Differential object marking in Basque varieties[1]

Beatriz Fernández (UPV-EHU) and Milan Rezac (CNRS-IKER UMR 5478)
beatriz.fernandezf@ehu.es   *milan_rezac@iker.cnrs.fr*

Abstract: This chapter studies Differential Object Marking (DOM) in nonstandard varieties of Basque. DOM in Basque overtly resembles a common DOM pattern of coding direct as indirect objects in both case and agreement, that is absolutives as datives, according to their animacy and specificity, as in Spanish and Hindi-Urdu. However, Basque DOM is also sensitive to properties of the clause such as tense. In both respects, there is variation across Basque. Some varieties let us probe the nature of DOM datives, and reveal systematic patterning with non-DOM absolutives rather than with indirect object datives. This includes robust diagnostics for structural Case, such as ECM and absolutive-dative alternations. We propose a structural Agree/Case mechanism for DOM datives that brings out their relationship to absolutives and allows sensitivity to properties of both the object and the clause.

1   Introduction

Under certain conditions, nonstandard varieties of Basque code objects of transitives as dative rather than as the canonical absolutive. The phenomenon belongs to the family of constructions studied in the typological literature as *Differential Object Marking* (DOM). In Basque, the morphology of DOM has been described in dialectological studies, but syntactic inquiry is only at its beginning (Rezac 2006, Fernández and Rezac 2010, Mounole 2012 and Odria 2012, 2014, in progress, among others). In this chapter, we investigate syntactic differences between absolutive and dative coding of objects. The study leads us to three conclusions.

First, DOM objects are *direct objects*: they have same thematic and argumental relations as canonical absolutive objects, and not those of dative indirect objects; in particular, they do not use applicative or prepositional structures. In this they contrast with dative internal arguments of bivalent unergatives, which are dative indirect objects.

Second, the dative of objects under DOM reflects a *structural Case*: it is independent of argumenthood relations and so available for Exceptional Case Marking. More tentatively, like structural Case bearers and unlike inherent datives, DOM objects need to be licensed by Agree with a clausal locus.

Third, Basque DOM is parametrizable by tense and finiteness/agreement. This supports the structural Case analysis because these never play a role in the inherent Case of internal arguments. On this score, Basque DOM differs from most nearly comparable phenomena, such as Spanish and Hindi-Urdu DOM. In Basque, the dative versus absolutive coding of objects has access to the features of T+v as well as those of the object.

We propose a theory of DOM Agree/Case that fits these results: dative and absolutive codings are both due to Agree with v, differentiated by a property of v that is reflected as dative case/agreement and may involve object shift, and sensitive to any material in the Basque agreement complex which involves a complex head formation from v to Fin.

The chapter is organized as follows. First, we briefly present the general properties of DOM and its theoretical analysis with Spanish *leísmo* and *a*-marking as well as Hindi *ko*-marking. Second, we describe the morphology of Basque DOM and delimit its parametric variation across Basque varieties, as we presently understand it. Third, we study its syntax, which leads us to the foregoing conclusions, building on Fernández and Rezac (2010) and Odria (2012).

2   Differential object marking (DOM)

In Basque, objects of plain transitives are canonically coded by absolutive case and agreement. However, some varieties code them as dative, like indirect objects, under certain circumstances, for instance if human. This fits the profile of Differential Object Marking in the typological literature (Bossong 1991, 1998, Lazard 2001, Aissen 2003): objects of transitives high on the animacy hierarchy show a marked coding, often identical to that of indirect objects. Such is mostly the situation in Romance languages, where DOM objects have the same marker *a* and sometimes the same clitic form as indirect objects (Bossong 1991), and frequent cross-liguistically, as in Hindi/Urdu (Mohanan 1995), Guarani (Shain 2008) and Tigre (Xasa) (Raz Shlomo 1980), although DOM can also take forms unrelated to indirect objects, as in Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994), Hebrew (Aissen 2003),

Persian (Lambton, 1993) and Turkish (Kornfilt 1997, Enç 1991). We begin by briefly presenting the DOM of Spanish and Hindi-Urdu, for they are similar to Basque and have been studied for their syntax.

2.1 Spanish DOM

Spanish has two DOM phenomena. One is *a*-marking, whereby the coding of indirect objects by *a* (1a) extends to certain objects of transitives that are otherwise accusative (1b). DOM *a*-marking occurs under several conditions, the best studied of which are animacy and specificity: it is obligatory for specific animate objects and impossible for nonspecific animates and mostly for inanimates, in contrast to indirect objects of ditransitives where neither factor plays a role (see Torrego 1998: chapter 2, Ormazabal and Romero 2013):[2]

(1)   a. Entregaron un libro *(a) un físico.
          gave.they a book P   a physicist
          'They gave a book to a physicist.'

        b. Vieron   (a) un físico.
          saw.they P a   physicist
          'They saw a physicist.' [*un físico* specific with *a*]

The other DOM phenomenon is leísmo, by which the clitics representing or doubling indirect objects take the form of those of indirect objects. Spanish direct and indirect object clitics are syncretic in 1st/2nd persons, but in the 3rd person distiguish accusative and dative. In leísmo, some varieties code 3rd person masculine animates by dative clitics, namely *le* in (2a), and others like the Spanish of the Basque Country also feminine animates (2b) (Fernández-Ordoñez 1999, Landa 1995). Leísmo only occurs if DOM *a*-marking also does. There are different types of leísmo; henceforth we keep to that of Basque Country Spanish, whose syntax has been studied in depth by Ormazabal and Romero (2007, 2013).

(2)   a. ¿Conoces a Juan? Sí, le   conozco hace tiempo.
          know.you P Juan   yes CL.DAT know.I   does time
          'Do you know Juan? Yes, I've known him for a long time.'

        b. A María hace tiempo que no le   veo.
          P María does time   that not CL.DAT see.I
          'María, it has been a long time since I saw her.'
                                  (Fernández-Ordoñez 1999)

---

[2] Glosses to Spanish examples are P for the *a*-marking preposition or case-marker, CL.DAT for the 3sg masc./fem. dative clitic, M/FSG for masc./fem. singular concord.

Neither DOM coding is found in passives, where the object of the active promotes to an agreeing nominative (3a), unlike the indirect object of a ditransitive (3c) (Ormazabal and Romero 2007). Thus DOM participates in the same alternation as canonical accusative coding, giving active/accusative ~ DOM versus passive/nominative. Such alternation has been one diagnostic of structural rather than inherent Case (Torrego 1998: chapter 2).

(3)   a. Maria fue vista.
            Maria was seen.FSG
            'Maria was seen.'

        b. *Le   fue vista/visto.
            *CL.DAT was seen.FSG/MSG

        c. El libro le   fue entregado a Juan.
            the book CL.DAT was given.MSG P Juan
            'The book was given Juan.'

Studies of the syntax of Spanish DOM have led to two conclusions. One is that *a*-marked DOM objects are structurally Case-marked, perhaps in contrast to inherent Case on indirect objects. The other is that both *a*-marking and leísmo DOM reflect a syntax distinct from that of canonical accusatives, not only a morphological difference. This special syntax has been analysed as object shift, required for certain objects like specific animates (Torrego 1998: chapter 2, cf. Diesing and Jelinek 1995), or in certain configurations like Exceptional Case Marking configurations (4) where even inanimates show DOM (Ormazabal and Romero 2013):

(4)   Le   veo   al   avión caer envuelto   en llamas.
         CL.DAT see.I P.the plane fall surrounded in flames
         'I see the plane fall down enveloped in flames.'

Superficially, Spanish DOM bears striking similarities to Basque DOM: in both, DOM affects both object coding (*a*-marking, dative case) and its cross-referencing (dative clitic, dative agreement), and in both DOM coding is identical to indirect object coding (Rezac 2006, Austin 2006, Fernández 2008, Fernández and Rezac 2010, Mounole 2012, Odria 2012, 2014, in progress). Moreover, both are sensitive to some of the same factors, like animacy and specificity. However, we shall also see important differences: for instance Spanish DOM is never conditioned by tense, and Basque DOM never seems available for inanimates.[3]

---

[3] Spanish and Basque also share dative marking of otherwise accusative objects in

2.2 Hindi-Urdu DOM

Hindi-Urdu DOM likewise assimilates the coding of transitive objects to ditransitive indirect objects, by using the suffix -*ko* for both, and animacy and specificity also play a similar though not identical role (Masica 1982, Butt 1993, Mohannan 1995, Bhatt 2007).[4]

(5) Mina tum-*(ko)/Tina-*(ko) dekh rahii   thii.
     Mina.F you-KO/Tina-KO   see   PROG.F be.PST.FSG
     'Mona was looking at you/Tina.'

