independently lack plural specification for 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person (C1), so it cannot be determined how partial DD of 1.PL affects plurality.

**TABLE: PARTIAL DD -- 3VS PAST OF B-V-O:A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT 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>otzan</td>
<td>otzain</td>
<td>notzan</td>
<td>gotzan</td>
<td>sotzan</td>
<td>sotzain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>osten</td>
<td>ostein</td>
<td>nosten</td>
<td>gosten</td>
<td>sosten</td>
<td>sostein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>Ø, nostan</td>
<td>Ø, nostain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sostan, Ø</td>
<td>sostain, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>Ø, noskun</td>
<td>Ø, noskuen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sostun, Ø</td>
<td>sostuen, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>otzn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>otzuen, Ø</td>
<td>notzun, Ø</td>
<td>gotzun</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>otzuen, Ø</td>
<td>otzuen, Ø</td>
<td>notzuen, Ø</td>
<td>gotzuen, Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE: 3VS past of B-V-O:O (1), B-V-O:O (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT ERG</th>
<th>Dial 3.SG</th>
<th>3.PL</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.P.ERG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.SG</td>
<td>1, 2 otzan</td>
<td>otzaiñ</td>
<td>notzan</td>
<td>gotzan</td>
<td>sotzan</td>
<td>sotzaiñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>1, 2 osten</td>
<td>osteiñ</td>
<td>nosten</td>
<td>gosten</td>
<td>sostun</td>
<td>sostuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>1, 2 Ø, nostan</td>
<td>Ø, nostain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sostan, Ø</td>
<td>sostain, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>2 oskun, Ø</td>
<td>oskuen, Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sostun, Ø</td>
<td>sostuen, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.R</td>
<td>otzun, Ø</td>
<td>otzuen, Ø</td>
<td>notzun, Ø</td>
<td>gotzun</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>otzuen, Ø</td>
<td>otzuen, Ø</td>
<td>notzuen, Ø</td>
<td>gotzuen, Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seem to be no other cases of partial DD in the Y corpus or elsewhere that I know of; that includes any DD of 2R/2.PL datives as 2F. Similarly, 2.PL does not lose its plurality in reducing to 2.SG: the special morpheme te is always kept under DD.\textsuperscript{28} The same asymmetry has been seen for the phenomenon of partial ED, if such it is, in APPENDIX ED-LOSS, where forms such as 1.P>3.S g-en-u-(gu)-n [1'-TM-3V-PT] surface as n-u-gu-n [1'-1'-3V-PT]. However, for partial ED, there is a good explanation of both the phenomenon and the asymmetry in terms of phonological deletion of intervocalic g, which cannot affect z, suggested by Pablo Albizu p.e. (see APPENDIX ED-LOSS). No such explanation is available for partial DD, since there is no n in forms like g-os-sku-n to begin with.

The existence of partial DD of 1.PL datives to 1.SG seems to provide an overt realization of the proposal that φ-Agree may copy only partial feature specifications, and that this property is subject to parametrization. Yet the phenomenon is poorly attested and its limitations, if they are not accidental, are not sufficiently well understood, so it would do well not to be hasty. One issue is the limitation to 1.PL. Another is the limitation of partial Agree by the [participant] probe of v to DD contexts, not when it is valued from 1.PL ergative or absolutive. This can be coded

\textsuperscript{28} In fact, in dialects like those of Oñate, the past tense default PX and the 2F PX are both Ø, so in non-ED context it cannot be determined which is present; so the point is really that there are no forms that demonstrate partial DD to 2F.
through selection because the DD context is identifiable by past T which selects v and by transitive v which selects Appl; however, an occurrence of partial Agree for the [participant] probe of v for several independent controllers would be welcome. It appears that there is an independent diachronic tendency in Basque dialects to make use of forms coding 1.SG dative for coding or as a base for coding 1.PL dative, a tendency that does not extend to other φ-features or to non-datives (APPENDIX BM). Herein rests both a possible explanation of these limitations on partial DD, and at the same time a possible road to explore a different approach, perhaps in terms of normal DD modulated by a different spell-out (on the tools for this, see XN).

I will end a virtually unexplored point in the transparency of theta-related DPs, 3rd person applicative datives in particular, to Agree. In Itelmen and Georgian, both their person and number features are visible, as seen in XN. In Basque, DD or non-DD dialects, their number features are never visible, though is manifest on the surface about their [π → local] feature. By the hypothesis about quirky Case made here, quirky datives, that is all applicative datives in Basque that are not transparent for DD, transmit just [π → local]. This calls for partial transmission of φ-features, as perhaps evidenced overtly by the Ofate DD group. A logical possibility is to find datives that also partially transmit number, that is say quirky [π → local, π → individuation], without transmitting the full value (dependants of) [individuation]: datives that behave regardless of their feature content as if they were 3.SG, not just 3rd person.

This could explain a phenomenon common enough in a minority of Basque dialects: the lack of PL agreement with [plural] absolutes in all and only applicative contexts, that is in the 1V' and the 3V paradigms. This is occurs in various dialects in one contact area between B and G, and goes back to at least the seventeenth century (Zavala 1848:57/§155, Azkue II:554/§775, Arejita 1984:13): in the B-Vergara-Ofate dialect group, independently of DD, in the G-Deba varieties of Bergara, Antzuola, or Debagoien dialects (Zuazo 1999: 71) or in G-Zaldibia (Garmendia and Garmendia 2003: 73; cf. Y-G2-158 for interesting reflections and the intermediate stage where forms historically for singular and plural absolutes seem to have been used indiscriminately). Of course, these dialects could have simply lost the overt PL marker for the relevant context, so it is now ∅. In any case, if the applied object stops v's φ-probe, the issue of Case licensing of O2/S arises, and one might suppose Appl develops a number probe as in DD dialects, itself often spelled out as ∅ (C4:DLM). The behavior of some Basque dialects is found elsewhere. It seems to be the situation in some dialects of Icelandic, though there agreement can only be investigated for applicative unaccusatives (Holmberg and Sigurðsson 2006, cf. Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003, including for interesting complications regarding plural datives in the context of singular vs. plural nominatives). However, if both the person and number features of a dative are visible to the φ-probes of v, and both φ-probes end up thus having a match, they should not require a farther dative goal to Agree with, and the Dative Dependency Generalization should disappear, as it does with DD. I leave these issues in abeyance for now.

---

29 Here for some speakers an applicative dative blocks plural agreement categorically; for others, only if not displaced by A-movement from between the target of agreement on T and the nominative goal, though when it blocks agreement in-situ it seems to be as high or as low as in the dialects where it blocks agreement categorically. There are various ways to approach this split: in terms of the relative heights of the target of movement and the location of the probes, as do Holmberg and Sigurðsson, in similar terms relying on the creation of an equidistant domain, or through parametrizing whether [plural] agreement is available separately of person agreement, which occurs with the quirky dative for [π → local] -- another way of looking at the Basque data as well.
3.7 Properties of O2/S and Appl

In the type of applicative found in non-DD Basque dialects, or in Greek or Spanish or Icelandic, the applied object has (quirky) theta-related Case, and it is O2/S that behaves as does the O1/S of non-applicatives; it receives absolutive case and controls corresponding morphology on the agreement complex. English, and Norwegian, Mohawk, Passamaquoddy for example, instantiate a different kind of applicative construction: it is the applied object that behaves as O1/S in terms of case and agreement, as can be seen in the English active – passive alternation of *I baked them, a cake, They were baked a cake*. In the literature on this type of applicative, the question of O2 (and S) agreement and case has been paramount. The following options have been considered:


(ii) Preposition: In goal and benefactive applicatives in Halkomelem (Gerds 1988, cf. Gerds and Kiyosawa 2004), O' is treated like O1, and O2 is preceded by an overt oblique marker or P. Larson (1988) proposes that O2 in English gets inherent case from the verb, Pesetsky (1995:00) from a null preposition; compare with in *Napoleon presented the soldier with a medal ~ Napoleon presented a medal to the soldier* (Baker 1997);

(iii) Extra probe on Appl. McGinnis (1998) and Anagnostopoulou (2003:151ff.) put a φ-probe on Appl to move O2 to [Spec, ApplP] to account for symmetric languages where either O' or O2 can show O1-like behavior. Adger and Harbour (2003) put a number probe on Appl in Kiowa based partly on empirical evidence from agreement with O2 in a language where it is otherwise the applied object that behaves as O1.

Basque DD lies on the interface of the two kinds of applicatives: O' has theta-related Case from Appl, but it controls the φ-probe(s) of v, so O2/S finds itself beyond them. It has already been demonstrated in XN that O2 is amenable to A'-extraction, so incorporation seems to be on the wrong track entirely (cf. ex. (27)). On the hypothesis that absolutive assignment to O1 occurs through φ-Agree with v, neither Agree with nor Case assignment to O2/S from v should be possible. What happens to O2/S is enlightening: it does get absolutive Case, but at the same time the agreement morphology clearly indicates that there is a special number probe added for O2, as on Adger and Harbour's (2003) proposal for Kiowa.30

In (44) are given examples of an applicative transitive and in (45) of an applicative intransitive in DD dialects, compared with EB. O'.DAT triggers the regular absolutive plural morphology that O1/S do with simple transitives and unaccusatives, the PL marker *it* and its variants. Singular O2/S like all singular agreement except for DAT is Ø; but plural O2/S triggers an extra number marker: *zki, z, zie*, and in some cases, Ø. The form and origin of these plural markers will be studied in detail in XN; in brief, they are coopted from all over the place and extended beyond their original morphosyntactic context to become a new plural marker controlled by O2, one that I gloss PL2. The existence of this extra number probe is very suggestive of the correctness of the proposal that O2/S licensing when O' controls the φ-Agree of

30 There is no special agreement morphology for O2 in the other two languages that show DD discussed here (XN), Itelmen and Georgian, as far as I know.
ν involves an extra probe on Appl, and moreover that it is a number-type probe. A confirmation of the lack of a person probe is that DD dialects, like non-DD dialects, do not tolerate Person Case Constraint violations, (46) (Fernández 2004:102). If the PCC is a consequence of the failure of person Agree between a 1st/2nd person DP and a φ-probe, as discussed in C5, the probe of Appl is only a number probe.31

(44) a. Guri sagarrak eman ___
   us.DAT apples.D.ABS given
   He gave the apples.
   b. ga-it-u-zki (L-Sar:FE) / ga-itx-u-z. (B-Lek:F) / d-i-zki-gu-te (EB)
      1'-PL-√-PL.2  1'-PL-√-PL.2  X-√-PL-1'-PL'

(45) a. Guri bokatak gustatzen ___
   us.DAT sandwiches.D.ABS like
   We like sandwiches (Sandwiches appeal to us.)
   b. ga-(i)tt-u-ste (HNn-Ir-pM) / ga-tt-u (HNn-Ir-pB) / zai-zki-gu (EB)
      1'-PL-√-PL.2  1'-PL-√  √-PL-1'

(46) a. *Niri zu gustatzen nauzu. (DD, regular for 1.SG dative here)
   me.DAT you.ABS liking 1-TM-√-2
   I like you.
   b. *Zuri ni gustatzen d-i-zu-t. (no DD, regular for 2R dative here)
     you.DAT me.ABS liking X-√-2-1
     I like you. (Fernández 2004:102, Hondarribia)

Extra agreement with O2/S is well known from other languages where O' controls the same agreement as O1. Baker (1996:194-5) gives Wichita, Nahuatl, and Southern Tiwa. For all three, agreement with O2/S of applicatives is impoverished with respect to regular agreement, being limited to number and gender/class, and the Person Case Constraint prevents it from being 1st/2nd person (at least). For all three languages, O’ also does not have oblique case; the languages lack morphology for structural Case, though some like Southern Tiwa do have PPs for theta-related Case. Southern Tiwa (Allen and Frantz 1983, 1986, Allen et al. 1990) is a particularly well-studied case, (47). There is an applicative construction of the English/Norwegian type in which O' patterns with O1 and S for agreement (except as cross-linguistically selectional number agreement, see C1). A, S, O1, and O’ control the realization of the agreement prefix by person

31 These examples are constructed for convenience. Cf. for example:
(i) Guri, bokatak, gustatzen g-a-tt-u-z-ε / *g-a-tt-u
(ii) pro, sagarrak, enori n-a-u-ε/zki
    me.DAT anchovies.D.ABS given pro
(iii) Biar pro, pro laranjak, ekarriko n-a-u-zki,
(v) Zuk, niri, sagarrak, eman n-a-u-zki,
    you.ERG me.DAT anchovies.D.ABS given pro
    Zuk, niri, sagarrak, eman n-a-u-zki,
    you.ERG me.DAT anchovies.D.ABS given pro
    Zuk, niri, sagarrak, eman n-a-u-zki,
    you.ERG me.DAT anchovies.D.ABS given pro
and noun-class (a combination of number and animacy), but O2/S of applicatives by noun-class only. PCC effects hold in both applicative transitives and intransitives, so O2/S of applicatives cannot be 1st/2nd person (Allen et al. 1990:333ff.). Up to this point, Southern Tiwa and Basque DD differ only in that O' bears no case morphology in the former and DAT in the latter. However, there is an important difference: despite agreeing, O2/S of applicatives in Southern Tiwa must incorporate (as it does in (47)) except if it is a pronoun or a proper name, even in cases where O1/S incorporation of non-applicatives is not obligatory (Allen et al. 1984; Allen et al. 1990:331, 366f.).

(47) a. Ka-khwian-wia-ban.
   1i:2s\A\dog-give-PAST
   I gave you\j the dog\k. (Allen et al. 1990:333)
   b. Kam-khwian-hliaw-ban
      2s\B\dog-descend-PAST
      The dogs\j went down to you\j. (Allen et al. 1990:336; my indices)

Within the context of Case licensing of the O2/S of applicatives, this raises interesting questions about incorporation. Baker (1996:194-5, 208-210, 240-1n13) in discussing this matter concludes that number/class agreement with O2 does not suffice for Case licensing and incorporation takes place for that reason. However he does not discuss the pronoun / proper name exception of Southern Tiwa, and it seems clear that in Basque no incorporation takes place, so Case licensing is apparently through the Agree spelled out as PL2, putatively with a number probe on Appl. It remains mysterious why this probe is never for person, a generalization to which I know no exceptions.

Under this proposal, O2/S Case licensing in DD contexts in Basque requires a φ-probe on Appl. This probe is a primary locus of parametric variation for DD, because although it does not have anything to do with the transparency of the dative O' to external φ-Agree, its unavailability makes derivations where the dative values the φ-probe of \v crash. Appl is directly selected by \v, the locus of transitivity (of A selection), so \v becomes a secondary locus of parameterization of DD, again subject to clarification with a properly constrained theory of selection in SECITON. This makes it possible that transitivity should be like the φ-features of the dative in having a systematic effect on DD occurrence, rather than those of the ergative that do not have one.

Transitivity does indeed have a systematic effect on DD. Of the 105 dialects in the Y corpus (not counting HNn-Ir-pB, HNn-Ir-pM which have data only for unaccusatives), 46 have DD in the 3V paradigm with transitive \v, of which a proper subset, the 6 discussed in section 00, have

52 I do not consider the possibility of different Apps that differ only in allowing DD or not, but only due to lack of data. I have only one indication that this may occur in Basque. Trask (1981), noting that the causative of a ditransitive is usually out in Basque, gives an exception from Milafrango, noting "The last form is extraordinary in that it actually includes TWO markers of first person singular, one in direct object position, and one in indirect object position." (Trask 1981:294), this being (ii), with DD + DAT doubling. This contrasts with his datum (i), without DD and DAT doubling for the same 1.SG.DAT, though different ERG (2.F.SG vs. 3.SG resp.). It could be that DD occurs only with the causative Appl in Milafrango. Yrizar's data on the dialect (= Villefranche) give no DD.

(i) Eman d-a-u-t
   given X-TM-√-I
   He/she gave it to me.

(ii) Eman aazi n-a-u-ta-k
   given caused 1-TM-√-DF+1-M
   - (I believe) "Thou madest me give (it to her, e.g.)"
DD in the 1V′ paradigm with unaccusative ν; other data in this literature, for example Fernández and Ezeliabarrena (2002) on L-Sar:FE, do not modify this picture. This means that whether an applicative O′ is present in a transitive or unaccusative construction has a direct systematic effect on whether DD is possible, though in principle either kind of construction allows DD.

With a φ-probe on Appl, a further point of potential interest is whether the φ-features of O2/S, namely its singular vs. plural number as it is restricted to 3rd person, have a systematic effect on DD. A priori, one could imagine the articulation of the φ-probe on Appl as a point of parametric variation, licensing say only singular or only plural O2/S, and thus limiting DD to such contexts. This does not seem to be attested. Although O2's φ-features have an effect on the frequency of DD, O2=SG favoring it, there are very few cases where DD depends on them: that is cases where, tense being kept constant, DD occurs when O2=SG but not when O2=PL in a dialect. The potential examples are given in TABLE, the numbers giving occurrences of DD; the relevant contrasts where the number of O2 seems to categorically condition the possibility of DD in a dialect are in bold, with O2=SG always enabling DD where O2=PL makes it impossible.

**TABLE: DD and O2 number correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>3VSPr:3VPPr</th>
<th>3VSPt:3VPPt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-H-nePS:ALO</td>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>1:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-H-neS:Y, HNn-Ir-RA, HNn-Ir-RZE</td>
<td>4:0</td>
<td>0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNn-Ir-RF</td>
<td>4:0</td>
<td>1:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, these statistics are misleading. For the G-Bu-A:G, G-Bu-B:G, G-Bu-l:G, G-Bu-U:G group of dialects, the 3VPPr paradigm is very scarcely attested (5-6 forms out of potential 28), and the lacunae include the ergative-dative combinations where DD occurs in 3VSPr. Contrasts 1:0 are too small to count. The present tense contrasts in G-H-neS:Y, HNn-Ir-RA, HNn-Ir-RZE, and HNn-Ir-RF are real; but these four geographically and linguistically very close dialects in fact instantiate a single areal pattern, where 3VSPr has DD for 1.SG dative while 3VPPr does not. A single pattern is not convincing. The same conclusion may be drawn of the far more rare DD in applicative unaccusatives, given in TABLE in XN, where such dependency on the number of S as there exists is too slender to bear any weight.

3.8 **Locality of selection: Limits on systematic variation**

FIGURE resumes the syntactic structure within which DD is embedded. Properties of this structure that allow DD, such as transparency of the dative PP, follow from the theory developed in XN. Direct or indirect parametric variation of these properties constitutes the syntactic parametrization of DD. The relevant properties can only be those that are visible to narrow syntax. One goal of a theory of DD syntax is that it on the one hand makes available and on the other properly delimits all such syntactic parametric variation in DD. This is something that is ultimately decided by interaction of the theory with the empirical data, but for which systematic spell-out independent patterns of DD distribution are a good guide. For example, φ-features of the dative but not of the ergative have been seen to have a systematic effect, and a theory of DD should capture this contrast. The syntactic structure with or without DD is then subject to spell-out, at which point properties of vocabulary items in the lexicon may block the spell-out of
otherwise legitimate syntactic structures; but these effects will be arbitrary insofar as they depend on the arbitrary properties of individual vocabulary items, though as will be seen in XN this may still give rise to apparent systematic patterns insofar as individual vocabulary items stand in one-to-one correlation with syntactic properties.

FIGURE: DD syntax

The theory of DD developed in XN identifies two primary loci of parametrization of its syntactic availability, which may be seen in reference to FIGURE. First, the transparency of the dative PP is determined internally to it by the φ-probe of P. Second, the φ-probe on Appl determines whether derivations with DD converge in providing O2/S with Case licensing. These two primary loci of parametric variation are subject to selection by other syntactic elements, for example Appl by v, whose syntactically visible properties, like selection of A by v, thus also enter into determining the syntactic availability of DD; they may be called the secondary loci of parametric variation for DD. In evaluating what predictions this makes for parametrization of DD, and whether they are correct, a theory of c-selection is necessary to clarify which elements in FIGURE may select for properties of P and of Appl, and which are thus second loci of DD parametrization.

I will assume that X can only for Y that Merges with it (cf. Collins 2001). X can select for properties of the first-Merged element, its complement. A good example is furnished by Basque factive verbs of thinking, some of which select the theme in the instrumental (jabetu 'come to realize', ohartu 'notice', akordatu, gogoratu 'remember'), others in the locative (interesatu), some without theta-related Case so that it is absolutive (amestu 'dream', ukatu 'deny', igarri 'guess, deny', sumatu 'perceive', and also gogoratu 'remember' that can also choose an instrumental theme). The Obligatory Case Parameter determines whether the experiencer can be absolutive (when the theme is not) or not (otherwise). Similarly, X can select for properties of the second-Merged elements, its specifier. In Basque, some experiencer + theme psych-verbs with the experiencer as external argument code the it in the dative, e.g. gustatu 'like', others do not and so it gets structural case, e.g. estimatu 'esteem, appreciate'. Combination of complement and specifier selection gives rise to complex interactions without apparent change of meaning: the experiencer-theme can be coded respectively as dative-absolutive and absolutive-instrumental for gustatu (the latter is colloquial but co-exists with the former for the same speakers) or dative-absolutive and absolutive-locative for interesatu. The selection in question is for particular PPs, such as P in instrumental.

I do not commit to whether this is selection for a specific lexical item, or for a feature so that there exists a featural
studied elsewhere, for example in Icelandic (see Andrews 2001 for a recent overview, also Yip, Maling and Jackendoff 1987, Jónsson 1998) or Choctaw (Davies 1986).

I will assume further that when X selects Y, X can select for both the interpretable properties of Y, such as $P_{\text{instrument}}$, and for uninterpretable properties of Y, such as a φ-probe. This much does seem to be commonly assumed. For example, non-finite C/Fin selects for T without a φ-probe (Case licensing capacity) in languages like English, while finite one selects for T with a φ-probe. The interpretable properties of T do not seem to differ; the relevant kinds of infinitives make tense distinctions as much as finite clauses, and contrast with tenseless infinitives.

In principle, selection can seem to have long-distance effects through recursion. Suppose X selects Y, and Y selects Z. If Y only occurs in contexts where it is selected by X, this will appear as a direct selectional dependency between X and Z; otherwise, the local nature of the selection Y-to-Y-to-Z will be clear, but there will still be a distributional dependency of X on Z. If X selects another element U, simple local selection by X can lead to a correlation between properties of say [Spec, XP] = U and of [Spec, YP] = Z, which does not seem to be attested, for example taking X as v and Y as Appl. This kind of thing cannot be precluded in principle if there is selection. It clearly has a high cost: three separate selectional relationships, X-U, X-Y, and Y-Z, must come into existence diachronically and be acquired synchronically.

Such non-local relationships established indirectly by selection should be severely curtailed. Consider the earlier example of V selecting a theme as an particular PP beside or rather than a bare DP. There is no dependence between the the tense features of T, the subordination features of C, or the properties of a higher verb which selects a C, and V's selection of its theme. In investigating this, care must be taken to eliminate interface requirements from consideration: the combination of the Case properties of T and v along with the options for projecting the various arguments required for interpretation as PPs or bare DPs affect whether a theme with structural Case can be licensed. Keeping this in mind, the examples to investigate are whether Vs selecting their theme in a particular PP, say locative for Basque interesatu 'interest' and instrumental for gogoratu 'remember', are ever distributionally dependent on properties of T and C: whether interesatu-type verbs are restricted to the past and gogoratu-type verbs to the present, or to embedded contexts, and so on. This seems to be unattested, and intuitively, it is a type of dependency that selection should not be able to establish.

Exactly this type of case is blocked if X that selects Y cannot select for selectional features of Y, although it can otherwise select for its uninterpretable formal features. This seems desirable therefore, and I will adopt it. The idea has repercussions in certain domains where the desired power of selection is less clear than in the above case, especially the configuration involving X and the specifier Z of its complement Y. What look like selectional dependencies do exist in such contexts. A particularly common and relevant situation is illustrated by Hindi-Urdu. The perfective correlates with (quirky) theta-related Case for A, the ergative, while the imperfective lacks one. The highest DP without theta-related Case (without Case morphology) controls clausal agreement, if there is one: the S of unaccusatives, but for transitive the A in the imperative

---

34 C-selection by a clausal head X for the properties of its specifier DP Y, enveloped in a containing PP, is perhaps not to be blocked, but this becomes a moot issue to the extent that the very introduction of P here occurs upon selection by X, an issue that I return to in XN.

(48)  a. laRkiyãã j rooTii j khaatĩĩ i hãi.
    girls bread eating-FEM be-3-PL
    The girls eat bread. (Imperfective: agent agreeing DP + object non-agreeing DP)

b. laRkiyõõ j nee j rooTii j khaaii j.
    girls ERG bread ate-FEM-SG
    The girls ate bread. (Perfective: agent non-agreeing ERG PP + object agreeing DP)

(Hindi; Comrie 1984: 858; my indexing)

The proposed constraint on selection, that X cannot select for the selectional properties of its selectee Y, prevents perfective T from selecting the v that selects an ergative PP in its specifier (cf. Ura 2000: 205, 218f.). One may want to entertain defining phrase structure or locality in selection in such a way that X and the specifier Z of Y can stand in a direct selectional relationship (Hallman 2004). This also does not introduce the unwanted long-distance effects. The desired relationship between perfectivity and theta-related ergative can be obtained in other ways. A common but to my mind unmotivated approach is to assume, just for this very reason, that the ergative also requires structural licensing in a local relationship to T (e.g. Davison 2004), though a perfectivity-dependent ergative as structural T-assigned Case in general may well be correct for languages like Georgian. Woolford (2006: 125 note 15), arguing for the ergative as theta-related Case without a structural component, observes that it suffices that the relevant temporal notion be vP internal aspect coded by v; even if properties of T are involved, Woolford’s proposal can be adopted by having T select for particular interpretable properties of v (like aspect), so that v with these properties is precisely the v that selects an ergative A. Finally, one may capitalize on the fact that in the non-perfective where A is structural, O needs v as a Case licenser, so v with a φ-probe, while in the imperfective v must not have one because O is the only available goal for both T and v; if v can generally select A as ergative PP or as DP, and perfective T selects for v with a φ-probe while imperfective for v without, convergence will correlate the ergative with the perfective.

With selection delimited in this way, consider now how it plays out for Basque DD in FIGURE. The possible combinations of the properties of primary loci of parametrization for DD are indicated in TABLE, ignoring further nuances due to the type of φ-probe of P. The starred options do not converge, either because of the failure of a DP to find a Case licenser (iii) or the failure of a probe to find a goal (ii). The remaining options converge, (i) with no DD, (iv) with DD and Case licensing by the number probe of Appl of 3rd person O2/S (Person Case Constraint).

TABLE: Primary loci of DD parametrization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>No probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Number probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>No probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Number probe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appl with its φ-probe is selected by \( v \), and accordingly different types of \( v \), namely the transitive and intransitive type that differ in selecting A or not, directly select the primary locus of DD parametrization and accordingly can have a systematic effect on DD; this possibility is exploited, as shown in XN. It is thus possible to deal straightforwardly with a common situation where a 1.SG dative undergoes DD for transitives but not for unaccusatives, for example in L-L-šA:S. In such a dialect there is both a dative P that Agrees with 1.SG DPs and one that does not. The Appl that selects one that Agrees must itself have a φ-probe in order for the DD derivation to converge, and the one that selects the P that does not must not have a φ-probe. To encode the effect of transitivity on 1.SG DD, it suffices that transitive \( v \) select with a φ-probe, and unaccusative \( v \) select Appl without one.

In theory, properties of ERG could play a role in DD given this theory of selection, as discussed above: given X that selects Y, it does not seem possible to prevent the possibility of selection creating a systematic correlation between properties of [Spec, XP] and of [Spec, YP]. There could be a "flavor" of \( v \) that selects for 1.SG ergatives which is in turn the unique \( v \) to select for Appl with a φ-probe, so that DD only occurs with this flavor of \( v \) and thus only with 1.SG ergatives. As noted, this requires a chain of three direct selectional relationships and thus comes at high cost in terms of diachrony and acquisition. Empirically, it does not seem to be exploited in Basque, as XN has shown.

Elements outside the \( vP \), such as T, should be too far away from the primary loci of DD to affect them through selection. As XN shows, this is incorrect; the past - non-past difference, the only one recorded in the Y corpus, can like transitivity have a systematic effect, and the past often categorically blocks DD where the present allows is, and more rarely but robustly the reverse also occurs. Even more curiously however, the same Tense distinction plays a role in leismo in Basque (XN), which is not an occurrence of agreement displacement, but fairly clearly of the use of the applicative constructions for human themes of simple transitives (XN); if so, it is like Tense influencing on whether a verb will select is theme as a PP or not. In XN I show how this effect of Tense can be modeled, in either case, as properties of the insertion of the past tense morpheme \( n \), assimilating it to arbitrary gaps; but whether this is a correct approach, or whether there is a mystery here that is on anyone's theory unexpected, cannot be resolved with the data in the Y corpus (and indeed generally many dialects, period), limited to the present and past of the indicative.

For the potential effect of other \( vP \)-external properties, such as C, there is no data, exception being the allocutive. This brings me to another configuration where selectional relationships cannot hold, by definition, consists of a non-selected element (adjunct), like an adverb if these are not selected, and anything else. If the allocutive in Basque, discussed in C1, is unselected T-adjoined pro, as proposed by Oyharçabal (1993), it should play no role in the syntactic parametrization of DD. If it is selected by a functional category such as Uriagereka's (1995) F high in the T-system, the same should be true. This appears to be the case, though I have not investigated the matter in sufficient depth to be certain; see XN.

This brings me to the end of this section. Any theory of the agreement complex may in principle affect its spell-out, as discussed in C1 and for DD at length in C4:DLM, and thus any may enter into deciding whether a particular DD or non-DD form is licit. However, the theory of DD syntax proposes a far more limited set of the loci of potential parametric variation of DD, namely P which makes the dative PP transparent, Appl that allows \( vPs \) with such a transparent PP to converge, and the elements that stand in direct selectional relationship to these properties. These loci of parametric variation modulate a very limited set of properties, of parameters, such
as the sensitivity of the φ-probe of P. The results of this modulation typically are systematic, sweeping effects in DD paradigms, such as its presence or absence, or its availability for all datives with particular φ-features. Correctly, this approach singles out datives the unique agreement controller on which the applicability of DD depends systematically; successfully, it allows DD to correlate with transitivity; and it runs into problems with the effect of Tense, perhaps to be explained otherwise.