Unlike in Spanish, Hindi-Urdu objects can retain their *ko*-marking in passives (6a,b), like indirect objects (Mohanan 1994, Bhatt 2007).

(6) a Ram-ne is ṭehnii-ko   kal   kaaṭ-aa   thaa.
        Ram-ERG this branch.F-KO yesterday cut-PF.MSG   be.PST.MSG
        'Ram had cut this branch yesterday.'

     b is   ṭehnii-ko   kal   kaaṭ-aa   gayaa
        this.OBL branch.F-KO yesterday cut-PF.MSG   pass.PF.DFLT
        thaa.
        be.PST.MSG
        'The branch was cut yesterday.'

Bhatt (2007) studies the syntax of Hindi-Urdu DOM. He demonstrates that *ko*-marked objects are structurally higher than unmarked ones for c-command into temporal adjuncts, and consequently they are linearized between the subject and *ko*-marked indirect object rather than after the latter.

(7) Ram-ne   chitthii-ko$_i$ Anita-ko t_i bhej-aa.
     Ram-ERG letter-KO   Anita-KO   send-PF
     'Ram sent the letter to Anita.'

Bhatt concludes that Hindi-Urdu *ko*-marked objects undergo object shift with respect to unmarked ones, converging with the analysis of Spanish DOM above.

---

impersonal clauses (Mendikoetxea 1999, Ortiz de Urbina 2003c). In both languages, the phenomenon is independent of DOM, being found in varieties where there is no DOM. Provisionally, we set it aside.
[4] Hindi-Urdu glosses are PROG progressive, PF perfective, PST past, DFLT, M/F masculine/feminine, SG singular.

2.3 The syntax of Basque DOM

Three chief options seem available for the analysis of the syntax of DOM with respect of that of identically marked indirect objects:

(a) DOM objects have the syntax of indirect objects, distinct from that of canonical direct objects. This explains the morphological identity of the former two against the latter, and predicts the same grouping for syntactic phenomena like (Bleam 1991 for leísmo, contrast Ormazabal and Romero 2013, and Rezac 2006 for Basque).

(b) DOM objects are just direct objects and the coding difference is due to morphology alone (cf. Ormazabal and Romero 2007 on leísmo as spellout of animacy).

(c) DOM objects are generated as direct objects, not as indirect objects, but acquire distinctive syntactic properties, for instance by object shift, which may be sui generis or which may partly assimilate them to indirect objects (see Jelinek eta Diesing 1995 generally, Bhatt 2007 for Hindi-Urdu DOM, Torrego 1998: chapter 2 and Ormazabal and Romero 2013 for Spanish DOM).

In what follows, we examine the syntax of Basque DOM. Though it proves difficult to obtain a fine resolution on its syntactic behavior, it seems clear that assimilation of the syntax of DOM dative objects to that of indirect objects is to be excluded, and that DOM dative objects are substantially akin to absolute direct objects, with certain properties suggesting a difference such as might be given by object shift. We begin by describing Basque DOM, its conditions, and their parameters in section 2, and delve into its syntax in section 3.

3   Differential Object Marking in Basque

3.1   Canonical and Differential Object Marking

Basque is a morphologically ergative and syntactically accusative language. Finite structures indicate the presence or absence of agreement with each of absolute, ergative, and dative arguments by agreement morphology, the 'dative flag' indicating the presence of dative agreement, and in analytic constructions typical of the language also by choice of the auxiliary root.[5] In

---

[5] In English, overviews of Basque agreement morphology may be found in Laka (1993), Trask (1995), Hualde (2003), and with focus on the dative flag and on root allomorphy, Trask (1981), Albizu (2002), Fernández (2013, 2015) (in French, Rebuschi 1983).

this section we set out how case and agreement reflect canonical and DOM object marking.

In Standard Basque and in most varieties of Basque, the form of a sentence with a bivalent transitive like *see* is shown in (8):[6]

(8)   Nik   zu   ikusi zaitut.
         I.ERG   you.ABS see   TRN (2sgABS-1sgERG)
         'I saw you.'

The subject is marked by the ergative case, *-k*, and the object by absolutive, *-∅*. Correspondingly, the auxiliary is one proper to ergative-absolutive agreement combinations, the transitive *edun indicated by the root *-u-*, rather than intransitive or ditransitive. This auxiliary cross-references the ergative and absolutive arguments through ergative and absolutive agreement markers: the suffix *-t* for 1st person singular ergative and the prefix *z-* for 2nd person absolutive respectively.[7]

The corresponding sentence in the dialect of Lekeitio, a DOM variety of Basque, is in (9):

(9)   (Nik)   suri   ikusi   dotzut.
         I.ERG   you.DAT   see   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
         'I saw you.'

                                (Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994:125-7)

Compared to the canonical object coding in (8), (9) presents two differences. (i) The object *su-ri* 'to you' is marked by dative case *-(r)i*, not by absolutive case *su-∅*. (ii) Along with the dative case, the auxiliary is ditransitive, indicated by *-ts-*, and agrees with the dative object by dative agreement, the 2nd person singular suffix *-zu*. Both case and agreement are identical to those of dative indirect objects of trivalent predicates like *give*, as in (10a), also from Lekeitio, which corresponds to (10b) in standard Basque, with the same morphological analysis:

(10)   a. (Nik) suri   liburua   emon dotzut.
            I.ERG   you.DAT   book.D.ABS   give   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
            'I gave you a book.'

---

[6] For Basque, glosses are: ERG, ABS and DAT for ergative, absolutive and dative cases respectively; FUT future and PST past, D determiner; INTRN, TRN and DTRN auxiliaries with absolutive, absolutive-ergative, and absolutive-dative-ergative agreement respectively; their agreement is glossed in the manner of 2sgERG or 2sgE for 2nd person singular ergative. We follow Etxepare's (2003) terminology of *monovalent (unaccusative, unergative), bivalent (unaccusative, unergative, transitive)* and *trivalent (transitive)* for predicates. Dialectal phonology is kept, such as *su* 'you' in (9) rather than standard *zu*.

[7] In Basque, the 2nd person singular is morphologically plural, due to its origin as 2nd person plural, while for 2nd person plural, an additional pluralizer is added (see Hualde 2003: 206).

    b. (Nik) zuri   liburua   eman dizut.
        I.ERG you.DAT book.D.ABS give DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
        'I gave you a book.'

In Lekeitio, 2ⁿᵈ person singular objects participate in DOM only optionally, and the canonical coding is also available, with an absolutive direct object and an absolutive-ergative transitive auxiliary, with the same morphological analysis as Standard Basque (8).

(11)   (Nik) su   ikusi   saittut.
        I.ERG you.ABS   see   TRN (2sgABS-1sgERG)
        'I saw you.'

<div align="right">(Elordieta, Arantzazu, p.c.)</div>

Since DOM (9) and ditransitive (10a) have the same finite verbal form, *dotzut*, dialectology has interpreted DOM as the use of ditransitive forms, *dotzut* in (9, 10a) = S.B. *dizut* in (10b), instead of transitive ones, *saittut* in (11) = S.B. *zaitut* in (9); see Table 1. This is a recurrent description of DOM from Bonaparte (1869: 434) to Zuazo (2003: 109). Descriptively, it has two gaps. One is the omission of case morphology. In DOM, the ditransitive auxiliary with dative agreement for the object of bivalent transitives like *see* always goes together with dative case on this object. Second, in varieties where DOM is more extensive than in Lekeitio, such as Dima, it has become obligatory for 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ person, and so the transitive auxiliary forms for 1ˢᵗ/2ⁿᵈ person absolutives disappear and there is no longer a contrast between transitive and ditransitive auxiliaries (unlike in 3ʳᵈ person, since DOM never affects inanimates).