3.9 Interaction with locality and cyclicity

The theory of DD developed in XN has some additional nice consequences that do not seem to follow automatically from a number of imaginable syntactic and morphological alternatives, and that are correct. These consequences lie in the interaction of transparent datives with the locality and cyclicity properties of syntactic derivation. They determine the interaction of DD with canonical agreement by potential controllers of the φ-probes of v, including ergative displacement, and with allocutive agreement.

Consider again the syntactic structure for DD in FIGURE. With respect to the φ-probes of v, the dative PP in [Spec, Appl] is the closest goal for any φ-features matching the probes, pre-empting thus control of the probes by both O2/S lower down, but by A under cyclic expansion in ergative displacement contexts. The φ-probes of v are [individuation], and [π → local → participant] (in ED contexts) or [π] (in non-ED contexts, as determined by the Tense Condition). DD, where detectable in Basque, only occurs for 1st/2nd person, and the proposal made in XN has been that P in such cases has an [individuation] probe, to which an DP is a match as for the [individuation] probe of v, and specific articulation of the dependants of the [π → local → participant] side of the feature geometry that finds only DPs of the appropriate person values in each dialect. Under these assumptions, a dative is always a match for the φ-probes of v, and it will uniquely and fully control them. It will pre-empt control of either probe by O2/S, and it will likewise block ergative displacement.

The assumptions about the φ-probe of P are part stipulations. The theory of quirky Case developed in XN, such as the dative applied object in non-DD Basque dialects and 3rd person datives in all Basque dialects, envisages precisely the possibility that the φ-probe of P may be simply limited to transmitting no more than [π → local] φ-specification of the applied object. In such a case, the dative is not a match for the [individuation] probe of v, and remote agreement with O2/S occurs. [π → local] is a match for the "person" probe of v, but if this is [π → local → participant], in ED contexts, it fails to control it and the [participant] segment of the probe remains available to Agree with A. Both these predictions are correct, as discussed in more fully in C2, C5.

At the same time, keeping to the DD of 1st and 2nd person it may not be a stipulation to assume that an [individuation] is necessarily present on P as well. This is something that does not follow from the theory of probes and feature geometries sketched out in XN. However, such a dependency is indeed suggested by the apparent "pied-piping" of number agreement with person agreement in Georgian and in Fiorentino/Trentino mentioned in XN. The underlying reason for this dependency may be along the lines suggested by Taraldsen (1995): [participant] arguments require [individuation] for interpretability, or rather since in both his mechanics and the ones here it is uninterpretable probes that are at stake, for simple well-formedness. I do not venture into a theory of feature geometry that captures this: making it work formally is trivial, since co-
dependencies of this sort have long been explored in phonology in terms of for example filters, and making it follow from minimalist principles is far beyond by scope.

Once the assumption is made, that Agree by P that transmits [participant] or more from the applied object on the "person" side entails also transmission of [individuation], it follows immediately that the 1st/2nd person dative of DD controls the φ-probes of v as discussed above. Not only is it the case that the the person and individuation probes of v cannot be controlled by an element other than the dative together; they cannot be so controlled separately, for example person Agreeing with A under ED and number with the dative under DD.

It is important to be as clear as possibly on the underlying reason for this seemingly trivial fact: that the theory here attributes the same mechanics to the "anomalous" PX and PL control by the dative O’ under DD as it does to the "canonical" PX and PL control by the absolutive O2/S. All the difference between the two is whether the φ-features of the dative are visible to φ-Agree or not. The φ-features in question, containing [participant] and [individuation], fully value the φ-probes of v, and that is the end of the story for these probes, exactly as it is when it is O1/S that has these φ-features for simple transitives and unaccusatives. No Agree with another element is possible. In order for this to occur, the dative would have not to provide a sufficient goal for one of the probes of v, as occurs when it the quirky [π → local] dative, lacking [participant] to allow ED and [individuation] to allow remote number agreement.

The crucial element in this account is the feature-locality of φ-Agree, and correspondingly, the result does not follow if it is missing. For example, if agreement displacement were accomplished by a post-syntactic allomorphy mechanism, the result does not follow (see C2). Nor does it follow if Agree by v can potentially ignore locality; for example, if the locality of Agree is simply that it is limited to goal in the current phase, within which it might Agree with multiple goals simultaneously (REF). I do not mean to suggest that there are not other insightful accounts of agreement displacements possibly; merely to point out the virtuous role played by the particular tools used here, tools arguably justifiable independently on both minimalist and empirical grounds.

The logic of the derivational mechanics that yields these results makes other predictions. One is that a transparent dative in a syntactic structure will always pre-empt ergative displacement. Theoretically, this is a consequence of exactly what has just been discussed; empirically it turns out to be a very different matter. As seen when discussing in detail patterns of DD in XN, many dialects that have DD for a particular dative also allow non-DD for the same dative, so in theoretical terms they have both transparent and opaque dative, and that leads to the possibility of both DD and non-DD derivations, the latter permitting ED for 1st/2nd person ergative. Arbitrary gaps in both DD and non-DD may force either option. TABLE is a nice example. For 3rd person dative, and in this dialect for 2.PL dative as well, no DD is possible, and ED occurs (italicized). For 1st person dative, only DD occurs, and ED is correspondingly blocked. For 2R dative, DD is also a possibility, as is non-DD and so ED if A is 1st person. 1.P>2.R+>3.S allows both; 1.S=2.R+>3.S only the non-DD, ED option.

TABLE: X>Y+>3.S past in L-S-Z:1

35 C4:DLM also notes that in those dialects where 2V and 3VS DD forms are systematically identical, they can have arbitrary gaps at different points, something that follows if the syntactic input to spell-out is the same, but not under certain versions of the morphological approach to agreement displacement where existence of the potential target form in the 2V paradigm should entail availability of the process mapping 3VS to it.
The possibility of such ED/DD mix follows from the possibility of arbitrary gaps to DD and non-DD derivations when they are possible; so it is that empirically, the surface distribution of ED and DD when both are possible is haphazard (Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2002). Still, the present theory makes a prediction. If DD is syntactically available for a dative with φ-features α in a context K, blocking it relies on the existence of an arbitrary gap to the spell-out of this syntax, including for contexts where ED is independently possible. An alternative not made available by the theory is that if ED of an ergative β can also occur in this context with α replaced by a non-DD dative, ED pre-empt DD of α in the syntax. If the latter could occur, there would emerge patterns of gaps to DD based on specific choices of φ-features of the ergative; in TABLE C in XN, they would show up as vertical swaths to horizontal DD patterns. Evaluating whether this occurs is a risky business though: a glance at TABLE above shows that any sub-paradigm that keeps tense and O2 number fixed has only 8 cells of DD-ED interaction, far fewer in most dialects where not all datives can undergo DD. The few candidate patterns in TABLE C for ED blocking DD seem unconvincing in this light. On the other hand, for the vast majority of dialects, all those in TABLES A and B that have DD for all choices of an ergative for a some dative, and those dialects that have DD throughout, there are DD patterns blocking ED, but no ED patterns blocking DD. So the systematic DD blocking by ED not made available by the present theory does indeed seem to be ruled out correctly, while the expected reverse whereby DD systematically blocks ED falls under the broader class of dative-based DD patterns, which do occur.

Properties of the syntactic derivation also dictate the interaction of DD with allocutive agreement, discussed in C2. I have investigated this on a much more limited scale, keeping to the L dialects where DD is most pervasive and to the question in (49).

One point of interest if the interaction of DD with allocutives occurs because in some dialects, in some contexts, allocutive agreement ends up looking exactly like agreement with a dative of corresponding φ-features when added to a transitive, and this has led to one of its traditional analyses at least in these contexts as the "ethical dative" of French and Spanish, one that is obligatorily pro. Thus, 3.S>3.S present d-u [X-v] + 2F.F allocutive is d-i-n [X-v+AF-F], which is in some dialects the same as 3.S>2F.F>3.S with AF in the glossed replaced by DF. This is by no means generally, and as discussed in C1, there is nothing deep about it. Still, given that this is one (influential) traditional analysis, one wants to see whether allocutive agreement is ever accessible to DD; this is examined by question (i) and (ii) in (49). The prediction of the present theory on this matter is clear: insofar as it has been established that the allocutive is not reachable by cyclic expansion of the φ-probe of v in C2, it should not be accessible to DD either, for the same reasons as discussed there.

Question (iii) is different: it asks whether allocutive agreement can have some effect, at all, on DD. Since any property that enters into the spell-out of the agreement complex can block its spell-out, an effect there could be, according to the present theory. However, the allocutive
should not have any effect on the syntax of DD, since it is too far from any of the primary loci of DD to affect them, and perhaps it is even an adjunct. Lack of a syntactic effect rules out one kind of systematic patterns induced by the presence of an allocutive in DD, though not others such as could arise from factors like frequency or register.

The results are given in TABLE.

(49)
(i) In the alloc. of 3.S→3.S present, does DD of the allocutive take place (compare 3.S→2F.F→3.S)?
(ii) The same for past, where ED might expand to range of the probe to include the allocutive.

TABLE: DD and allocutivity

NB: Forms in () are 2F.M allocutive where particularly relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>(i) DD of alloc. in 2VPr?</th>
<th>(ii) DD of alloc. in 2VPt?</th>
<th>(iii) DD/alloc. interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-S-p:B</td>
<td>din [doon]</td>
<td>zinan [*]</td>
<td>doot [zootan]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-S-S:D</td>
<td>din [au]</td>
<td>zinan [intuen]</td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-S-ZI</td>
<td>din [dain]</td>
<td>zin-en' an [zanen]</td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(intuen [zaken])</td>
<td>([ziatark/niak])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Aip:B</td>
<td>din [dau]</td>
<td></td>
<td>nau [niain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1p:B</td>
<td>din [hau]</td>
<td></td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1hG:A</td>
<td>(dik [au])</td>
<td>zian [intuen]</td>
<td>nau [niak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1hG:S</td>
<td>din [hau]</td>
<td>(zikan) [hintuen]</td>
<td>nau [niak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1s:A</td>
<td>din [hau]</td>
<td>zifen [hinduen]</td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1s:B:S</td>
<td>din [hau(n)/iaun]</td>
<td>zifen [hintuen]</td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1s:H:A</td>
<td>(d)in [au]</td>
<td>zifen [intuen]</td>
<td>nau [ni(i)ñ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1s:U:S</td>
<td>din-n[ì] [hau]</td>
<td>zifen [hintuen]</td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Arp:H</td>
<td>din [hau]</td>
<td></td>
<td>nau [nain]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SarZugBon</td>
<td>nau [ziatan]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JeanSpGuéAri</td>
<td>din [hau]</td>
<td></td>
<td>dau(ù)/nau [zatan]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcPrBon</td>
<td>din [dan]</td>
<td></td>
<td>dat [zatan]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcArbBon</td>
<td>din [dan]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answer to questions (i) and (ii) is absolutely clear from their corresponding columns: the allocutive never undergoes DD, though in most of these dialects, an applicative dative with the same φ-features does. DD of the dative gives $h/\varnothing [2F]$ as PX; DD of the allocutive would give the same result, but instead what is found is the default PX $d$ of the present, $z$ of the past, and the
allocutive coded by the SX *na* [2F.F]. For question (ii), this result has in fact already been established (and more generally) in C2, for the question is the same as whether the allocutive in the context can ever undergo ED, which would also give it control of PX.

Similarly, in the column addressing question (iii), the allocutive is never the PX controller. However, question (iii) is different: whether the presence or absence of allocutive agreement can influence whether DD occurs with the applicative dative. Here the answer is clearly yes: in L-S-U:T the presence of an allocutive blocks otherwise available DD, and the reverse occurs in JeanSpGuéAri. Evidently, the effect is not systematic across the dialects. This is already the conclusion of Yrizar, who both ties it to the difference in register associated with the use of the allocutive, and notes that the effect is different in different dialects:

(50) Parece como si la tendencia popular, reflejada principalmente en las flexiones alocutivas, imposara al empleo de las formas "típicas", mientras existe una posible influencia cultural (predicación, prensa, literature) más sensible sobre las flexiones indefinidas [...] Por lo que veremos después, esta indicación no concuerda con los datos de Bähr referentes a Irún y Fuenterrabía [where allocutive blocks DD –MR]. (Y-D2-361)

He illustrates the different effects with the two TABLES that I reproduce; DD forms are in bold.

**TABLE: Y-D2-361, allocutive and DD in Labourdin, second half of 20th century**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. J. de Luz</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>naïk</td>
<td>nauzki</td>
<td>naizkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urrugne</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>naïk</td>
<td>naizuki</td>
<td>naizkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guéthary</td>
<td>dau</td>
<td>naïk</td>
<td>nauzki</td>
<td>naizkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascain</td>
<td>dau</td>
<td>naïk</td>
<td>dauzkit</td>
<td>naizkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zugarramurdi</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>naïk</td>
<td>nauzki</td>
<td>naizkik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE: Y-D2-361, allocutive and DD Irún/Fuenterrabía, early 20th century**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irún</td>
<td>dit, nau</td>
<td>zirak</td>
<td>ttit, nazki</td>
<td>zittirak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenterrabía</td>
<td>dit, nau</td>
<td>ziak</td>
<td>ttit, nazki</td>
<td>zittiaik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This kind of conclusion about the effect of allocutivity is fully consonant with the theory of DD presented here. There can be no effect on DD syntax of the allocutive. However, the allocutive (as well as the coding of 2F argument by agreement) typically defines its own register, which differs from the non-allocutive register in such details as SX order, form of vocabulary items, extent of agreement displacement, and so on (see C1). That at a different register of a dialect, that is essentially a potentially differently parametrized dialect, DD should have a different extent is unsurprising. It remains to establish for the allocutive the conclusion established in XN for the ergative, that unlike the dative its φ-features do not have a systematic effect on DD. This I do not undertake here.
In sum, the theory of DD developed here, embedded as it is in the present model of derivational syntax, makes the right predictions about what can control the φ-probes of υ under DD, and what can parametrize the syntactic occurrence of DD.

4 DD vs. leismo

There is a phenomenon in Basque that provides a nice minimal contrast with dative displacement: the treatment of the human object of simple transitives as a dative, different from DD in origin and dialectal distribution (cf. Y-D2-360, 362ff., Landa 1995, and cf. Spanish leismo reviewed in Fernández-Onitorez 1999). This is illustrated in (51)b for the dialect of Lekeitio (Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994: 125f.): (51)a is the version without it. Here, it is not only agreement that treats the object as a dative. The DP itself also now bears morphological dative case, and morphology associated with applicative constructions like the "dative flag" appears in the agreement complex; the same agreement complex, dotzat, indicates a 3.SG dative goal + 3.SG absolutive theme in neskia liburua emon dotzat 'I have given the book to the girl' (op.cit.). This suggests that the phenomenon involves treating the object of a transitive as an applicative dative in all ways, while DD involves treating an applicative dative as anomalous for agreement only, not as an absolutive transitive object / unaccusative subject in other ways. The idea receives some support from the fact that a leismo O1 is not compatible with an applicative dative, say a possessor, which would follow from the general impossibility of multiple applicatives in Basque (XN), though non-leismo absolutive O1 is, (52):

\[(51)\]
a. Neskia ikusi d-o-t.  
girlABS seen X-√-l

b. Neskia ri ikusi d-o-tz-a-t.  
girl.dat seen X-√-DF-3-1
I have seen the girl. (Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994: 125)

\[(52)\]
a. Marak Aneri 〈amonari〉 eraman d-i-o 〈ikaskolaxe〉  
Marta.ERG Ane.DAT grandmother.DAT brought X-√3V-3 to.school
Marta has take Ane to school/grandma. (available for some speakers vs. standard Ane absolutive) (Albizu and Fernández forthcoming, note 17)

b. ikasketaburui gomendatuko  *z-a-izki-o-t / z-a-it-u-t / d-i-zu-t.  
department.head.D.DAT recommend.FUT 2-TM-√-PL-3-1 2-√-PL-1 X-√-2-1
I will recommend you to the head of the department. (Albizu 2001:49)

Leismo has been much studied for Spanish, where Ormazabal and Romero (2002) provide a plausible alternative interpretation of facts like (52) in terms of the Person Case Constraint. For them, animate O2 would be impossible in the context of O' just as 1st/2nd person is, a conclusion they demonstrate to be true for Spanish independently of leismo. They propose that the dative O1 in leismo is contextual realization of the regular υ-Case. Support comes from the fact that Spanish, and Basque as well, restrict leismo to O1, and it is unavailable to S. An alternative with equal scope would be that the primary locus of Case/Agree by the Obligatory Case Principle, υ in Basque and T in Spanish, requires a goal for its φ-probe, and making S an applied object would remove the only goal for unaccusatives. This would independently explain why in Basque and Spanish there are unaccusative of the type common in Icelandic, (53), or Irish, whose only
argument(s) bear(s) theta-related Case/PP (overviewed in Andrews 2001, McCloskey 1996 resp.). Setting aside whatever strategy is behind the Icelandic/Irish examples (cf. Rezac 2004a: 341ff.), it seems that a DP with theta-related Case cannot be the sole goal of the relevant φ-probe of Spanish (T) and Basque (v). This conclusion has already been reached for Basque in XN, from the dative dependency generalization that makes an applicative dative dependent on independent Agree between v and a goal. If this is right, then S cannot be an applied object in leismo simply because the φ-probe of T / v never finds a goal for Agree.  

(53) a. Bátnum hvovldi.
   boat.DAT capsized
   The boat capsized. (inchoative of "They capsize the boat")

b. Bátninn rak á land.
   boat.ACC drifted to shore
   The boat drifted to the shore. (Icelandic; Andrews 2001:88)

For Basque, clear dative agreement and dative case, along with applicative morphology, given more of an indication about the status of the construction than there is on the surface for Spanish. This is all the more consequent because up to idiosyncracies in spell-out, simple transitive leismo and ditransitive 3V paradigm forms always use the same principles of formation and morphology in the agreement complex, such as applicative head and SX morphology (ANNEX). This is an important contrast with DD, where 3V DD and 2V paradigms end up with the same agreement complex forms only accidentally when the applicative and SX morphology happens not to surface (C4:DLM). The applicative analysis is also consonant with the systematic patterns of leismo distribution discussed in ANNEX, where the φ-features of O1 play a primarily role, though there are important caveats like the role of tense, as for DD (see also C4:DLM). My concern is not directly with leismo, but in its contrast and interaction with DD. DD affects φ-Agree alone (and its spell-out); leismo affects case and probably applicativity.

---

36 Hindi-Urdu is instructive here (Mohanan 1994: chapter 4). It has a leismo-like phenomenon by which human O1 is marked by the same case morphology as O', ko, rather than being bare as otherwise; and as in Spanish and Basque (52), if there is already a ko-marked O', O2 cannot be so marked. Ban on ko-marking the S of unaccusatives is also in force. Yet dialects of Hindi-Urdu differ in whether O1 in a passive contexts becomes nominative or whether it can retain its ko-marking, apparently with this giving rise to a difference in meaning (Mohanan 1994: 92-7).

37 There is some evidence that leismo in Basque actually lets O1 avoid the Person Case Constraint. Leismo is available in both Basque and Spanish for the impersonal construction (for Basque, see G: 4.7.2-5, Albizu 2002), where there is an impersonal external argument, one available for example as an anaphor binder, but obligatorily pro and not reflected as ergative by verbal agreement morphology: (i). In Spanish, this impersonal agent creates the Person Case Constraint for O1 if O1 receives nominative, and, this is obviated if O1 is accusative or leismo dative. Arguably, the impersonal agent is an intervener for person Agree between T and O1, so O1 nominative can only be 3rd person, but not between v and O1 because it is in [Spec, vP], so O1 can be accusative of any person, and independently, leismo (D’Alessandro 2004). For Basque, the Person Case Constraint also arises, but for absolutive O1, which should be assigned by v like the Spanish accusative; leismo of O1 obviates this: (ii). It would be spurious to simply conclude that the impersonal A is lower in Basque so it intervenes for v-O1 Agree. More likely is it that impersonal A requires person Agree for licensing. In Spanish it gets it from T, which prevents T but not v from further person Agree with O1, and in Basque it gets it from v via cyclic expansion, which can only occur if there has been no person Agree with O1.

(i) Ikusi da / zai-o.
   seen X-√1V √1V'-3

(ii) Ikusi zai / n-ia-iz.
   seen √1V'-1  I-TM-√1V
as well. The differences between non-leismo and leismo transitives are those that one would expect from two constructions with different theta-theretic structures but closely related meanings.

In the context of the theory of DD developed above, the proposal that leismo O1 is an applied object makes a clear prediction: DD might apply to it. This is correct. In (54), leismo puts O1 into the dative, but it is a dative that controls PX and PL morphology, that is v-Agree, for a speaker who independently has DD available a true applied object with the same φ-features.

(54) Neri ikusi d-i-t / n-a-u.
     me.DAT seen X-√-1 1-TM-√
     He saw me. (AI)

Normally, applying DD to leismo of transitives would not be seen in the Y corpus, which typically gives only verbal agreement complexes and not case morphology of the controllers. DD + DAT doubling would be visible, but independently DAT doubling tends to surface only if there is the PL2 marker discussed in XN and so it requires a plural O2, which is obviously not possible in simple transitives. One paradigm in the corpus does have the expected forms, given in TABLE. In the underlined forms, O1 controls both the PX morphology, and the SX morphology, which is otherwise never controlled by an absolutive, so its controller is presumably an O1 that has dative under leismo.38 In this dialect the 3VS past paradigm has no DD. This would follow simply on the theory of DD developed here if Appl has no φ-probe available: DD where v Agrees with the applied object converges only when there is no O2 in need of Case licensing, so only when the applied object is O1 of simple transitives under leismo. At the same time, it is not recorded whether these forms actually do use a dative O1, and it could be that they reflect an otherwise extremely rare but attested SX doubling of absolute-controlled PX (see C4:DBL).

TABLE: G-Bu-U:1 2V past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O1 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>zen</td>
<td>zetun</td>
<td>nen</td>
<td>genduben</td>
<td>zendubun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL</td>
<td>zituben</td>
<td>zitubein</td>
<td>niotuben</td>
<td>genduzen</td>
<td>zenduzen</td>
<td>zenduzein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>nenduben</td>
<td>nendubain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nenduzun</td>
<td>[zenduein]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>gendun</td>
<td>gendubain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>genduzun</td>
<td>genduzain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R</td>
<td>[zezun]</td>
<td>[zezain]</td>
<td>zenduzun</td>
<td>zenduzain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>[zezain]</td>
<td>[zezain]</td>
<td>zenduzain</td>
<td>zenduzain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DD and leismo do not in general have the same distribution across the Basque dialects: many dialects have one but not the other, so G-Bu-B:O has only leismo, L-L-sA:S only DD. The distribution of leismo is studied in Y-Dial-II-360, 362ff. Whenever leismo and DD coexist, there is a clear tendency to apply leismo in the 2V paradigm where DD does not apply in the 3V

38 The morphology of these forms is as follows: z-enk is the regular realization of 2-TM:PAST, to be compared with n-enk, g-enk in the rest of the paradigm; u is the regular realization of both the 2V root; and zu 2.R.DAT, zai 2.PL.DAT are also regularly realized, as seen in the DD forms ([]); the ERG markers, i.e. 1.SG.ERG and 1.PL.ERG are missing here (this is not surprising for 1u which undergoes other strange recombinations in the dialect, e.g. 2VPr 1.P.2.S.A zaithai for expected *zaithugu, using the same morphology as 3.P.E-2.S.A, and whose ai encodes plurality as it does in -z-ai).
paradigm and vice versa. Taken to its extreme, there arises a full complementary distribution that surfaces as a single, unified 2V/3V agreement paradigm for 1st/2nd person dative and absolutive:

For any particular α:ERG-β:ABS/DAT combination, where α and β are φ-sets, either *leismo* has applied to O1 or DD has applied to O', so for both 2V and 3V combinations there is but one agreement form. Dative and absolutive case continues to be distinguished, and 3rd person O1 and O' continue to control different agreement types, since neither is affected by DD and non-human objects are not affected by leismo. This stage is seen completed in HNn-Ir-H:S in TABLE. 2V past and all but 1.SG 1st of 2V present have full *leismo* while 3VS/P past and all but 1.SG.DAT of 3VS/P present have no DD, so these combinations have original 3V forms only; 1.SG.O1 of 2V present has no *leismo* while 1.SG of 3VS/P present have full DD, so these combinations have canonically 2V forms only.

NOTE: In TABLES the following conventions are used: + means *leismo* (in 2V paradigms) / DD (in 3V paradigms) applies, - it does not, ± it applies optionally; rows are different paradigms; within each row, blocks separated by | are blocks of the same φ-features for O1 (for 2V paradigms) or O' (for 3V); within each such block the six separate positions are six values of the ergative 3.S, 3.P, 1.S, 1.P, 2R, 2.P.

### TABLE: DD and leismo in HNn-Ir-H:S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>O1/O': 1.S</th>
<th>1.P</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2VPr</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>++++XX</td>
<td>++++XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V Pt</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>++++XX</td>
<td>++++XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3VS Pr</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3V Sp</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3VP Pr</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3VP Pt</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HNn-Ir-H:S is a rare extreme. Intermediate stages tending towards it look like G-Bu-B:I and G-EA-p:Y. In G-Bu-B:I the merger of the 2V and 3V paradigms is not complete, but *leismo* and DD apply in distinct α:ERG-β:ABS/DAT combinations, so that they never interfere with each other, and so each combination to which they have applied is merged with the corresponding 3V/2V form respectively. Commonly, this complementarity is not respected; in HNn-Ir and G-Hn dialects like G-H-nePD:ALO, there are many cases (underlined in TABLE) where for a particular φ-feature combination to which DD applies in the 3VS paradigm, leismo also applies in the 2V paradigm, giving canonical 2V and 3VS-like forms respectively, and so the two phenomena "cross" each other. 39

### TABLE: DD and leismo in G-Bu-B:I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>O1/O': 1.S</th>
<th>1.P</th>
<th>2R</th>
<th>2.P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2VPr</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V Pt</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>++++XX</td>
<td>++++XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3VS Pr</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>++X+++</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3V Sp</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3VP Pr</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>-XX--</td>
<td>----XX</td>
<td>----XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 It seems that in cross-over cases, one but not necessarily both of the crossing leismo/DD apply optionally.
There is thus no intrinsic relation between *leismo* and DD, either absolutely, or when both apply in the same paradigm. The very striking phenomenon of *leismo* feeding DD discussed above indeed clearly demonstrates that one phenomenon can partially "undo" the other. The tendency to apply the two in distinct portions of the paradigm, to in the limit create a single one, must have an extra-grammatical basis. This tendency explains patterns of *leismo* noted in ANNEX, keeping in mind that the Y corpus is specifically constructed to include all DD dialects and then their surrounding dialects: the points in the paradigm where it tends to apply most often are approximately the inverse of those where DD does, favouring 2\textsuperscript{nd} person and past tense rather than 1\textsuperscript{st} person and present tense.

5 Conclusion: The parallelism of agreement displacement

In this conclusion I want to tie together several strands of the discussion up to here, relating DD as agreement displacement to ED, and the theory of theta-related Case to the theory of Case in general. One major topic is omitted, for I have already addressed it sufficient in XN: the role that feature-relativized locality in a derivational syntax plays in accounting for the properties of DD. Fernández (2001: 160ff.) makes an important point that must be addressed by any theory of DD: the parallelism of the two agreement displacements DD and ED.\textsuperscript{vi} The two share the following effects: a morphology canonically controlled by the absolutive, PX for ED and PX/PL for DD, receives an eccentric controller, the ergative and dative; the morphology canonically controlled by the eccentric controller, SX for both, may either disappear or remain. It is however equally important to notice their difference. Both control PX morphology, and Fernández ties this causally that in both the canonical controller of PX morphology is 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, specifically, she derives the anomalous PX control from failure by 3\textsuperscript{rd} person control.

Yet is equally important to account for the core difference with respect to agreement between the two, which she also raises: PL control is not affected by ED, but under DD the anomalous controller pre-empts canonical PL control, regardless of the ability of the canonical controller (a plural absolutive) to control PL. Moreover, even the relationship between 3\textsuperscript{rd} person canonical controller and the eccentric control of PX seems to me to be different in the two agreement displacements. In ED, the agreement displacement occurs in 1/2>3 contexts, and the remaining contexts have O controlling PX canonically. Here I have adopted Laka's hypothesis that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person-hood of O causes ED in C2. However, in applicative contexts where DD occurs, the
canonical PX controller is *independently* restricted to the 3rd person in all dialects by the Person Case Constraint, whether DD occurs or not.

Effectively, for DD I have pursued a different intuition, looking to the behavior of PL as a guideline. The anomalous controller pre-empts PL control by the canonical controller under DD. It also happens to be closer to the target of PL agreement: PL expresses the number probe on \( v \), the anomalous controller is \( O' \) that c-commands the canonical controller O2/S. The fact that \( O' \) beats out O2/S for PL control follows by locality. It should also follow by locality that it beats out O2/S for PX control, not that the 3rd person-hood of O2/S is what permits the derivation to see the person features of the anomalous controller. In the event the issue does not arise because of the Person Case Constraint. Yet this approach has permitted a way of looking at the Person Case Constraint as a situation where the (impoverished) person specification of \( O' \) always beats out PX control by O2/S as a closer controller.

In the model developed here, the parallelism of the two agreement displacements, insofar as it exists, follows on the one hand because in both it is the \( \varphi \)-probes of \( v \), looking for the closest maximal controller, that are involved, and because in both cases, the canonical dative and ergative controller SX morphology that reflects \( X^0 \)-movement is also available or may be suppressed by the same mechanisms (discussed in C4:DBL). This parallelism extends very neatly now to datives in non-DD dialects, which control only SX morphology. In those dialects, the \( \varphi \)-probes of \( v \) see on the dative a 3rd person. This is not reflected by PX spell-out, which is sensitive to participants only. However, the person probe is manifestly stopped by it, and \( X^0 \)-movement of the dative yields SX morphology, exactly as it does in DD dialects where the dative does value the person probe of \( v \) was participant.