Table 1

		DOM varieties of Basque	
	S.B.	**Lekeitio**	**Dima**
Transitive auxiliary	*zaitut*	*saittut*	-----
Ditransitive auxiliary	*dizut*	*dotzut*	*dotzut*

The foregoing examples use the analytic conjugation of the verb, which involves an auxiliary and a nonfinite form of the lexical verb. This is the typical formation of Basque finite clauses. Only a handful of verbs also have synthetic forms, where the lexical root itself carries agreement and finiteness morphology, and many are restricted to registers where DOM does not occur. However, nothing in principle prevents them from combining with DOM. The following example shows DOM with synthetic forms of *eroan* 'bring' and *eduki* 'have' in Basauri Basque (Arretxe 1993). As in the analytic conjugation, the verb has dative agreement with the object, 1ˢᵗ person singular *t(a)*, preceded by the dative flag *-(t)s-* that

indicates the presence of dative agreement (here the object is pro-dropped, but we shall see overt dative objects with *eduki* later).

(12) a. Etzera   daroste.
          house.D.to bring (1sgDAT-3plERG)
          'They brought me home.'

      b. Emen dekostasu.
          here   have (1sgDAT-2sgERG)
          'You have me here.'

<div align="right">(Arretxe 1993: 234)</div>

Different terms have been used in Basque linguistics to refer to DOM, including *leísmo* adopting the name of the similar phenomenon in Spanish (Rezac 2006), *dative overmarking* (Austin 2006), and *quirky (dative) objects* which highlights the combination of direct objecthood with an unexpected case (Fernández 2008, Fernández and Rezac 2010). Here, we use *Differential Object Marking* (also in Fernández and Rezac 2010 and Odria 2012, 2014, in progress), to place the phenomenon in the wider context of superficially similar phenomena in the typological literature.

Before proceeding, it is important to highlight and contextualize the observation above that DOM affects both case and agreement, making the object dative for both. Other phenomena involving agreement in Basque that have been the focus of syntactic inquiry affect agreement only, leading to case-agreement mismatches. Particularly relevant is *dative displacement*, which seems the mirror image of DOM, but does not affect case (Fernández 2001, 2004, Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2001, Rezac 2006, 2008a, and Rezac and Fernández 2013, among others). In dative displacement, the indirect object of a ditransitive retains dative case but noncanonically controls absolutive agreement. Compare standard (13a), repeating earlier (10b) to dative displacement in (13b) with the same object case but the auxiliary form of transitive (8):

(13) a. (Nik) zuri   liburua   eman dizut.
          I.ERG you.DAT book.D.ABS   give DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
          'I gave you a book.'

      b. (Nik) zuri   liburua   eman zaitut.
          I.ERG you.DAT book.D.ABS   give   TRN (2sgABS-1sgERG)
          'I gave you a book.'

Basque dialectology mentioning DOM has focused on auxiliary forms, and thus treats DOM and dative displacement as the two sides of the same coin: on the one side, DOM, i.e. the substitution of transitive auxiliary forms by ditransitive ones and on the other dative displacement, with the opposite

substitution (e.g. Arretxe 1994: 227). This perspective needs changing, for DOM is a matter of both agreement and case. [8]

3.2   *Dative objects in alternating verbs*

The case and agreement pattern of Basque DOM is identical to that of dative objects of bivalent unergatives (Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2010, 2012, Ortiz de Urbina and Fernández this volume). An example is *bultzatu* 'push' in (14a), compared to DOM of *ikusi* 'see' in (14b).

(14)   a.   (Nik)   suri   bultzatu   dotzut.
             I.ERG   you.DAT   push   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
             'I pushed you.'

       b.   (Nik)   suri   ikusi   dotzut.
             I.ERG   you.DAT   see   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
             'I saw you.'

   For verbs like bultzatu 'push', the ergative-dative frame is available outside DOM varieties, as in standard Basque (15a), and alternates in them with the ergative-absolutive frame (15b), without conditions on DOM like animacy (15c).

(15)   a.   (Nik)   zuri   bultzatu   dizut.
             I.ERG   you.DAT   push   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
             'I pushed you.'

       b.   (Nik)   zu   bultzatu   zaitut.
             I.ERG   you.ABS   push   TRN (2sgABS-1sgERG)
             'I pushed you.'

       c.   (Nik)   mahaiari   bultzatu   diot.
             I.ERG   table.D.DAT   push   DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG)
             'I pushed the table.'

---

[8] In many works, DOM is a highly stigmatized phenomenon, typically described as a confusion of transitive and ditransitive agreement patterns and attributed to external influence or language loss: see for instance, Yrizar (1981-II: 360) under the title of *Observaciones referentes al empleo incorrecto de algunas flexiones*, Bonaparte (1869), and more recently Aurrekoetxea and Txillardegi (1983: 49). This is not only an academic but also a public perception, of which DOM speakers are very well aware (see Austin 2006, Fernández and Rezac 2010 and references therein). Strikingly, Spanish leísmo, similar to Basque DOM, is sometimes judged even in literature as sign of elegance and prestige, as pointed out by Fernández-Ordoñez (1993: 1386-1388).

This alternation in object marking and agreement morphology leads to these verbs being called alternating verbs; see Etxepare (2003) and Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina (2010) for an exhaustive description. They make for an excellent point of comparison with DOM transitives: both are bivalent, both have an ergative external argument, in both the internal argument is sometimes absolutive and sometimes dative in case and agreement, although under different conditions. The dative internal argument of verbs like *bultzatu* 'push' turns out pattern with the dative indirect object of trivalent ditransitives like eman 'give', leading to the conclusion that in the ergative-dative frame, alternating verbs are bivalent unergatives: the ergative is the external argument, the dative is an indirect object, and there is no other internal argument to surface as absolutive (Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2012, Ortiz de Urbina and Fernández this volume). By contrast, the dative internal argument in DOM will prove to behave differently, like the canonical absolutive direct object of bivalent transitives.

3.3 Conditions and variation of DOM

DOM is governed by two types of factors. One is properties of the object that participates in it: animacy, person, and definiteness/specificity. These have been richly documented for DOM in other languages (Bossong 1991, Aissen 2003). The other is properties of the clause like tense and finiteness. These have been observed for Basque DOM (Rezac 2006, Fernández and Rezac 2010), but far more rarely elsewhere, playing no role – as far we know – for instance in Spanish (Ormazabal and Romero 2013) or Hindi-Urdu (Mohanan 1994), or else deriving from different alignments of the tenses involved, as in Iranian languages (Haig 2008).

3.3.1 Animacy

DOM in Basque and crosslinguistically is sensitive to the animacy of the object. The point in the Animacy Hierarchy of Silverstein (1976) where DOM occurs varies across Basque varieties. In Lekeitio Basque (Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994: 125ff., Fernández 2008, Mounole 2012), the crucial factor is the human/non-human distinction: only human objects accept DOM. The examples in (16) show DOM instead of canonical absolutive for animate objects. DOM is always optional in Lekeitio Basque, so that beside DOM the canonical absolutive pattern is also available.[9]

(16)   √ ABS case/agreement/TRN   √ DAT case/agreement/DTRN

---

[9] Independently of DOM, first person datives undergo so-called dative displacement whereby they control absolutive agreement (Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994: 124-7; on dative displacement, see Rezac and Fernández 2013).

a. (Nik) su   ikusi saittut   a'. (Nik) suri   ikusi dotzut
   I.ERG you.ABS see   TRN   I.ERG you.DAT see   DTRN
   'I saw you.' (2nd person pronoun)

b. Peruk   Jon   ikusi dau   b'. Peruk   Joneri ikusi dotzo
   Peru.ERG Jon.ABS see   TRN   Peru.ERG Jon.DAT see   DTRN
   'Peru saw Jon.' (human object, proper noun)

c. (Nik) neskia   ikusi dot   c'. (Nik) neskiari   ikusi dotzat
   I.ERG girl.D.ABS see   TRN   I.ERG girl.D.DAT   see   DTRN
   'I saw the girl.' (human object, common noun)

The examples in (17) show non-human objects, animate and inanimate, for which DOM is unavailable:

(17)   √ ABS case/agreement/TRN   * DAT case/agreement/DTRN

a. (Nik) txakurra   ikusi dot   a'. *(Nik) txakurrari   ikusi dotzat
   I.ERG dog.D.ABS   see   TRN   I.ERG dog.D.DAT   see   DTRN
   'I saw a dog.' (non-human/animate object)

b. (Nik) telebisiñoia ikusi dot   b'. *(Nik) telebisiñoari ikusi dotzat
   I.ERG TV.D.ABS   see   TRN   I.ERG TV.D.DAT   see   DTRN
   'I watched TV.' (non-human/non-animate object)

This distribution of DOM is replicated in the data gathered by Mounole (2012) in Tolosa (Central Basque), by Arraztio (2010) in Araitz-Betelu (Central Basque, oriental variety), and by Odria (2012) in Elgoibar (Western Basque, transitional variety).[10] Some exceptional DOM of non-human animates is attested, such as Hurtado's (2001: 104), *gizon batek joyo zakurrai* 'A man hit a dog' where *zakurrai* 'a dog' is marked by dative and not by absolutive. This and similar examples may be rare and reflect idiolectal variation, as suggested in Arraztio (2011).