Other parallelisms occur between the morphology controlled by DPs in different structural positions do occur in Basque: the ergative and dative control SX morphology, any agreement controller can control gender and PL' morphology, and so on. For SX morphology (to be concrete), the question of anomalous controllers, and of potential parallelisms between different kinds thereof, arises in a different way, because they are \( X^0 \)'s moved by the \( \varphi \)-probes of T (which receives little spell-out) and \( v \), so eccentric control of SX would be visible on the former as well, creating agreement displacement of the type that occurs. A simple imaginary scenario is if there were SX morphology realizing \( X^0 \)'s moved by the person probe of \( v \), which there is not (see C4:DBL): in that case, ED would make the ergative A anomalous controller of this morphology. For SX this does not occur, because for unclear reasons there is no potential absolutive O/S controller in the first place. The PL' and gender morphology that is consequent on control of the \( \varphi \)-probes of \( v \) by suitable controllers in agreement displacements, such as 2.PL dative under DD, where none appears under canonical controller, arguably instantiates exactly this scenario, though these morphologies are not my focus here.

**TABLE: Agreement and agreement displacement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement phenomenon</th>
<th>Spell-out of Person probe of ( v )</th>
<th>Spell-out of Number probe of ( v )</th>
<th>SX trigger (see C4:DBL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive (canonical)</td>
<td>PX if participant</td>
<td>PL if plural</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative (canonical)</td>
<td>(valued from ABS)</td>
<td>(valued from ABS)</td>
<td>probe(s) of T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative (canonical)</td>
<td>(always non-participant)</td>
<td>(no value)</td>
<td>probe(s) of ( v )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED (+ ERG doubling)</td>
<td>PX if participant</td>
<td>(valued from ABS)</td>
<td>probe(s) of T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD (+ DAT doubling)</td>
<td>PX if participant</td>
<td>PL if plural</td>
<td>probe(s) of ( v )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most significant lack of parallelism between ED and DD is the Case-theoretic nature of the controller. The ergative has to be non-theta-related -- or that must be one option for it -- since it is available to non-thematic DPs, and its associated agreement can even be controlled by an argument in-situ in another CP. The dative is asymmetric with respect to this behavior of the ergative, and absolutive, in a way that requires local theta-related "assignment", such as selection of \( P_{\text{dat}} \) by \( \text{Appl} \) as proposed here.

There are proposals in the literature to make the dative structural. This is particularly relevant to Basque, since even in dealing with non-DD dialects, it is often the default assumption, since it controls agreement morphology (e.g. Fernández 2001:160, 2004:104). The correlation between agreement morphology and structural Case is a seductive intuition, particularly in the context of the post-1990's generative frameworks that have shifted more and more burden for the establishment of syntactic dependencies relations between \( \phi \)-features that are prototypically spelled out as agreement morphology. Beyond this, making the dative structural Case seems to rest intuitions such as the regularity of its assignment (applicative contexts), and the parallelism of Spanish/Basque-like applicative constructions where the applied object is dative with those of English, Norwegian, or Chichewa where it is clearly has structural Case.

One way to cash out this intuition is proposed by Adger and Harbour (2003): the dative is a contextual variant of uniform assigned Case, and the context is a special feature present uniquely on applied object, \([\text{participant}]\). A similar proposal is advanced by Omazabal and Romero (2002). Interpreted in the most straightforward way, one expects \( O' \) with such a dative to behave fully like \( O1 \) in intercepting a higher \( \phi \)-probe and its Case assignment properties. One expects also that when \( O' \) and \( O1 \) are not differentiated by the special feature that defines the context where assigned Case is realized as a dative, which for Adger and Harbour would be for all 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person DP's that are already [participant], the realization of assigned Case on all these DPs is the same ("case syncretism").

For the specific language for which they make the proposal, Kiowa, these properties are all correct. By the same token, they are clearly incorrect for Basque dialects, DD or not: case morphology always differentiates \( O' \) from \( O1 \), and even in DD dialects where \( O' \) controls the PX and PL morphology that \( O1 \) does as well, only \( O' \) can control SX agreement morphology under DD + DAT doubling. Adger and Harbour do suggest extension of the mechanism to languages without \( O'/O1 \) syncretism in 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person, such as Greek: the difference between e.g. 1.SG realized as accusative vs. dative clitic would be that the latter is the realization of 1.SG with Case "in the context of Appl".

It seems to me that a suitably sharp definition of the "context of Appl", that can deal with \( A, A' \), and head movement that will separate the two, is indistinguishable from theta-related Case selected by Appl. The advantage of including the notion of theta-related, non-alternating Case, including one that is regularly linked to particular structural configurations such as [Spec, Appl], are the asymmetries between ergative/absolutive and dative in Basque discussed in XN: the local nature of dative assignment, lack of case alternation in different functional contexts, and so on. The formulation of theta-related Case in terms of an extra PP-like shell above the DP is suggested by the morphology, but its advantages are to be judged by the use that is made of it.

\[\text{Qu}_{\text{uite a different mechanism of contextual differentiation of the dative (and ergative) from absolutive/ accusative, both structural Cases assigned by the same head, is developed by Bobaljik and Branigan (forthcoming), for Chukchi ergatives and French causee datives. In a nutshell, the context involves a configuration where two DPs relate to a single Case licensor; the higher gets one case, the lower another.}\]
From a quite different perspective, Bayer, Bader and Meng (2001) also distinguish the German dative from its nominative/accusative by a special shell (KP), the relationship between the two groups being comparable to the Basque dative-ergative/absolutive split.

I do not suggest though that the resulting theory of Case in general is entirely satisfactory. Possible empirical issues arise too if the loss of ergative displacement, discussed in C2, actually occurs, and if it depends internally to narrow syntax on the \( \phi \)-features of the ergative in the way that application of DD does. Even if ED loss does truly occur, its sensitivity to the \( \phi \)-features of the ergative does not show the diversity found with DD, particularly the different possible datives that may be affected uniquely and separately such as 1.SG, 1.PL, \{1.SG, 2.SG\}, and so on. Yet if this is the correct way to view ED loss, there ought to be a PP-like shell around the ergative that can modulate the visibility of its \( \phi \)-features to external \( \phi \)-Agree.

To progress along this road, the notion of non-theta-related Case and its relationship to theta-related Case must first be clarified. This is the goal of the next section. The basic argument is that under some assumptions, the "encapsulation" of X Merged to (a projection of) Y within a shell \([\text{KP} K X]\) need not be viewed as a characteristic of theta-selection. The result is a theory of Case shells that arise from c-selectional requirements upon Merge, grouping together regardless of theta-relatedness the Basque ergative and dative, in distinction (perhaps) to the absolutive and (at any rate) Case assigned at long distance without a Merge relation like Icelandic nominative and accusative. This creates a new way of looking at such phenomena as "Raising to the Object of a Preposition", and it leads to a greater parallelism between ED and DD. It puts the burden of differentiating the behavior of ergative and dative in Basque, on the one hand on the properties of the selector, namely the fact that Appl introduces and assigns an interpretation to what it selects in [Spec, Appl], while a DP in [Spec, TP] is normally moved there does not receive a theta-role from T, and on the other on arbitrary, parametrizable transparency of the PP/KP shell of DPs in these specifiers.

6 Excursus on Case

Some Case is clearly assigned at a distance. C1 has given examples standardly taken in the literature to demonstrate that in Icelandic, nominative and accusative are both assigned at a potentially unbounded distance across ECM TPs, by T and \( v \) respectively. I now put this kind of structural Case aside. Clearly, both nominative and accusative cannot be defaults. They thus do seem to be assigned by T and \( v \) to DPs that bear no Merge relationship to these DPs. One way of seeing this nevertheless as a KP shell around the DP the identity of whose K is determined by the T/\( v \) target of Agree is worked out in Rezac (2003, 2004a: chapter 5). An alternative for these Cases is to differentiate them not according to T/\( v \), but according to a general algorithm that decides the spelled-out case morphology on a DP with such structural Case as a function of its hierarchical relationship to other DPs with this kind of Case in a certain domain: see Marantz (1990), Bobaljik (forthcoming), McFadden (2004).

It is difficult to demonstrate the existence of such Case in Basque, for the study of the limits of movement such as A-scrambling have only begun (particularly Elordieta 2001), and it is not clear what to read into the distance or proximity between a DP and an agreement complex that agrees with it or the lexical predicate that selects it. The only really clear cases are those where a DP agreement controller is in a separate CP from an agreement complex with which it agrees, C1:RAISING, but then the DP also agrees and has case internal to that CP and long-distance Case assignment would not necessarily be expected to overwrite it. I will assume, for simplicity,
that the absolutive in Basque is of this kind, though it could equally be that all absolutive DPs are
in fact Merged under movement in [Spec, v] (Uriagereka 1998: 395), and then the absolutive also
becomes the kind of Merge-assigned Case under discussion. Likewise, simply to develop the
argument in this section, I will assume that the facts of Basque are compatible with the ergative
being only borne by DPs in the (non-thematic) [Spec, T] configuration.

Consider now the general relationship between a head Y and the constituent X Merged to Y
by a trigger on Y. Y may bear theta-assigning relationship to X or not; in the latter case, the
position into which X Merges with Y is formalized by an OCC feature on Y. When Y assigns X
a theta-role it may also require particular formal properties of X through c-selection. The specific
configuration discussed in this chapter has been Appl selecting for an applied object DP in its
specifier contained in a PP headed by a P with specific properties (realized as dative, with a φ-
probe, etc.); I have left it open whether P is best construed as part of the extended functional
projection of the lexical N it contains or not (see NOTE).

Generalizing this, let us say that when Y theta-selects for X, it selects for X contained with a
shell headed by Y', possibly null, possibly an ensemble of formal properties at different positions
above X. The classical way of conceptualizing the Y-Y'/X relationship is c-selection: Y has a
formal property P that specifies the shape of X which Y theta-selects to be Y'. This leaves open
the way that the correspondence between P and Y' is checked. One non-standard approach would
be to see P as a component of Y that is added to X under Merge with Y, so that P ∼ Y', so that
Merge of X with Y copies P/Y' on "top of" X, adding P/Y' as a structural layer above X. A multi-
dominance approach to copying would further reduce this by simply combining X and Y, and
viewing Y' as the automatic realization at spell-out of the P component of Y on X. In either case,
one can think of the Y' portion of X as the realization of a certain part of X, namely that part
determined by P, on X. The result is a Merge that systematically leads to a parallelism between
the functional architecture of DPs Merged to particular clausal heads and the clausal heads
themselves, each Y being partly reflected (through P) reflected as Y' on X: cf. Mahajan (1996),
discussion though along some quite different lines.

Whatever approach is adopted for the imposition of Y' on X by P of Y, there is no reason to
limit it to cases where Y assigns a theta-role to X. That is, where X Merges with Y because of
the OCC property of Y only, and the position into which it Merges is thus a non-thematic one
(the configuration discussed in most of the works just cited), nothing bars a formal c-selectional
relationship between Y and X by which a property P of Y requires the form Y' of X. In concrete
terms, just as in Basque but not in English the DP Merged in [Spec, Appl] must be headed within
a PP headed by P with certain formal properties, the DP Merged in the non-thematic [Spec, TP]
might also be subject to such a requirement to be contained in a PP headed by some P with non-
themtic position is Merged there by movement, so that there is a lower copy that must be
deleted under identity with the copy in [Spec, TP]: will the PP layer be problematic for the
identity requirement between copies in copy-deletion? I will assume that it will not, and see
where this leads.

This possibility leads to a more complete parallelism between elements Merged in thematic
and non-thematic positions. A DP Merged in the former may be bare (or at any rate with an
irrelevant layer) or have PP shells with different P heads and thus different properties such as the
degree of transparency to φ-Agree. In a parallel fashion, a DP Merged in a non-thematic position
may be bare or contained in a PP headed by a specific P with its properties, such as opacity or
transparency to $\varphi$-Agree. The introduction of such a shell is divorced from theta-selection, and a part of c-selection, a conceptually different property of Merge. PP shells and their special properties no longer have anything to do with theta-selection. The only difference that remains is that a shell that a DP bears by virtue of movement to a non-thematic position will vary with the embedding of the DP under different functional architectures, and thus different probes and movement targets, while a shell that a DP bears as a result of selection is not changeable. This, one core structural - inherent distinction, becomes a simple contingent fact about how a DP acquires its shell.

If this proposal is on the right track, there still remains an instance of "structural" Case that is truly different: structural Case assigned at a distance without, such as nominative and accusative under raising vs. ECM structures, without displacement of the DP, so not as the result of Merge in a position local to the category that determines the Case (see C0 for examples). Proposals exist to take approach this using the PP shell mechanism too, without displacement (Rezac 2003, 2004a: chapter 5), but they involve countercyclicity, at least intuitively, and they do not seem convincing.

It is possible now to construe both the thematic dative and the non-thematic ergative in Basque as PPs, headed by different Ps. Implementing the ergative in this fashion leads to a greater degree of parallelism between dative and ergative, and between DD and ED. In particular, in both cases properties of P can be parametrized for the transparency of the DP within the PP, and therefore systematic sensitivity of ED to $\varphi$-features of the DP can be dealt with in the same way as has been done for DD. Although the system proposed here is very different, the emphasis on the parallelism of of ED and DD is a core feature of the approach of Fernández (2001) et seq.

The proposal that PP shells can be assigned to non-thematic positions should create phenomena where it can be verified independently. This seems to occur in the class of constructions known as "Raising to complement of preposition", RCP, studied for English by Postal (1974: 363n7, 1986, 2003: chapter 3), for Irish by McCloskey (1984), Stowell (1989), and for Greek by Joseph (1979, 1990). The flavor of these constructions can be illustrated with English data in (55), involving the $V + P$ combinations count on, rely on, depend on. The issue is the status of the underlined $P + DP$. Interpretively it seems to function as the subject of the following infinitive, and indeed as the data shows, that is the only interpretive requirement on it, and in particular it can be an idiom chunk belonging to the infinitive and even (under some circumstances) the there expletive. This demonstrates that in these cases, DP originates within the infinitival complement of the P on; the DP is not an argument of P, and it does not control PRO. At the same time, $P + DP$ can move as a constituent, as in (55)b. Postal’s conclusion (in generative terms), which I adopt for the sake of the argument, is that the DP originates as the subject of the infinitive, an ECM infinitive, from which it undergoes A-movement to become the object of the preposition.\textsuperscript{41}

(55) a. You can depend on him to do something decent.
b. On which person does Mary rely to dress himself. c. Don’t count on there to be that many supporters in the resistance.

\textsuperscript{41} However, it is worth keeping in mind that the strongest test for $P + DP$ constituency, $wh$-movement, is disjoint from the strongest tests that show that the DP is not an argument of P, those of expletives and idiom chunks. So for this particular data, I am not convinced that there is not an analysis with two structures, on + ECM infinitive and [on + DP] + control infinitive, and no RCP.
d. ?They were counting / depending / relying on close tabs to be kept / *placed on her movements.

e. ?Close tabs were being counted / depended / relied on e; to be kept / *placed on her movements.