No DOM of inanimates has been reported for any Basque variety, which play an important role in Odria's (2012) analysis. In particular, Basque DOM does not seem to extend to inanimates in the way DOM does in Spanish (Torrego 1998: 2.7.2.1, Ormazabal and Romero 2013) or Hindi-Urdu (Mohanan 1994, Bhatt 2007), which have been illustrated above (Ane Odria, p.c.).

---

[10] We follow Zuazo's (2003) dialectal designations, using *central, oriental* and *occidental* for *erdigunekoa, sortaldekoa* and *sartaldekoa*, and *transitional varieties* for *tarteko hizkerak*.

Animacy alone may be insufficient for some more nuanced patterns. While in Lekeitio or Tolosa, DOM is found with all transitives, Austin (2006: 141-142) points out that DOM is prefered with verbs such as *jo* 'hit' or *molestatu* 'bother', as attested in her study of a spoken corpus. This hits at a role for agentivity of the external argument and affectedness of the internal argument, discussed for Spanish *a*-marking by Torrego (1998: chapter 2).[11]

3.3.2 *Person*

Closely related to animacy, person seems to play a significant role in Basque DOM, as likewise cross-linguistically. In Lekeitio Basque, DOM is available and optional for humans of any person. In Arratia Basque, DOM is obligatory for 1st and 2nd person objects, but unavailable for 3rd person even if human:

(18)   a.   (Zuk)   (neri)   ikusi   dostesu.
            you.ERG   I.DAT   see   DTRN (1sgDAT-1sgERG)
            'You saw me.'

       b.   (Nik)   (suri)   ikusi   dotzut.
             I.ERG   you.DAT   see   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
            'I saw you.'

       c.   (Nik)   Jon/*Joneri   ikusi   dot / *dotzat.
            I.ERG   Jon.ABS/*DAT   see   DTRN / DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG)
            'I saw Jon.'

This role of person is a traditional observation, confirmed for Dima Basque by Mounole (2012) based on data from Iglesias (2005) as well as in our fieldwork. Even in varieties where 3rd person objects can participate in DOM, it is more frequent with 1st and 2nd person than with 3rd (Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994: 125-127 for Lekeitio Basque and Odria 2012 for Elgoibar Basque). Elsewhere the contrast appears as obligatory DOM in 1st/2nd person versus optional DOM with 3rd person, as in Ultzama Basque (Navarrese, central variety) (Ibarra 1995: 427), or at least admitting of exceptions in Erroibar and Esteribar Basque (Navarrese, oriental varieties) (Ibarra 2000: 152-3) (see further Fernández and Rezac 2010 and references therein).[12]

---

[11] In emerging phenomena, frequency is a factor (Bybee 2010), but all these are basic, common verbs of the colloquial register.

[12] Descriptions of paradigms suggest the possibility for far more nuanced fine-tuning of DOM, for instance limiting it to 2nd person singular or even to the presence of a particular ergative (Rezac 2006). This may reflect incomplete grammaticalization and multiple grammars, with not all forms being necessarily captured in any given investigation.

When all of 1st/2nd person is obligatory affected by DOM, the ergative-absolutive agreement paradigm disappears for these persons (though as discussed below, their absolutive case forms may be preserved in nonagreeing contexts). This leads to partial collapse of the ergative-absolutive and ergative-dative-absolutive agreement paradigms. The collapse never affects agreement forms for 3rd person objects, as these always retain absolutive forms at least when inanimate.[13]

3.3.3 Definiteness and/or specificity

Finally among properties of objects, Basque DOM as DOM crosslinguistically is affected by the object's referentiality. As Mounole (2012) first observes, definite but not indefinite (human) objects participate in DOM in Lekeitio Basque:

(19) a. *Eztotzat   ezaututen iñori.
           not.DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG) knowing   anybody.DAT
           'I don't know anybody.'

      b. *Morroi bateri   ikusi dotzat.
           guy   one.DAT see   DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG)
           'I saw a guy.'

Mounole also provides data from Tolosa Basque, where indefinites and reciprocals are barred from DOM:

(20) a. *Nik ez diot   iñorrei   ikusi.
           I.ERG not DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG) anybody.DAT see
           'I didn't see anybody.'

      b. *Jonek neska askori   ikusi dio.
           Jon.ERG girl.ABS many.DAT see   DTRN (3sgDAT-3sgERG)

Detailed work remains to be done to establish even the most basic of these distinctions. Distinct is sensitivity of DOM to whether or not the allocutive paradigm is being used, which may reflect the role of register.

[13] An interesting phenomenon is the interaction of DOM with another agreement phenomenon, dative displacement, where dative objects are coded by absolutive agreement, though keeping their dative case (see Rezac and Fernández 2013 and references therein). When a dialect has both phenomena, DOM may occasionally feed dative displacement, producing opaque forms with dative objects but absolutive agreement, as in Basauri and Pasaia. More common is the tendency for the two to apply to distinct parts of the paradigm, DOM originating in 2nd person of past tense and dative displacement in 1st person of the present tense, up to the creation of a single agreement paradigm, some objects of which use original dative agreement markers (2nd person past), others absolutive agrement markers (1st person present), as in Hondarribia (Sagarzazu 2005) (Rezac 2006, Fernández and Rezac 2010, Rezac and Fernández 2013).

'Jon saw many girls.'

c. *Elkarri ikusi   diote.
   each   other.DAT DTRN (3sgDAT-3sgERG)
   'They saw each other.'

In our work, the reflexive anaphora *bere buru* 'herself/himself' is likewise excluded from DOM in Dima.

(21) a. Lurrek bere burue   ikusi dau   ispiluen.
         Lur.ERG her head.ABS see   TRN (3sgABS-3sgERG) mirror.D.in
         'Lur saw herself in the mirror.'

      b. *Lurrek bere buruari   ikusi dotza   ispiluen.
         Lur.ERG her head.D.DAT see   DTRN (3sgDAT-3sgERG) mirror.D.in
         'Lur saw herself in the mirror.'

Similar restrictions have also been noted for Araitz-Betelu (Arraztio 2010). The specific factors and range of variation remain to be studied, addressing such questions as the semantic characterization of the referentiality involved and its relationship to the morphological marking of definite and presupposed DPs in Basque (for Spanish, see Torrego 1998: chapter 2, Gutierrez-Rexach 2000, and Ormazabal and Romero 2013).

3.3.4 Properties of the clause: tense, finiteness, agreement

So DOM has been conditioned by properties of the object. Properties of the clause matter as well: tense and finiteness/agreement. These do not usually bear on DOM in other languages, and thus are particularly significant for analysis of Basque DOM.

Descriptions of verbal paradigms indicates that in some varieties DOM is restricted to the past tense, as in Azpilkueta *zaiztet* vs. *natzen* (Yrizar 1997: 716-750), while in others it covers more ground in the past, as in Hondarribia and Irun (Sagarzazu 2005: 82) (see Rezac 2006). Our investigation has confirmed the role of tense for some speakers in Araitz-Betelu Basque thanks to data gathered by Arraztio (2011). For one speaker, whereas DOM is optional in the present, it is obligatory in the past.

(22) a. Nik zu   ikusi zattut.
         I.ERG you.ABS see   TRN (2sgA-1sgE)
      a'. Nik zui   ikusi dizut.
         I.ERG you.DAT see   DTRN (2sgD-1sgE)
         'I have seen you.'

      b. *Nik zu   ikusi zintudan.

I.ERG you.ABS see   TRN.PST (2sgA-1sgE)

b'. Nik zui   ikusi nizun.
I.ERG you.DAT see   DTR.PST (2sgD-1sgE)
'I saw you.'

In other varieties like Lekeitio Basque, DOM is found in both present and past:

(23) a. Su   ikusi saittuten.   .
you.ABS see   TRN.PST (2sgABS-1sgERG)
Suri   ikusi neutzun.
you.DAT see   DTRN.PST (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
'I saw you.'

b. Koldok   dzo saittun / eutzun.
Koldo.ERG hit TRN.PST (2sgA-1sgE) / DTRN.PST (2sgD-1sgE)
'Koldo hit you.'

c. Peruk   ikusi eban / eutzan.
Peru.ERG see TRN.PST (3sgA-3sgE) / DTRN.PST (3sgD-3sgE)
'Peru saw him/her.'

In addition to tense, some varieties seem to condition DOM according to whether a clause is finite/agreeing or nonfinite/nonagreeing: DOM may be reduced in the latter with respect to the former. In Dima, DOM with $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person is obligatory for agreeing objects in both plain finite and restructurnig configurations like (24a), but optional for the nonagreeing objects of nonfinite clauses, (24b).

(24) a. Seuri   eroan gure dotzut.
you.DAT carry want DTRN (2sgDAT-2sgERG)
'I want to bring you. '

b. Seu/seuri   ikusten etorri nes.
you.ABS/DAT seeing come INTRN (1sgABS)
'I am coming to see you.'

Other varities have no such condition, at least for some speakers, as Irun, Pasaia and Hondarribia Basque (central Basque, transitional varieties). The matter remains to be better studied, but provisionally, it seems that finiteness/agreement affect DOM.

3.4   Dialectal distribution

Basque DOM is attested throughout the Basque-speaking area, save for eastern Basque (see Yrizar 1982-II: 359ff. for a general overview, also Fernández and Rezac 2010; for sources, see the Appendix):

(i) Navarrese: DOM is widespread (Zuazo 1998: 18), e.g. Bortzerriak (occidental), Sakana (south-occidental), Ultzama (central), Esteribar and Erroibar (oriental), and also in Aezkoa and Baztan (transitional varieties), with only occidental Navarrese varieties (also) keeping the canonical absolutive marking of the object (i.e. Bortzerriak, Sunbila, Bertizarana, Malerreka, Basaburua Ttikia and Araitz).

(ii) Western Basque: Basauri, Bermeo, Igorre (occidental), Forua (Busturialdea), Lekeitio (oriental) and Elgoibar (transitional varieties).

(iii) Central Basque: Tolosa, Ordizia and Goierri, Lasarte-Oria; Pasaia, Oiartzun, Hondarribia and Irun (transitional varieties); also oriental Imotz, Basaburua Nagusia and Larrau. There is no evidence for DOM in descriptions of several contemporary central varieties, including Antzuola, Arrasate, Bergara, Eibar, Ermua / Eitza, Leioa, Orio, Otxandio, Sopela and Zegama, with descriptions of some like Antzuola explicitly noting its absence.

4   On the syntactic nature of Basque DOM objects

In this section, we examine the syntax of DOM dative objects in the light of absolutive direct objects and of dative indirect objects, building on the work of Fernández and Rezac (2010) and Odria (2012). Our results indicate that DOM dative objects are direct rather than indirect objects configurationally, bear structural rather than inherent Case, and alternate with absolutive direct objects in such a way as to suggest a single underlying mechanism for both absolutive and DOM dative, sensitive to properties of both the probe and the goal in its outcome.
    We present the following findings:

(i) Secondary predication: DOM dative objects license secondary predicates like absolutive direct objects but unlike dative indirect objects, indicating that DOM dative objects use a configuration and interpretation similar to that of direct and not indirect objects, in particular not applicative and prepositional structures.

(ii) Structural Case: DOM can be used in Exceptional Case Marking, where the DOM dative bears no selectional relationships to the clause that assigns it and agrees with it. Consequently, the DOM dative is not an inherent Case but a structural one, like the absolutive of direct objects.

(iii) Concomitantly, DOM dative objects mostly require agreement like absolutive objects, suggesting the need to Agree with the clause for Case licensing.

(iv) DOM objects may by conditioned by clausal properties like tense, again contrasting with inherent Case, and indicating that the DOM dative must be able to take into account properties between *v* and Fin, ceding to the absolutive when its conditions are not met.

In light of these results, we propose that absolutive and DOM dative objects occur in the same structure and participate in the same Agree/Case relation as absolutive direct objects, sensitive to the features of goal and probe which modulate the identity of the outcome as absolutive or dative, possibly reflecting a difference like object shift.

4.1 *DOM objects and depictives*

Depictive secondary predicate licensing suggests that DOM objects occur in a configuration relevantly identical to that of absolutive direct objects, and at any rate distinct from that of dative indirect objects.

In systems with 'low applicative' indirect objects, depictive secondary predicates can be controlled by the direct but not the indirect object (Pylkkänen 2002): such are English (Pylkkänen 2002), Spanish and French (Zubizarreta 1998), German (McFadden 2003, 2004), and Basque (Zabala 2003, Arregi and Molina-Azaola 2004, Oyharçabal 2007).[14] This is illustrated in (25a) versus (25b) for standard Basque, but it obtains in DOM varieties like Dima, Elgoibar, and Lekeitio Basque:

(25)   a. Jonek   haragia$_i$ gordinik$_i$ jan zuen.
           Jon.ERG meat.D.ABS raw   eat TRN.PST (3sgABS-3sgERG)
           'Jon ate the meat raw.'

      b. *Jonek$_i$ Joanari$_j$ berriak   mozkor$_{i/*j}$ eman zizkion.
           Jon.ERG Joana.DAT news.D.ABS drunk   give DTRN.PST
                                    (3plABS-3sgDAT-3sgERG)
           '*Jon gave Joana the news drunk.'

                                      Oyharçabal (2007)

---

[14] The generalization includes indirect objects of all types (goals, possessors, experiencers) but only in structures with a higher thematic/promoted subject, thus excluding e.g. the experiencers of unaccusatives or indirect objects promoted to passives, and only in simple applicative constructions, thus excluding causatives and light verb constructions. For derivation of these conditions, see Pylkkänen (2008).

The dative internal argument of alternating verbs like *begiratu* 'look at' patterns with dative indirect objects in not licensing depictives (Fernández and Rezac 2010). Here we illustrate this from Elgoibar Basque (Odria 2012: 22); the same obtains in Dima Basque. Spanish behaves in the same way (Zubizarretta 1985: 251).

(26) a. Nik$_i$ Mireni$_j$ pozik$_{i/*j}$ begiratu nion.
          I.ERG Miren.DAT happy   look.at DTRN.PST (3sgDAT-1sgERG)
          'I looked at Miren drunk.'

      b. Nik$_i$ Mireni$_j$ oinutsik$_{i/*j}$ jarraitxu nion.
          I.ERG Miren.DAT barefoot   follow   DTRN.PST (3sgD-1sgE)
          'I followed Miren barefoot.'

In these varieties, DOM dative objects pattern with absolutive direct objects in licensing depictives (Fernández and Rezac 2010, Odria 2012). This is so in Dima Basque (only for 1st/2nd person objects like (26a), for in Dima DOM is limited to them), and in Elgoibar Basque whence the following data (Odria 2012: 22, with DOM optional). The same holds of Spanish for both the *a*-marking and leísmo DOM (Odria 2012).[15]

(27) a. Nik$_i$ zuri$_j$ mozkortuta$_{i/j}$ ikusi dizut.
          I.ERG you.DAT drunk   see   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
          'I saw you drunk.'

      b. Nik$_i$ umiari$_j$ oinutsik$_{i/j}$ ekarri diot.
          I.ERG kid.D.DAT barefoot   carry DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG)
          'I carried the kid barefoot.'

This gives us a minimal contrast between two bivalent structures with an external argument ergative and internal argument. In one, alternating predicates, the internal argument behaves like a dative indirect object in not licensing depictives, confirming their analysis as bivalent unergatives with an indirect object (Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2010, 2011, 2012, Ortiz de Urbina this volume). In the other, the internal argument is a DOM dative object, and it behaves like a canonical absolutive direct object in licensing depictives.

Thus, DOM dative objects pattern with absolutive direct objects and against dative indirect objects in licensing depictives. The interpretation of this finding depends on the theory of depictive licensing, which needs to single out external arguments and direct objects against indirect objects of various kinds, among other contrasts. On Pylkkänen's (2008) proposal,

---

[15] Thus *Juan encontró a María$_i$ borracha$_i$* or leísmo, *Juan le$_i$ encontró borracha$_i$,* beside *Juan le habló a María$_i$ borracha$_i$* (Odria 2014, in progress, with references).

licensing depends on the possibility of conjoining the main and depictive predicates and sharing the subject of the main predicate as subject of the two. This in turn depends on both interpretation and phrase-structural configuration. The interpretation of low applicative heads and prepositions is such that a depictive cannot combine with them, while that of transitive roots and *v* is such that it can, as is that of predicates derived by movement. DOM objects belong in the latter rather than former group. They are not, at any rate, low applicative or prepositional arguments, as indirect objects are. They could be in the same configuration as absolutive direct objects, but also differ from it by further A-movement like object shift.