Postal (2003: chapter 3, ex. 1; note 1 ex. iii-d; ex. 24a; ex. 25c; ex. 25d)

There is a simple analysis of RCP within the preceding proposal that non-thematic Merge may introduce a PP shell just like thematic Merge can. Verbs like rely on have an ECM infinitival argument and a higher clausal functional head M. M, like v, has a φ-probe and projects a non-thematic specifier, just like v, M Agrees with the DP subject of the ECM infinitive and raises it to [Spec, MP]. The difference with v is that M c-selects that [Spec, MP] be an on PP, and so the raised DP receives a PP shell along any of the specific lines suggested above. Possibly, there is a variant of M that does not induce raising (lacks the OCC feature), and this is itself realized as on. This kind of duality is expected under the intuition that the shell Y’ introduced by Y on X Merged in its specifier is a (partial) copy of Y, the nominal reflex of a clausal functional category, as discussed above and in the references there given.

A quite different, and appealing, analysis is developed by Stowell (1989) for Irish data, analogous to English RCP in relevant respects. The main difference being that English RCP verbs are all transitive and Irish ones are all unaccusative, so that P + DP raises to the matrix [Spec TP], as if the English RCP construction allowed a passive + locative inversion of the type *On Kate was relied to leave (as with all ECM infinitives in Irish, the subject may also get infinitive-internal accusative and stay in-situ).

(56) Tharla dó go minic [e; a beith ar an anás]
    happened to. him often be(-FIN) on poverty
    He often happened to be destitute. (McCloskey 1984: 465)

Stowell's analysis is essentially that the P introduced by the matrix verb selects an ECM infinitive, but attaches to the DP in its specifier; the result is then available to regular raising from the infinitive to matrix [Spec, TP], like Icelandic DPs with quirky theta-related Case (Maling et al. 1985, Sigurðsson 1989).42 In more recent approaches such attachment would presumably occur at spell-out, satisfying the affixal requirements of P, and its result would have to feed further movement. A similar non-constituent movement is posited for regular P + DP movement by Pesetsky (1995: 00) in his cascade analysis of PPs.

Potential RCP examples occur in other languages. In Basque, the verb iritzi ‘think, consider’ takes a dative DP and a small clause predicate. Raising out of the small clause to a non-thematic dative is one possible analysis. However, so are the normal alternatives for such constructions that do not involve the DP originating in the small clause, particularly secondary secondary predication, (I sent) the letter post-dated (cf. Williams 1983, Browning 1989). The same options are available for the perception verb entzun ‘hear’, (57)b, which appears in a structure where its object is an infinitive whose subject has a dative coming from entzun, unlike ikusi ‘see’, with the same structure except that the infinitival subject is absolutive.43 ECM may be the analysis; but it

42 Stowell in fact draws a distinction between Ps and inherent Case K, P constituting a c-command shell around a DP, K adjoining to a DP so that the result is a DP. As discussed in XN, there are no grounds for this distinction, and I uniformly treat inherent Case as PP.

43 Etxepeare (2003) demonstrates that at least when agreement with the object of the infinitive occurs (dizkio), the
has also been argued that perception verb select DP complements containing the infinitive, of the type a man to fix the sink (arrived) (Burzio 1986: 287-304), or a structure where the predicate and the dative are both arguments of the matrix verb.\footnote{Cf. French Je lui croyais une maîtresse dans chaque porte "I believed him.DAT a mistress in each port" (Ruwet 1982: 172).}

\begin{align*}
\text{(57)} & \quad \text{a. Zure lanari}_i \text{ interesgarria d-e-ritz-o}_j \text{-t}_k \text{ pro}_l \\
& \quad \text{your work.DDAT interesting.D X-TM-wconsider-3-1 LERG} \\
& \quad \text{I think your work is interesting. (G; §4.2.3)} \\
\text{b. Mikelek}_i \text{ Jon}_j \text{ [kopla horiek}_k \text{ kantatzen] entzun d-i-(zki)_l-o}_m.
& \quad \text{Mikel.ERG Jon.D verse.ABS singing heard X-√3V-(PL)-3} \\
& \quad \text{Mikel has heard Jon singing these verses. (Etxepare 2003: 186)}
\end{align*}

Examples where a DP receives a PP shell in a non-thematic position are also found outside of the RCP phenomenon. Particularly intriguing are oblique subject of non-finite constructions in many languages, such as dative in Russian, which differ from theta-related Case in that they do not correlate with any particular interpretation of the infinitival subject and thus seem to be a property of the non-finite non-thematic subject position (Davies 1988, Moore and Perlmutter 2000, Sigurðsson 2002). It is tempting to seek a rapprochement between this non-thematic oblique subject associated with a particular non-finite T, and the prepositional complementizer heading the entire infinitive in other languages, as the comparison between the Russian and its English translation in (58) suggests.\footnote{Cf. Ortiz de Urbina's (1989:00) proposal that Case assignment (structural or inherent) to a CP in Basque idea potentiates its own ability to assign ergative to its subject, so obligatory control complements (at least in Basque) are in fact those where a CP cannot get Case. Yet my guess is that the reason here is rather than infinitives that assign ergative have enough functional architecture to be nominal and require Case (cf. Artiagotia 1995).}

\begin{align*}
\text{(58) } & \quad \text{Cvetam zdes' ne rasti} \\
& \quad \text{flowers.DAT here not to.grow} \\
& \quad \text{It's not (in the cards) [for flowers to grow here]. (Moore and Perlmutter 2000: 389)}
\end{align*}

These examples are systematically compatible with either analysis where raising to a non-thematic position assigns a PP shell, or with Stowell's proposal that there is a P/C that attaches to the specifier of its complement.\footnote{The latter analysis for iritzi would give dative to the small clause, realized on its specifier; cf. ekin 'begin', utzi 'let', which take sentential gerunds in the dative.} At this point, the conclusions to be drawn from the original RCP paradigm and its potential extensions alike remain unclear.

---

\footnote{Sagarzazu (1994) reviews earlier observations of the DD, and of leismo, in the Hondarribia area. The first comes not from Hondarribia, but from Larramendi's early eighteenth century mention of DD in Donostia [REF, exact]:}
Indeed, in the earliest written document from the Hondarrubia area, a sermon given by Roque Jacinto de Salazar in 1778 and investigated by Letamendia and Sagarzazu (1992), the sole relevant form fails to lack DD where later it would be present:

Nor-nori-nork sailean aipagarria da [...] adibide bakarra izanagatik, *didate (1)*, Bonaparteren *idiotisme marin* (Bonaparte 1877a, 155) delakoarekin eta egungo hizkeraarekin bat ez datoren. (Letamendia and Sagarzazu 1992:526)

Sagarzazu continues with the nineteenth century observation of the phenomenon by Bonaparte:

La substitution des terminatifs exprimant le régime direct de première ou de second personne, à ceux qui renferment un régime indirect de mêmes personnes plus un régime indirect de troisième, a lieu à Fontarabie et à Lezo, et s'étend le long de la côte jusqu'à Saint Sébastien inclusivement, et même en Biscaye.


After Bonaparte the phenomenon is noticed in the 1920's by Azkue, for Bizkaian, and Bähr, for Hondarrubia. Azkue, in describing what the re-definition of the past tense on the present model (involving loss of class markers) in Lekeitio also happens to mention DD:

Modernement se ha introducido en varios pueblos la sustitución de elementos recipientes de 1.ª y 2.ª persona por pacientes de igual categoría en frases en que figure un dativo fuera del verbo. La juventud de Lekeitio (B[Bizkaian]) usa de locuciones como *geuri emon gaitu*, *niri berak esan nau*, por *geuri emon dezka elo* nos lo ha dado a nosotros; y *niri berak esan duet* a mí me lo ha dicho él. Hace treinta y cinco años nadie conocía allí tales locuciones; y quien estas líneas escribe no tuvo ni noticia de que en parte alguna fuesen conocidas, hasta haberla obtenido de Bonaparte en su Le Verbe basque. (II:539/§770)

miós conterráneos de la nueva generación [...] De *ikusi gaituz* que dicen los jóvenes lequeitanos por 'nos han visto' y aun *emau gaituz* por *mon emon deuskuz* 'nos los han dado', sacan ellos y lo dicen *ikusi gaititzan* por nuestro *ikusi genduzan* 'nos vió', *emon gaititzan por emon euskuzan* 'nos los dieron', que decíamos nosotros. (II:576/§810; my bold)

Seventy years later, Lec-HEE describe the Lekeitio DD as follows:

[For trivalent forms of the transitive auxiliary in the present:] It should be noted that, for the case where the indirect object is first person singular or plural, there are no distinct trivalent forms, but bivalent forms are used instead…
The loss of the original trivalent forms for first person direct objects is characteristic of the Lekeitio variety, and is not found in neighboring varieties such as Ondarroa Gaminde (1988: 247-248), Rotaetxe (1978). For second and third person indirect objects, on the other hand, the distinction has been preserved in Lekeitio. Thus whereas in both ikusi nau 'she saw me' and liburua emon nau 'she gave the book to me' the same (formally bivalent) auxiliary is used, in ikusi saittut 'I saw you' and liburua emon dotzut 'I gave the book to you' different forms of the auxiliary are employed. [Note 32: The (partial) merging between direct and indirect objects is verbal morphology and case marking is a phenomenon known as "selectivism of the coast" which is found in a number of coastal towns as far as Hondarribia on the eastern boundary of Gipuzkoa and Saint Jean de Luz (Donibane-Lohitzune) in Labourd, although Lekeitio appears as an isolated point in presenting it (since it is not found in neighboring towns. This phenomenon has, moreover, different realizations in different varieties.] (p. 124-5)

"Unlike in the present, there are morphologically distinct trivalent forms for a third person singular direct object for all dative persons. ... Although there are distinct trivalent forms for all person combinations (unlike in the present), formally bivalent forms are frequently used when the indirect object is a first person singular or plural. In fact bivalent forms are more frequent than trivalent ones in this case. Most trivalent forms with a first person, singular or plural, dative arguments are very rare, bivalent forms being preferred in this case: Péruk liburua emon estean or (more commonly) Péruk liburua emon naben 'Peru gave me the book'; Péruk liburua emon gaittusen 'Peru gave us the book'; lagonak liburüak emon gaittusen 'our friends gave us the books' (much more common than emon euskunën)." (p. 126-7)

Azkue did make a special investigation of the Hondarribia area, but does not mention the phenomenon. Bähr however, somewhat later, observes it there, along with leismo:


For present day use in the Hondarribia area, there are various sources. These extend also to remarking DD with 1V verbs as well as with 3V ones. Brief but expressive, Artola's (1981) testimony:


Holmer (1964:87n161), unlike the preceding sources, mentions DD for IV verbs as well as with 3V ones. Brief but expressive, Artola's (1981) testimony:

Por iruditzan zait "se me parece". En Fuentarrabia y otras partes ya no se usan ciertas formas con objeto dativo sino que son remplazadas por formas con objeto directo, quizá por no ser distinguidas formalmente las dos construcciones en español. (Holmer 1964:87n161)

Etxaburu (1981) is an important source because of its detail:

Hondarribitarrez, datiboan, DITen ordez NAU esaten da:

Maixaaik esan nau.

Aitak eman nau.

Baiha DIT esaten ez bada ere bere beste lagun guztiaik esaten dira: dizu, dio, digu, dizue, die.]

Nork eman dizu orí?

Baiha, osagarrit datibo askokoa danean nola esan hori? Olatokoei NAU aditz-lagun pertsosaneri ezin sartu dakioko bere askotasun erdiñki edo atzizkiriik. Ezin san datzeke endorengorik:
Aitak eman naitu.
Ba da ori baiño irrereba egokiagorik. Datiboari dagokian a skotasauna sartu ta kito; ZKI erdizkia sartu:
Aitak eman nauzki.
Olañzoteren da Hondarribia'n.
Ta, dit ecan bearraren beti NAU ecaten dalako datiboko aditz lagunaren ordeza makakatiboko pertsonala esteko jorea dagoanik ez dezagun ustel izan. Alderantziera geiago egilen di; aditz pertsonalaren tokian datiboko ordeza geiagotan geratzen da.
Elizan ikusi di jot Jose'ri. (Etxaburu 1981:308)

He continues with a list of Gipuzkoan-to-Hondarribian examples, among which are importantly examples of DD in both 3V and 1V', and of leismo (p. 309; my bold):

gipuzkeraz
Zure aitak dirua eman naitu. Zure aitak dirua eman nauzki.
Biar laranjaz etarrez gatuzte.
Zuri ere emango dizu dirua.
Elizan ikusi det Jose'bu.
Txakoliña gastatzen al zaizi?
Bai, neri gustatzen zait baiña nere aitonari ez zaio gustatzen

hondarrabiatarrez
Zure aitak dirua eman nauzki.
Biar laranjak ekarri dizkit.
Zuri ere emango dizu dirua.
Elizan ikusi di jot Jose'ri.
Txakoliña gustatzen dizu?
Bai, neri gustatzen nau baixa nere aitonari ez dio gustatzen.

And reviewing the current usage after considering the historical sources, Letamendia and Sagarzazu say:

Egun Hondarri bia deka joka hori erakusketa hori ez. Nor-nori-nork sailean [...] niri denean izan ezik: naké nan, nau, razi, razi, naitu(na)ziki(ako), naitu(na)ziki, naitu(na)ziki, naitu(na)ziki, hrina naké nan, náu, nazú, nazú, eta (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak, (u)zkitak. Eta eman gattu, esan gattu izan da, batez ere, hizkera dotoreagoea eginahi denean. Nor-nork sailean, arrunta dako nor-nori-nork-eko adizkiak erabiltzea osagarri zuzena zeharkakoa bilakatzen dela, nik iri eman nikén ('nik hina hainduan'). (Letamendia and Sagarzazu 1992:528).


Yrizar, in his 1981 dialectology summary and in introducing ten years later the Labourdin volume where DD finds its greatest expansion and arguably its origin for the "northern group" of St. Jean de Luz - Irún - Hermani, describes thus the results of Lucien Bonaparte's research on the phenomenon in the nineteenth century, and the various forms the phenomenon can take:

Sustitución de la forma correcta de objeto indirect (del tipo dit) por la de objeto directo correspondiente (del tipo nau), es decir, empleo de nau con el significado impropio "él me lo ha" (además del suyo propio "el me ha"); este uso da lugar a expresiones incorrectas, tales como esan nau (en lugar de esan dit) "él me lo ha dicho".

[...]
El Principe [Bonaparte] encontró esta confusión, no sólo en la variedad de San Juan de Luz, como dice en su Verbe basque [Notas del reverso del cuaderno suplementario], sino también en la de Ainhoa [man. 51 y man. 53]; en las localidades de Ahetze, S. Pée [man. 51 y man. 53], Zugarramurdi [man. 54] y Urdax [man. 53], pertenecientes a la variedad de Sara, y en la población de Bassussarry [man. 52], de la variedad también labortana como las anteriores, de Arcangues; así como también en la población de Fuenterrabía (6), perteneciente a la variedad irunesa del altounavo septentrional.

Por las indicaciones de las notas manuscritas de la colección Bonaparte referentes a los citados pueblos, se ve que el Principe buscaba deliberadamente en ellos "la faute de nau", como él la llamaba.