We cannot go securely beyond this at present, for we do not have to hand for Basque diagnostics like Bhatt's (2007) adjunct test that shows Hindi-Urdu DOM to involve object shift. Adjunct subjects in Basque can be anteceded by absolutive and DOM dative objects alike, as shown below, as well as subjects and indirect objects (see Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Duguine 2012 on whether they use PRO or *pro*).

(27)   Nok   ikusi dotzu   / zaitxu
        who.ERG see   DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG) / TRN (2sgABS-1sgERG)
        urteten / urteterakuan?
        leaving / leaving.upon
        'Who saw you$_i$ while/upon PRO$_i$ leaving?'
                            (Lekeitio Basque, Arantzazu Elordieta p.c.)

There is indirect evidence for the object shift analysis of Basque DOM: its sensitivity to animacy and specificity, insofar as this can be derived from object shift in general (Diesing and Jelinek 1995), and goes together with clear object movement in Hindi-Urdu DOM (Bhatt 2007).[16]

It bears to end on two caveats, one minor and one significant, both raised in Fernández and Rezac (2010). The depictive diagnostic seems robust for the speakers/varieties cited. However, some speakers do allow depictives to be controlled by the dative internal argument of bivalent unergatives of the *begiratu* 'look at' type, and others seem to do so even for the dative indirect objects of ditransitives like *eman*. These qualifications are familiar in the literature even for English (Himmelman and Schultze-Berndt 2005: 55). For such speakers the diagnostic cannot be used. More troubling is the situation with Lekeitio DOM. In Lekeitio, DOM is optional with 3rd person animates, as in Elgoibar, yet whereas in Elgoibar (20b) is grammatical with DOM, in Lekeitio it is not and the canonical absolutive is used instead, *Nik umia$_i$ ortosik$_i$ ekarri dot* 'I carried the kid barefoot'. This

---

[16] There remain significant uncertainties: Diesing and Jelinek's (1995) proposal says nothing about animacy, though see Jelinek and Carnie (2003), while the Germanic languages do not bar reflexive/reciprocal pronouns from object shift, unlike Basque from DOM. It is also not clear whether Basque absolutives undergo DOM: see Vicente (2005) and Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare (2014).

could be a quirk in the data; but nothing in our work ensures that Basque DOM is one and the same phenomenon in all varieties.

4.2   ECM: DOM in transitive predication with **eduki** 'have'

In this section, we extend this parallelism between DOM dative objects and non-DOM absolutive direct objects through Exceptional Case Marking. It leads us to conclude that DOM objects receive structural rather than inherent Case, like the absolutive of direct objects.

We assume the distinction between structural and inherent Case of Case Theory in Chomsky (1986, 2000, 2001), reviewed with respect to Basque in Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare (2014). Inherent Case depends on the selectional relationship between a predicate, such as P, V, Appl, v_{Agentive} and the argument it introduces. It is thus constrained by selection, notably to being phrase-structurally local and invariant under changes in higher function architecture. Structural Case, on the other hand, reflects the Agree relationship between an Agree/Case locus such as *v* and T and an argument that need bear no selectional relationship to the locus or the extended projection hosting it. It may occur under phrase-structural distance and change through changes in functional architecture alone. In English, an active clause can assign the structural accusative to the subject of a lower clause in ECM, *We consider [him-ACC (to be) clever]*, and switch it to the structural nominative when passive in raising *He-NOM is considered [__ (to be) clever]*. On the other hand, the prepositional and Saxon genitive are inherent, barring *Our consideration of him (*clever, *to be clever)*, *His being considered (*clever, *to be clever) surprises you?* Correspondingly, genitives need a selectional relationship, so there are no genitive expletives and idiom chunks beside nominative and accusative ones: *The cat(*'s) seeming to be out of the bat surprises you?* (Abney 1987). In Basque, the absolutive and ergative clearly come out as structural (Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). In this section, we look at the DOM dative in ECM constructions, where its bearer has no selectional relationship to the clause responsible for it. The DOM dative does seem available under ECM, identifying it structural Case, independent of selection.[17]

The Basque ECM construction we examine is the transitive counterpart of *intransitive predication* with the copula *be*. Intransitive predication with *be* involves a small clause subject-predicate structure, whose subject raises to become the subject of *be* (Stowell 1978, 1991, Couquaux 1981, Burzio 1986: 2.7, for Basque Zabala 2003).

---

[17] Aside from the ECM structures we study, Basque also has ECM with perception verbs, but it alternates with surface-identical adjunct control construction, and because DOM requires human objects we cannot employ tests like idiom chunks to ensure we are dealing with ECM (see Arteatx 2007, 2012, Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). Thus in *Kantatzen entzun dizut* 'I have heard you.DAT singing', *you* can be analysed as the theme of *hear* controlling into an adjunct gerund, rather than ECM.

(28)   Xabier   mutil azkarra   da.
         Xabier.ABS boy   quick.D.ABS be (3sgABS)
         'Xabier is a clever boy.'

         [Xabier$_i$ [$_{SC}$ [$_{SUBJ}$ t_i] [$_{PRED}$ mutil azkarra]] da]

Basque has a *transitive predication* counterpart, studied by Rebuschi (1984), Etxepare (2003: 4.1.6.1.1-2), Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria (2012: sec. 6), and de Rijk (2008: 675-677) who gives it its name.

(29) a. Orain datozenak   adiskideak   ditugu.
          now come.3plA.who.D.ABS friends.D.ABS have (3plA-1plE)
          'Those who are coming now are our friends.'
                                                          (de Rijk 2008: 676)
      b. Nor   zaitugu, ba?
          who.ABS have (2plABS-1plERG)
          'Who are you, then?'
                                                          (de Rijk 2008: 676)
      c. Xabier   mutil azkarra   duzu/dugu/dute.
          Xabier.ABS boy   quick.D.ABS have (3sgABS-2/1/3plERG)
          'Xabier is an intelligent boy, which benefits/interests
          you/us/them.'
                                        (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2012: 323)

In transitive predication, the copula is *have*. This verb is ordinarily used for possession, with the ergative as possessor and absolutive as possessum. Thus if the predicate *mutil azkarra* is omitted in (29c), the meaning is *'We/you/they have Xabier'*. In transitive predication, however, *have* works as a copula: it relates the subject-predicate relation, *Xabier-clever boy*, to the ergative, whose interpretation recalls of that of applicative datives like experiencers in intransitive predication. There is no entailment to possession, from (29c) to *'We/you/they have Xabier'*. The result resembles English *She still has her grandparents alive* beside possessive *Everyone has grandparents*, but it lacks the restrictions that English, French, or Spanish impose on such structures.

We adopt Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria's (2012: sec. 6) analysis of transitive predication as ECM. It builds on the raising analysis of intransitive predication, and on the similarity between its applicative datives and the ergative. Thus *We have Xabier a clever boy* has the structure in (30): (i) a subject-predicate complement to the copula *be*, (ii) to which is added the applicative head P$_{exp}$ introducing an experiencer, (iv) the experiencer ends up as ergative and *be*+P as *have* (following Kayne 1993). We assume

the small clause + ECM core of the analysis, and return to Agree/Case relations of the small clause subject as we proceed.[18]

(30)   BE [PP we [Pexp [SC [SUBJ Xabier] [PRED a clever boy]]]]

The question before us is the following: when DOM is independently required, does transitive predication use DOM? Since there is no selectional relation between the matrix and the small clause subject, any case/agreement between them must be structural. If transitive predication is compatible with a DOM dative, the latter is structural; if it is not, a good explanation is that it is inherent, dependent on selection which is absent in ECM.

In our examples so far, the transitive predication *have* verb has been **edun*. This cannot be combined with DOM, nor can DOM be suspended when independently required, say for a 1st/2nd person object. In that case, the result is ineffable. However, Basque has another *have* verb, **eduki*. Both **edun* and *eduki* may be used for possession, **edun* in eastern varieties, *eduki* in western and many central ones (Hualde 2003: 221, de Rijk 2008: 307), while some central varieties allow both with the same meaning (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2012: sec. 6, R. Etxepare, p.c., in some varieties with nuances, Orreaga 2000: 4.16).[19] In transitive predication, the situation is somewhat different. Where **edun* is available, *eduki* does not participate in transitive predication of the sort seen above, e.g. *Xabier is clever, a clever boy* (Etxepare and Uribe Etxebarria 2012: sec. 6). Even in some varieties where *eduki* has replaced **edun* for possession, **edun* is kept precisely in transitive predication (Zuazo 1998: 221). *Eduki* does occur in a superficially similar use, illustrated in (31) (de Rijk 2008: 677, 679, 25.2.2, 25.5). It is then usually restricted to predicates like *zain* 'waiting', *alboan* 'beside' or *eginda* 'done': predicates that in intransitive predication use copula *egon* 'be' (locational or stage-level) rather than *izan* 'be' (individual-level), and that also occur as secondary predicates or predicate complements with verbs like *jarri* 'put = become, turn (tr. and intr.)', *utzi* 'leave, be left' (Zabala 2003, Artiagoitia 2012, Eguren 2012).[20]

---

[18] There are restrictions on transitive predication with **edun* 'have' compared to intransitive predication with *izan* 'be': for instance both can be used with *this - my bed* but only *izan* with *this - my book* (Etxepare 2003: 415-6). These seem attributable to the relation that must hold between the predication and the ergative subject. The ECM + small clause analysis seems confirmed by the diagnostic for these structures developed in Moulton (2013):

(i)   Dirua eskatzeko, bi artikulu beharrezkoak ditugu, baina bat bera ere ez dugu.
      'To ask for the money, we need (we have necessary) two articles, but we don't have even one.' (necessary > two)

[19] The use of **edun* and not *eduki* as the transitive auxiliary is universal in all varieties.
[20] The details of which *be* copula is used when vary with dialects: while *izan* is present in

(31) Bi gizon zeuzkan behean zain.
two men.ABS had (3plABS-3sgERG) downstairs waiting
'She had two men waiting for her downstairs.'

<div align="right">(de Rijk 2008: 677)</div>

Comparable structures are found in English, French, and Spanish, unlike the general transitive predication of *edun*: *She has friends alive, waiting, near her, at home* but not **clever, *clever girls, *necessary*, fine in Basque with **edun*. The English structures have been analysed much in the same way as Basque transitive predication above: a small clause complement to a copula or empty *have*, which introduces the subject, which needs to bind a variable in the small clause, including possibly silent possessor and experiencer (Sæbø 2009, Ritter and Rosen 1997). Under this analysis, *eduki* in (31) is transitive predication. If that is so, then we do find DOM in ECM, because DOM is compatible in transitive predication with *eduki*. This is the situation in Itsasondo Basque. Both *eduki* and **edun* are used for possession *have*, with *eduki* more natural, (32a). Transitive predication with **edun* is available and normal when the object is absolutive. DOM is required of $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person objects, and **edun* is then impossible, nor can DOM be suspended (save through switch to Standard Basque with its $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person absolutives). However, *eduki* is available in the restricted transitive predication (32b) described above, excluding predicates like 'clever' or 'be a shepherd (temporarily or permanently)', (32c).

(32) a. Ardi asko edukiko/izango dugu aurten.
sheep many.ABS eduki.FUT/be.FUT TRN (3plA-2plE) this_year
'We will have many sheep this year.'

b. Alboan edukiko nauzu / didazu.
beside eduki.FUT TRN (2sgA-1sgE) / DTRN (1sgD-2sgE)
'I will always be beside you, which benefits/interests you.'

c. Nevadan artzain edukiko nauzu / *didazu.
Nevada.in shepherd.ABS eduki.FUT TRN (2sgA-1sgE) / DTRN
<div align="right">(1sgD-2sgE)</div>
'I will be shepherd in Nevada, which benefits/interests you.'

Still, it is less clear in this case than it was for **edun* that we have to do with ECM, because the predicates available are restricted in a way that is not well understood (but cf. Ritter and Rosen 1997) and similar restrictions

---

all dialects as copula, *egon* is absent from some eastern ones, and its use is more restricted as one moves from west, where it corresponds to Spanish *estar*, to east.

on secondary predication contribute to the contentiousness of its analysis through as raising/ECM (Beaver 2011).

This issue can be sidestepped in varieties where *eduki* spreads onto the terrain of transitive predication elsewhere held by **edun*. This is so in Dima Basque. In Dima, DOM is obligatory for 1st/2nd person objects, which are thus dative, and unavailable for 3rd, which are absolutive. Transitive predication is available with **edun* for absolutive but not DOM dative objects, thus for 3rd but not 1st/2nd persons:

(33)   Oier   artzain   dek(og)u   Nevadan.
       Oier.ABS shepherd.ABS eduki (3sgABS-1plERG) Nevada.in
       'Oier is shepherd in Nevada which benefits/interests us.'

Transitive predication with *eduki* is available for dative 1st/2nd persons under DOM. As in Itsasondo, it includes predicates like *beside* (34a), which uses the location/stage-level copula *egon* (34b) in intransitive predication:

(34)   a.   Ondoan edukiko   dostezu   beti.
            beside   eduki.FUT DTRN (1sgDAT-2sgERG) always
            'I will always be beside you, which benefits/interests you.'

       b.   Beti   egongo naz   zure ondoan.
            always be.FUT INTR (1sgABS) your beside
            'I will always be beside you.' (consultant paraphrase)

However, it extends to predicates like *(a) nationalist*, which use the individual-level copula *izan*, and are impossible with *eduki* in the varieties considered earlier (U. Etxeberria, p.c. for Itsasondo; R. Etxepare, p.c.):

(35)   a.   Abertzalea   edukiko   dostezu   beti.
            nationalist.D.ABS eduki.FUT DTRN (1sgDAT-2sgERG) always
            'I will always be a nationalist, which benefits/interests you.'

       b.   Beti   izango naz   abertzalea.
            always be.FUT INTR (1sgABS) nationalist.D.ABS
            'I will always be a nationalist.' (consultant paraphrase)

Likewise contrasting with Itsasondo is *eduki* with '(be) a shepherd': DOM occurs with 1st/2nd person and not with with 3rd person:

(36)   a.   Ne(r)i artzain   dekostesu   Nevadan.
            I.DAT shepherd.ABS eduki (1sgDAT-2sgERG) Nevada.in
            'I am shepherd in Nevada, which benefits/interests you.'

       b.   *Oierrei artzain   dekotsagu   Nevadan.

Oier.DAT shepherd.ABS eduki (3sgDAT-1plERG) Nevada.in
'Oier is shepherd in Nevada, which benefits/interests us.'

So in Dima, DOM dative objects occur in transitive predication as an ECM structure with *eduki*. We conclude that the DOM dative is not inherent Case dependent on selection between assigner and bearer, but structural Agree/Case, like the absolutive.

The above examples illustrate another property where Dima differs from Itsasondo: the availability of synthetic forms with dative agreement for *eduki*. As mentioned in section 2, the agreement complex of Basque finite clauses normally uses an auxiliary, which combines with a nonfinite form of the lexical verb. For a handful of verbs, synthetic verb forms exist for certain tenses, where agreement and finiteness is borne by the lexical verb itself. **edun* and *eduki* 'have' are the most common synthetic transitives, but in most varieties only **edun* can bear dative agreement. Dima belongs to a western group that does have synthetic forms with dative agreement for *eduki*, seen above. Like Dima seems to be Basauri Basque, with transitive predication and synthetic forms with dative agreement:[21]

(37) a. Orrek   e   niri   lokatzako dekoste.
          this.ERG too I.DAT mud.as   eduki (1sgDAT-3sgERG)
          'This one too slanders me [lit. has me for mud].'

                                                      (Arretxe 1994: 190)

     b. Emen dekostasu.
         here   eduki (1sgDAT-2sgERG)
         'You have me here.'