De estos pueblos, en algunos las formas de tipo nau (en su empleo incorrecto, con función de objeto indirecto "él me lo ha"), coexisten con las formas correctas de tipo deak o dit. En otros pueblos sólo conocen las incorrectas de tipo nau. Esto puede verse parcialmente en las variantes de las formas labortanas y de la variedad irunesa (dialecto
que publicamos en el presente trabajo; pero podrá apreciarse en toda su amplitud, cuando expongamos in extenso las
conjugariones de estos pueblos.

Son curiosísimas las insólitas e incorrectas flexiones de objeto plural, de San Juan de Luz, nauzki (formas
alocutivas, masculina naizkik, y femenina naizkín) "él me los ha", formadas sobre las también incorrectas de objeto
singular nau (naik y nain) "él me lo ha".

Las formas correspondientes de Ainhoa, en el mismo orden anterior, son las siguientes: dauzkit correcta
(alocutivas, niaizkik niaizkik, ambas incorrectas); daut, correcta, y nau. incorrecta en este sentido, las dos en uso
según Bonaparte (alocutivas, niaik y niai, ambas incorrectas). (Y-Dial-II-359f.)

En cuanto a la situación hace medio siglo, tenemos, respecto al caso A [DD], el valioso testimonio de Odón de
Apraiz, quien, al recoger los datos para el "Erizkizundi" [mun. (cuaderno de S. J. de Juz; anotación al pie de la
página 15)], anotó en San Juan de Luz: "erraten zaitut (sic), ekartzzen zaitut (sic)", y agrega "Ya me advirtió M.
Abbé Belleuze que en Doniane confunden a este efecto el directo zaitut con el indirecto daizut, que se distinguen
bien, por ejemplo, en Sura, pero no en Urruña ni Ainhoa ni Arangatze. También en Hendaya me dijo persona de St.
Péc: eres eñabuko zaitut". [...] Ello confirma que, al menos en lo esencial, la situación continuaba siendo semejante
da la que Bonaparte había registrado. (Y-Dial-II-360)

Veamos ahora la situación actual [...] Los datos proporcionados por nuestros colaboradores de Jan Jaun de Luz,
Urrugne, Guéthary, Ascain y Zugarramurdi confirman la permanencia del fenómeno señalado por Bonaparte, según
se indica en el cuadro:

|         | "él me lo ha" | "él me los ha"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indef.</td>
<td>aloc. masc. indef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. J. de Luz</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>naik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urrugne</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>naik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guéthary</td>
<td>daut</td>
<td>naik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascain</td>
<td>daut</td>
<td>nauzki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zugarramurdi nau</td>
<td>nau</td>
<td>naik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Como en los tiempos del Príncipe, en algunos casos se entremezclan las flexiones correctas de "doble régimen",
con intervención del dativo (daut, dauzkit), con las típicas de la zona, de "un régimen", acusativo (nau, naik; nauzki,
nai(j)zik). Es curioso observar que las diez flexiones allocutivas corresponden a la formación "típica", mientras que en
las flexiones indefinidas hay casos de formación "correcta" (daut, dauzkit) junto a otros de formación "típica" (nau,
nauzkit). Esto ocurrió también en tiempo de Bonaparte, quien da, para Ainhoa: nau y daut (aloc. masc. niaizkik).

Parece como si la tendencia popular, reflejada principalmente en las flexiones allocutivas, imposara el empleo
de las formas "típicas", mientras existe una posible influencia cultural (predicación, prensa, literatura) más sensible
sobre las flexiones indefinidas. Por lo que veremos después, esta indicación no concuerda con los datos de Báhr
referentes a Irún y Fuenterabía.

Advertiremos también que, aunque en las notas del Príncipe se señala en forma muy destacada, para muchos
pueblos de esta zona, el empleo de formas de la serie nau (con el significado impropio de "él me lo ha"), de spues, en
las conjugaciones de algunos de ellos, se dan únicamente las formas de la serie daut.

Las formas verbales correspondientes proporcionadas por nuestros colaboradores de Ahetze, Bidart y Urdax,
pertenecen en su totalidad a la serie daut.

En las notas de Bonaparte referentes a Fuenterabía pone, en grandes caracteres y con triple subrayado, nau.
Con ello quiere llamar la atención sobre el incorrecto empleo de esta serie.

La situación para Irún y Fuenterabía medio siglo después, según los datos de Báhr, quede reflejada en el
quadro adjunto:

|         | "él me lo ha" | "él me los ha"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indef.</td>
<td>aloc. masc. indef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irún    dút, nau</td>
<td>zirak</td>
<td>tit, nazki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenterabía dút, nau</td>
<td>zia</td>
<td>tit, nazki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Por otra parte, podemos, gracia a la excelente información que nos ha enviado Eusebio Erquiaga, señalar, dentro del dialecto vizcaíno (en el que, más adelante, veremos otros empleos también incorrectos, pero de sentido opuesto), un reciente brote del uso de las formas de la serie nau, en casos en los que las correctas serían las de la serie desast, doet (formas correspondientes, en vizcaíno, a la habitaria, antes considerada, daet). Los datos de Erquiaga referentes a este fenómeno, correspondientes al habla de Lequeitío, son los siguientes (las indicaciones "oker nabarmen" son de Erquiaga):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICADO</th>
<th>FLEX. PROPIAS FLEXIONES IMPROPIAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él me lo ha&quot; (indef.)</td>
<td>desast, doet nau (gasteek) &quot;oker nabarmen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él me los ha&quot; (indef.)</td>
<td>deustaz, dostaz nitsu (nitsu) (gasteek) &quot;oker nabarmen&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finalmente, queremos mencionar aquí una curiosa forma que recogió, hace algo mas de medio siglo, el P. Dámaso de Inza, en Bacáicoa e Iurumendi [Inza. - Burunda, pp. 19-20]: geru (por digiu) "él nos lo ha" y geuzku (por dizkigu) "él nos los ha". En este caso lo curioso es que no se hayan tomado las formas correspondientes a un solo régimen "él nos ha", ya que con este significado, anotó Inza gaitu.

Correspondientes a geru y geuzku, recogió, en Olazagutía y Ciordia, dezku y dezkiu; en Alsasua, dezgu y dezkiu, y en Urdiáin, deu y deuzkiu. Anotó la forma gaitu como común a los seis pueblos.

Resulta digno de ser señalado que, en el momento actual, en Urdiáin, según nos comunica J. M. Satrústegui, emplean una misma forma verbal, geau, con los dos sentidos "él nos lo ha" y "él nos has"; a ella corresponde, como forma con objeto directo en plural, geauzku, "él nos los ha".

Hemos considerado interesante reunir en un cuadro las citadas formas verbales de Bacáicoa e Iurumendi y las de Urdiáin (1922 y 1976):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urdiáin</th>
<th>Bacáicoa e Iurumendi 1922</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él nos lo ha&quot;</td>
<td>geru</td>
<td>deu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él nos los ha&quot;</td>
<td>geuzku</td>
<td>deuzkiu geauzku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él nos ha&quot;</td>
<td>gaitu</td>
<td>geau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Es curioso poner de relieve que, en Echarri-Aranaz, las flexiones con agente de 2.ª persona son de una estructura semejante a las de Urdiáin (1976): giezku, con los dos significados "Ud. nos lo ha" y "Ud. los ha", de los cuales el propio es el segundo, y gizkiezu "Ud. nos los ha", minuter que las flexiones con agente de 3.ª persona son duu z ku, con los dos significados "él nos lo ha" y "él nos ha", de los cuales el propio es aquí el primero —en lo que difiere esencialmente de las correspondientes de Urdiáin (1976), consignadas en el cuadro -- y duuzkiu "él nos los ha". (Y-Dial-II-361f.)

En el dialecto labortano, presenta especial interés el fenómeno que Bonaparte denominaba 'la faute de nau' (o simplemente nau entre dos aspas; a veces, en lugar de nau, se anotó nazii), expresión con la que designaba la sustitución de la forma correcta de objeto indirecto (del tipo, dit, daut), por la de objeto directo correspondiente (del tipo nau), es decir, el empleo de nau con el significado impropio 'él me lo ha' (además de con el suyo propio, 'él me ha'); este uso daría lugar a expresiones incorrectas, tales como esan nau (en lugar de esan dit), 'él me lo ha dicho'.

Bonaparte buscaba deliberadamente la existencia de esta sustitución en los pueblos que exploraba. En su Verbe basque (nota 3) del reverso del 'Dixième tableau supplémentaire montrant la conjugaison indéfinie du verbe haut-navarro méridional les variantes exceptées), señaló la presencia de este fenómeno en la variedad de San Juan de Luz, pero también la encontró en la localidad de Ainhoa, única representante de la variedad de este nombre (Man. 51 y Man. 70); en Sare, Ahetze, Saint-Pée (Man. 51, los tres pueblos), Zugarramurdi (Man. 54) y Urdax (Man. 55), qu integran la variedad de Sare, y en Bassussarry y Araba, de la variedad de este nombre (Man. 51 y Man. 52). Fuera del dialecto labortano, registró también estas formas en Fuentarrabía (Man. 56), del dialecto alto-navarro septentrional. Bähr las anotó en Irún y Fuenterrabía.

Erquiaga me comunicó que en Lequeitío (dialecto vizcaíno), los jóvenes empleaban -- 'oker nabarmen', señalaba -- nau por deast, doet, y nitsu (nitsu) or deustaz, doetast. A todo ello, así como a estos usos en las variedades guipuzcoanas de Burunda y Echarri-Aranaz, nos hemos referido en nuestra Contribución a la dialectología de la lengua vasca (t. II, pp. 359-362). Agreguemos aquí, que se han encontrado estas formas en Baztán, como se verá en los lugares correspondientes.
En nuestro citado Contribución, publicamos un cuadro (designado allí como Cuadro 4.1, t. II, p. 262) que hemos considerado conveniente reproducir aquí.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significado</th>
<th>V. Sare</th>
<th>V. Ainhoa</th>
<th>V. S. J. de Luz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él me lo ha&quot; (indefinido)</td>
<td>doit, daut (nau)</td>
<td>(nau), daut</td>
<td>(nau), daut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él me lo ha&quot; (alloc. masc.)</td>
<td>zuotak, zuatak</td>
<td>(niaik)</td>
<td>(naik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;él me lo ha&quot; (alloc. fem.)</td>
<td>zootan, zuutan</td>
<td>(nian)</td>
<td>(nain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ellos me han&quot; (indef.)</td>
<td>nauite</td>
<td>nauite</td>
<td>nauite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ellos me han&quot; (alloc. masc.)</td>
<td>nautek</td>
<td>naiitek</td>
<td>naitek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ellos me han&quot; (alloc. fem.)</td>
<td>nauten</td>
<td>naiine</td>
<td>naiten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ellos se los han (a ellos)&quot; (indef.)</td>
<td>diezkate</td>
<td>diotzate</td>
<td>diozkate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ellos se los han (a ellos)&quot; (alloc. masc.)</td>
<td>ziozkaten</td>
<td>ziotzatek</td>
<td>ziozkatek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ellos se los han (a ellos)&quot; (alloc. fem.)</td>
<td>ziozkaten</td>
<td>ziotzane</td>
<td>ziozkaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;vosotros lo habéis&quot;</td>
<td>(d)uzue</td>
<td>duzue</td>
<td>duzube</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los datos son todos de Bonaparte, por lo que las formas de las 10 flexiones seleccionadas, correspondientes a las variedades de Sare, Ainhoa, San Juan de Luz y Arcangues, son las que se utilizaban en esas variedades a mediados del siglo XIX.

Creo que en ellas se destacan diferencias que, junto a otras, pudieron servir al príncipe para fundamentar su visión del dialecto labortano en variedades. Las formas anotadas para cada una de éstas, son las de los pueblos que dan nombre a las variedades, excepto las nautie, naute y naive de la última columna, que son de Arbonne, por no haberse encontrado en los manuscritos de Bonaparte las formas de Arcangues.

En las tres primeras flexiones, puede apreciarse el empleo, ya en aquella época, de las flexiones bipersonales en sustitución de las correspondientes tripersonales, sustitución esta que, según hemos señalado, tenía también lugar en otros pueblos, tal como indicaba Bonaparte en diversos manuscritos, antes mencionados.

Las formas allocutivas correspondientes a 'ellos me han', permiten apreciar notables diferencias entre las formas que se empleaban en las distintas variedades.

En las correspondientes a "ellos se los han (a ellos)" se encuentran dos tipos de pluralizaciones, de las cuales actualmente está prácticamente desaparecida la pluralización en -tze-, que es sustituida por la en -tza-.

En la última línea, "vosotros lo habéis", ha dejado de usarse las formas verbales en -ube, sustituidas por las generales en -ue.

Lógicamente no podemos extendernos aquí en consideraciones, pero sí estimamos interesante referirnos a un fenómeno, en el que se manifieste la aptitud del euskaldún para crear las formas verbales que le resultan necesarias para concretar su pensamiento.

Así, cuando emplea nau (en sustitución de daut) con el significado "él me lo ha", para un sólo objeto y desear expresar esta misma idea, pero con varios objetos, es decir, "él me los ha", crea la forma verbal nauzki, con una pluralidad análoga a la de daztak, respecto a daut. Pero no en todos los casos ha empleado en vascohablante este tipo de pluralización, así en las formas de Lequeiti antes señaladas, ha creado, a partir de nau, la forma niztu, como ditut de daztak. Curiosamente este mismo tipo de pluralización lo encontramos en Arizun (Baztán), donde a partir de nauk (en sustitución de datak), con el significado de "tú me lo has", ha formado niztuk (en sustitución de diztak) con el significado "tú me los has". (Y-L-177)

Lafitte also notes it for Labourdien. The last form, goitzala, formally 3.S>1.P (DD for 3.S>1.P>3.S) subjunctive of the auxiliary formed with the regular use for this function, -ezan, is rather interesting. DD exists at a colloquial level of speech, and typically this level in these dialects has lost much in the way of complex tense formations, synthetic verbs, etc., particularly in the case of formations with 1st/2nd person objects (e.g.: Pasaia, ALO; Oiarzun, F&F; Lekeitio, HEE; Errenteria, AI). However, goitzala is not unique in the documents on DD; Fernández (2000:153) points out that in Lekeitio DD is even available in the imperative, hurreratu nazu, which is formally present subjunctive regularly used as 1st person imperative. Camíño (Abiaburu bat..., §4.10.9) gives the formally indicative eman naskitu giztak for "eman lezakizi guiztak".

Le solécisme de la côte. — Les Labourdins de la côte confondent souvent nau et dau, hau et dauk, goitau et dauka, c'est-à-dire qu'ils prennent les compléments direct d'objet au sens de complément-datif. C'est une grosse erreur. Il faut dire: ogia ekharri dau 'Il m'a porté le plain'. Jamais ogia ekharri nau.
 Ils vont jusqu'à introduire la marque du pluriel, et nous avons relevé des formes comme: bi ogiak ekharri nauzate, 'ils m'ont porté les deux pains', au lieu de: ekharri dauzkidate.

Ces formes sont curieuses, mais il y a lieu de les écarter comme contraires au courant général de la langue basque. (Lafitte, p. 296)

Eviter ici aussi le solécisme de la côte. Ex.: Ne pas dire igor gaitzada ogia, au lieu de: igor diezagula, 'qu'il nous envoie le pain'. (Lafitte, p. 307)

In extolling the virtues of the Gipuzkoan dialect: "En San Sebastián se ha introducido el abuso de confundir dos relaciones transitivas del verbo activo, y por decir esango didazu, dicen ridículamente esango nauz dirasme, como si el me del Castellano fuem acusativo como en maturasme".

Cf. also:

(i) ... perstona MARABILLOSO /A bat inditzen nauz...

... you seem to me a marvelous person...


"Zailagoa dirudi azaltzeak zergatik gailentzen zaion DD estrategia ELri Mayiren gramatikan." Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2002.

Investigations confirms the result in more contexts, e.g. (*Kepari) lagunari ikusi diot 'I saw Kepa's friend'.

Put particularly perspicuously by Fernández and Ezeizabarrena: "Badirudi, hortaz, badagoela Lekualdatze fenomeno orokorr batez hitz egitea, ED zein DD besarkatzen dituena, hain zuzen, eta baldintza sintakiko berbenak betetzen dituena, hau da: i. ABS argumentua hirugarren perstonakoa izatea, eta ii. ABSz gorako argumentua, alegia, DAT eta ERG, lehen edota bigarren perstonakoak izatea. Lekualdatze orokorra kasua eta komunzadura bereiztearen adierazgarri bat gehiago legez agertzen zaigu, kontuan izanez gero bere bi ezaugarri nagusiak: komunzadura bitxia eta komunzadura murrizketa, biak, ohiko eran kasuz markatutako argumentuekin."
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Annex to chapter 3

1 Leismo in the Y corpus


-Complete leismo with no non-leismo in the three forms, dire, zirek, direte (v. Lizaso (HNn) - l. Berasain).
-Both leismo and non-leismo in all three forms, daat/nu, diak/nik, daate/nute (v. Baaigorry (LNw) - l. St. Etienne-de-Baigorry).
-The allocutive form singled out for leismo nau, ziaq, naute (v. Huarte-Araquil (HNn) - l. Echarri (Larráun)), or for non-leismo, dit/nau, niakk, diate/nute (v. Irun (HNn) - l. Arano).
-The 3.S > 1.S form non-allocutive for leismo, dost/nau, yeustak, deste (B - v. Arrigorriaga - l. Arrigorriaga), or for non-leismo nau, zik/nik, dubie/naube (G - Burunda - Unanua), etc.

The potential factors that could create patterns of leismo are φ-features of the affected O1, of the ergative, of the allocutive, and the value of tense. Among these, there are patterns that depend on φ-features of O1, on the presence/absence of 3rd person ergative, and on the value of tense, but not on the φ-features of ergative as such; I do not consider the allocutive. This inquiry is limited to the Y corpus, which generally does not indicate leismo for 3rd persons even if available, for leismo is restricted to humans, and the goal of the Y corpus is to indicate the range of agreement forms available to a speaker; hence if non-leismo 3rd person forms are available, it is these that occur. Dialects without leismo are not given here.

Beginning with O1-based patterns, the following tables classify the leismo dialects in each of the 2VPr and 2VPt sub-paradigms as was done for DL in XN.

* The dialect has lacuna(e) in the columnar paradigm in which it is listed.
‡ The dialect has lacuna(e) outside the columnar paradigm in which it is listed (sometimes because O2.PL or past info is missing entirely).
+ The dialect had DL instances outside the DAT-values (rows) where it is listed within the columnar paradigm where it is listed (not applicable where all DAT-values (rows) for a particular columnar paradigm are given as a subtable) (Not applicable to Full Leismo groups)
Bold The dialect has NO DL outside the DAT-values (rows) where it is listed in its entire set of (3V) paradigms, so the rows can be viewed as absolute statement about what DAT-values permit DL. (For the Full Leismo group, used when the dialect has full leismo in the other sub-paradigm than the one under which it is listed).

TABLE: Full leismo

Full leismo only:

Full leismo, and some or all non-leismo as well:

TABLE: O1-based leismo patterns

NB: NL mean non-leismo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leismo</th>
<th>2V present</th>
<th>2V past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2RG, also (some) NL</td>
<td>HNn-Ir-OIR:A1, HNn-Ir-pV:A, G-Bu-A:O1, G-Bu-A:O2; 2VPt: G-Bu-A:O3 (+ one lacuna), HNn-Ir-HM:A</td>
<td>G-Bu-O:O, G-Bu-A:O1, G-Bu-A:O2; 2VPt: G-Bu-A:O3 (+ one lacuna), HNn-Ir-HM:A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2RG, no NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL, also (some) NL</td>
<td>L-E-pL:A, L-E-pAz:A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL, no NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2RG/PL, no NL</td>
<td>G-H-nePS:ALO, G-H-nePD:ALO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2. PL, no NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG, 1/2. PL, + (some) NL</td>
<td>L-E-pL:A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL, 2RG/PL, no NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL, 2/3. PL, no NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG, 2RG, no NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One may also investigate whether there are ERG-based patterns among dialects with O1-based patterns. For dialects with without a + in TABLES, the O1-based patterns given are the only cases of leismo in a sub-paradigm, and thus there are no ERG-based patterns since for the remaining O1's there are lacunae for any ERG. Dialects with + also have leismo elsewhere in the same sub-paradigm, and these could potentially create an ERG-based pattern. I exclude on the one hand cases where there are too many lacunae (2VPr EpGarAJ), and on the other those where there is but one instance of non-leismo in a subparadigm (2VPr G-H-nePS:ALO, G-H-nePD:ALO, G-Bu-A:O3, G-Bu-A:O1, G-Bu-A:O2; 2VPt: G-Bu-A:O3 (+ one lacuna), HNn-Ir-HM:A). There are some ERG-based patterns; those dialects are in bold. G-EA-p:Y is not convincing, but that leaves 2VPr G-EA-p:pl (3.SG/PL.ERG), L-E-p:pl:A (3.SG.ERG), and 2VPt HNn-Ir-H:Br (3.PL.ERG), L-E-p:pl:E (3.SG.ERG). Clearly the ERG-based patterns are quantitatively poorer than O1-based patterns, and qualitatively they point to the generalization that 3.SG/PL.ERG favours leismo, rather than that φ-features of the ergative in general create patterns of leismo. The remaining dialects, in TABLE, have no O1-based pattern, and except for L-E-L:PIA for 3.SG.ERG, they have no 2VPr ERG-based pattern either:

NOTE: In the following sub-paradigms, the six columns are the ergative values 3.SG, 3.PL, 1.SG, 1.PL, 2R, 2.PL, and the four rows are the O1 values 1.SG, 1.PL, 2R, 2.PL; + indicates leismo, - its absence, X an impossible combination, and 0 a lacuna.
TABLE: ERG-based leismo patterns in 2VPt of dialects with O1-based patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-Bu-</th>
<th>G-Bu-</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-</th>
<th>HNn-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>G-EA-</th>
<th>G-EA-</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>G-Bu-</th>
<th>G-Bu-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

++XX++ ++XX++ --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++
--XX00 --XX00 --XX-- --XX-- ++XX-- ++XX-- ++XX-- ++XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX--
000+0XX 00+0XX ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++

TABLE: ERG-based leismo patterns in 2VPt of dialects with O1-based patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-H-</th>
<th>L-S-</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-</th>
<th>G-Bu-</th>
<th>HNn-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>HNn-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
++XX++ ++XX++ --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- ++XX++ ++XX++ ++XX++
--XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX-- --XX--
++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX ++++XX

TABLE: Leismo in dialects with no O1-based pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O1</th>
<th>2VPt</th>
<th>2VPt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.S</td>
<td>HNn-Ir-R:A*‡</td>
<td>G-EA-p:G*‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0-0</td>
<td>-0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000</td>
<td>00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.P</th>
<th>G-Bu-A:I*‡</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-OI:Al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>--XX--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>--XX--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2R</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>L-E-</th>
<th>pAr:Go*‡</th>
<th>pAz:t:G*‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000</td>
<td>00000</td>
<td>00000</td>
<td>00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2P</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-pL*‡</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-RA*‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2R/P</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-RL G-H-neA:E‡</th>
<th>HNn-Ir-pO*‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
<td>00XX0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
ERG/DAT based patterns of leismo may then be summarized as follows. There are clear O1-based patterns, with 2\textsuperscript{nd} person favoured, but no necessarily implications as in DL where 2\textsuperscript{nd} person DL implies 1\textsuperscript{st} person. There seem to be no ERG-based patterns as such; however, there are some 3.SG/PL.ERG-based patterns, where 3.SG, 3.PL, or 3.SG/PL.ERG favours leismo. I return to these after discussing the role of tense, for I will suggest it is a morphological effect.

The remaining parameter to investigate is tense. Leismo is strongly favoured in the past tense, as Y-Dalal-H-366 observes (like other anomalies, he says, yet this is not true of DL). In fact, there is no dialect where leismo in the present outnumbers leismo in the past, although there are cases where it happens in different ERG-O1 combinations in the two tenses.
systematic patterns of the syntactic features of tense are in fact arbitrary patterns about the attachment properties of the tense morpheme, that seem systematic because there is a one-to-one correlation between present and the morpheme $\emptyset$ and past and $n$. The same story could be told about 3.SG/PL ergatives favouring leismo, these being precisely those that lack person and thus correlate person agreement morphology. Since the ergative is Merged in [Spec, vP], and the primary locus of parametrization for leismo is either $v$ or Appl, it would be possible to have the one influence the other through selection, but this would not explain the lack of patterns genuine based on the $\phi$-feature of the ergative, e.g. 1.SG.

As with DL, there are arbitrary gaps in leismo, into whose coding enters ERG, DAT, and tense. These occur at points where the expected forms do exist in the 3VS paradigm under the $\mathcal{O}l\mathcal{O}'$ mapping: so leismo 2VPt $2.P>1.S$ is identical to non-DL 3V $2.P>1.S+>3.S$. In general, leismo and 3V forms always use the same principles of formation: an important contrast with DL, where 3V DL and 2V paradigms end up with the same agreement complex forms only accidentally when the applicative and SX morphology happens not to surface (CHAPTER 3B).

Yet 2V leismo and 3VS forms are not always identical, indicating that there are syntactic differences between the two that can lead to different spell-out: an obvious one is the presence of O2 in applicative transitive but not in simple transitive even under leismo.

Close identity for leismo and 3VS holds the dialects in TABLE for each of the 2VPr, 2VPt sub-paradigms. Cases of minor phonological variation, such as $V$$-gu$ - $V$-$u$ or differential realization of a glide like $zezuwein$ - $zezubein$, if independently occurring in the dialect under question, are without given annotation. * marks cases where a morpheme is used that is different from the corresponding 3V form but that is found elsewhere in the dialect, e.g. 1.S.D $da'[ra]a$, past $-an/en$, or 2RG.DAT $zu+3.PL$.ergRG $te > zute/zia$.

TABLE: Leismo-3VS identical under ABS-DAT mapping: # of dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1 All 1.SG has leismo and $=3V$, except anomalous 3.S.E- $diz$ vs. regular 3V $diata$.
2 All 1.SG has leismo and $=3V$, except anomalous 3.P-E $du$ vs. regular 3V $dua$.
3 Leismo 3.S.P-E $zialen$ vs. 3.S $zian$, $zialen$; $ra$ as expression has no other parallel in the dialect.
4 Beside full 1.SA leismo which corresponds to a subset of available 3V forms, there is the strange form 3.P.E-1.SA $ziteken$ (by regular leismo).
5 L-B-An:IA 2V leismo $[daiku]||[da[	ext{i]ku}]||[da[	ext{kue}]][[da[	ext{zu}u]gu]]$ vs. 3V $[da[	ext{kue}]],[[da[	ext{zu}]gu]]$ involving different recombinations of the variant $data(+)gu$ -- $daku$ for stem+1.P.D.
There are however numerous divergences beyond the limits established for the above table, when leismo 2V uses a form that neither equals a 3VS form (within the limits of normal phonological variation), nor can be obtained from other 3V forms by combining independently attested morphological pieces. These are given below, classified by the type of divergence; "minor divergences" are such that they cannot be used for much.

TABLE: Leismo - 3V divergences in present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td>G-H-nePD: ALO, G-H-nePS: ALO, HNn-Ir-H:Bra*</td>
<td>[duuzube]</td>
<td>[daziube]</td>
<td>[daziubet]</td>
<td>[daziub]</td>
<td>[daziube]</td>
<td>[daziubet]</td>
<td>[daziub]</td>
<td>[daziube]</td>
<td>[daziubet]</td>
<td>[daziub]</td>
<td>[daziube]</td>
<td>[daziubet]</td>
<td>[daziub]</td>
<td>[daziube]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HNn-Ir-H:Br</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HNn-Ir-H:S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HNn-Ir-H:Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G-Bu-A:G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G-Bu-U:G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>HNn-Ir-H:S</td>
<td>[digo]</td>
<td>[diluz}</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
<td>[diluz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td>EpGarAJ</td>
<td>[dat]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
<td>[datete]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Gipuzkoan B* dialects have particularly many divergences between leismo 2V and 3V paradigms; I give G-Bu-A:O1 and G-Bu-A:O2 in full, and just the list of divergences for the remaining dialects:

TABLE: Present of G-Bu-A:O1 (A), G-Bu-A:O2 (I) (non-leismo in brackets)

TABLE: Past of G-Bu-A:O1 (A), G-Bu-A:O2 (I) (non-leismo in brackets)

15 Presumably ziagu = (d-i)-zi-a-gu; with 2.P.E zi-a found elsewhere in the paradigm (e.g. 2.P.E-3.S.A dízi-a). The anomalous DAT-ERG affix order is partly paralleled by the corresponding 3V d-i-z-i-te, where 2.P.E zi and te are discontinuous around u = gu.
16 In all but the anomalous form, 2.P.D tzue + 3.P.E te are neutralized into tzue.
Unlike for DL, I do not intend to embark on an analysis of these divergences in detail. The most intriguing and telling divergences are those that involve cases where EL is suspended in 2V leismo by comparison to the 3V forms, and the perhaps related use of present initial d for past z (CHAPTER 2). It seems to me possible that this reflects the loss of the productivity of overt theme marker morphology (see CHAPTER 2 for analysis), so the leismo 2V forms would be innovative with respect to 3V forms and make use of productive morphological resources, leading to the differences: one may compare the loss of class markers in the creation of DL forms noted in CHAPTER 3B for e.g. the Oñate dialect group. Indications of the same direction of divergence can be found in the rest of the divergences, e.g. G-Bu-A:O2 3.S>2.P dezuwei for 3V duei (missing zu); but this certainly does not account for all the cases. This use of productive morphology to code a new syntactic input, that is, insertion of extant morphemes in new contexts compatible with their features by the subset principle. Beyond this, space must be left for idiosyncratic lexicalization, that presumably reflects among other things the spread of leismo from dialect to dialect importing new forms.

The spell-out of leismo 2V forms places boundary conditions on the treatment of both them and the morphology of 3V forms. One the one hand, leismo 2V and 3V forms must be differentiable, for example by the presence or properties of 2. On the other hand, the prevalent, systematic use of the same spell-out for leismo 2V and 3V forms, means that morphemes found in 3V forms must be able to be inserted in 2V forms, including the applicative and SX morphology.