                                                      (Arretxe 1994: 234)

Dima DOM in transitive predication with *eduki* raises the question of why DOM is not available with **edun*, in Dima and elsewhere. We will end up suggesting that DOM occurs when the regular absolutive Agree/Case structure has an extra feature or head, P, that leads to dative rather than absolutive case and agreement, possibly with other consequences like object shift. It can then be stipulated that **edun* is a lexical exception to the

---

[21] All forms of **edun* as 'have' are identical with those as transitive auxiliary, and this identity extends whatever root is used in a given dialect for the ditransitive auxiliary, *-i-* (central), *eutsi* (west), *eradun* (east), to make available synthetic dative-agreeing forms 'have' in meanings like 'you have it for me'. For *eduki*, dative-agreeing synthetic forms are not part of the standard language, but occur in both old and modern dialects across the Basque Country, east and west, without it being clear whether they go to a common source (Gaminde 2007). Beside their application to DOM, which is a recent phenomenon, they include the meanings *for* (*Aitak batek semeari diadukon amorioa* 'The love that a father has *for his son*.', Axular *Guero* chapter XXXIII/§234), *from* (*entzunde dekotzat aitxeri* 'I have heard this *from my father*', Gaminde 2007: 55), and apparent ethical datives (*Orrek estekotzue erremediorik* '(S)he is hopeless and *it affects you*.' Gaminde 2007: 55). For *eduki*'s dative-agreeing synthetic forms, see also Fernández (2013).

possession of P. This might be derivable from the relationship between intransitive predication with *izan* 'be' and transitive predication with **edun* 'have'. If the latter is just the former plus an applicative head introducing the ergative, as in (30), then there is no agent-introducing *v* of regular transitives, and so no P if P depends on this *v*. Evidence that P does depend, at least partly, on agentive *v* comes from constraints like agentivity on DOM both in some varieties of Basque and elsewhere.

The question then is why *eduki* in Dima does have P. One possibility is to hark to the morphology. Dima is special in having synthetic forms of *eduki* with the dative flag *-ki-* and dative agreement.[22] This might be evidence for the learner to postulate P on *v*, since its surface outcome is dative agreement with the object. Outside Dima, when *eduki* participates only in restricted transitive predication of the English type, the very restrictions imposed on it might be evidence a less direct relationship between intransitive and transitive predication, giving *have* more content, like restrictions on event structure (cf. Ritter and Rosen 1997). The effect of both synthetic *ki*-forms and of restrictions on event structure is to sever the simple relationship between the *be* of intransitive predication and *be*+P of transitive predication seen in *izan -*edun*, giving transitive predication with *eduki* more content and structure, and thus allowing it to bear P.[23]

4.3   Double dative constructions: DOM objects + indirect objects

Case Theory posits that bearers of structural Case need to Agree with clausal Agree/Case loci for Case licensing (Chomsky 2000). In Basque finite/agreeing clauses, this requirement is visible in obligatory person

---

[22] The dative flag is added to the root *-duk-*. Historically, *-duk-/eduki* itself has been analysed as **edun* + the dative flag *-ki-* (Trask 1981), but synchronically at any rate this *-ki-* is not an indicator of dative agreement: verbs so formed do not need to take dative objects, including *eduki* (B. Oyharçabal p.c.). See also Fernández (2013).

[23] Outside DOM, Basque has one verb that seems to take ECM complements and always assign dative to the ECM subject: *iritzi* 'deem, consider', like *eduki* with synthetic dative-agreement forms (Zabala 2003). *Iritzi* passes Moulton's (2013) diagnostic for ECM in small clauses: in (i), the quantifier in the dative can take scope below the predicate complement, as it should not if it were a matrix argument and anteceded PRO/*pro* in the predicate complement. Questions arise about the exceptionality of *iritzi* (why is there no ECM assigning dative in Icelandic or French?), possible links to *a/le*-marking in Spanish ECM structures (see (4), which Ormazabal and Romero 2013 analyse it through object shift as other DOM), and any relationship between *iritzi* and Basque DOM (the *iritzi* construction is historically and dialectally independent of DOM, and includes inanimate datives that do not fall under the purview of DOM).

(i)   Hiru ikuskatzaileri/aukerari beharrezkoak deritzegu, baina zaila izango da aurkitzea.
      'We deem (3plDAT-1plERG) three reviewers.DAT/options.DAT necessary, but it will be difficult to find them.' (deem > necessary > three)

agreement with absolutes. DOM datives behave similarly, suggesting the same mechanics, partly in contrast to indirect object datives.

We focus on person agreement, which requires a brief explanation. Absolutive and dative agreement morphemes have distinct form and position. In dative agreement, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons each control distinctive morphology, including 3SG *-o-*, 3PL *-o-te-* or *-e-* where *-te-* is a plural marker. In absolutive agreement, 1st and 2nd person control distinctive morphology, but 3rd person is indicated only by plural agreement in 3PL, and 3SG has no expression. This is one of several pieces of evidence that all controllers of dative agreement group with controllers of 1st/2nd person absolutive agreement as +person, against controllers of 3rd person absolutive agreement (Arregi and Nevins 2011, Etxepare 2012, Rezac 2011). The distinction must be grammaticalized, because inanimate 3rd person dative indirect objects are still +person, while even human 3rd person absolutives are not (DOM datives agree like other datives). The grouping plays a role in the Person Case Constraint of Bonet (1991): dative agreement (even by inanimates) is not compatible with 1st/2nd person absolutive agreement but only with 3rd person (even if human), or in other words, two +person internal arguments cannot both agree (see Laka 1993, Albizu 1997, Arregi and Nevins 2011, Rezac 2011 for overviews focusing on Basque).

We can now probe the licensing of +person absolutives. In finite/agreeing clauses, 1st/2nd person absolutives must control person agreement, whether the outcome is good as in (38a) because a dative goal need not agree, or bad due to the Person Case Constraint, as in (38b) where a dative causee must agree (Rezac 2010). (38c) is given for comparison to show that (38b) is good if the absolutive is not +person.

(38) a. Poliziari   zu   eramango zaituzte /
        police.D.DAT you.ABS carry.FUT   TRN (2plA-3plE) /
        *zaizkiote   / *di(zki)ote.
        DTRN (2plA-3sgD-3plE) / DTRN (3sg/plA-3sgD-3plE)
        'They will bring you to the police.'

      b. *Pellori   zu   ezagutaraziko   zaituzte /
        Pello.DAT you.ABS know.make.FUT TRN (2plA-3plE) /
        diote   / dute.
        DTRN (3sg/plA-3sgD-3plE) / DTRN (3sgA-3plE)
        'They will made Pello know you.'

      c. Pellori   ikasleak   ezagutaraziko   dizkiote
        Pello.DAT students.D.ABS know.make.FUT DTRN (3plA-3sgD-3plE)
        / *dituzte.
        / DTRN (3plA-3plE)
        'They will made Pello know the students.'

                          (Rezac 2010, Tolosa, Central Basque)

28

The obligatory agreement of +person absolutes may be attributed to their need to Agree to satisfy a licensing requirement like Case or a person-specific version thereof (Béjar and Rezac 2009).

Dative indirect objects fall into two groups (Albizu 1997, 2001, 2011, Elordieta 2001, Etxepare and Oyharçabal 2013, Fernández and Landa 2009, Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2010, Fernández 2011, Rezac 2008b, 2011, Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). One type, in (38a) above, is structurally c-commanded by the absolute and limited to interpretations similar to those of the English prepositional object construction, like goals. These *low datives* do not need to control dative agreement under certain and dialectally varying conditions. They have been analysed as PPs with inherent Case. The other type c-commands the absolute, and can in addition have interpretations like possessor, experiencer, and causee in (38b) and (38c). These *high datives* must control dative agreement, even if doing so would incur the Person Case constraint, as in (38b) and (38c). They have been analysed as applicatives. Their dative could be viewed as structural with obligatory agreement (cf. Ormazabal and Romero 2013 for Spanish), or as inherent with obligatory agreement attributed to the mechanics of absolute Agree, cliticizing (clitic-doubling) a high dative because it is on its path (Rezac 2011, building on Anagnostopoulou 2003).

Consider now DOM dative objects. Their case and agreement is dative, like that of indirect objects, but their theta-role is that of absolute direct objects, and depictive licensing shows that they do not use the prepositional or applicative constructions. Their agreement can be examined by combining them with another dative, which has been investigated particularly for combinations with low datives in Albizu and Fernández (2006), Fernández and Rezac (2010), and Odria (2014, in progress).

The Basque agreement complex permits only one instance of dative agreement. When it is taken up, for instance by the dative causee-agent of a causativized ditransitive, there is variation in the acceptability of a low dative without agreement (Trask 1981: 294, Ortiz de Urbina 2003b).[24] When a DOM dative and a low dative combine, there is similar variation, but one constant: whatever the low dative does, the DOM dative must agree.

Albizu and Fernández (2006) investigate a speaker of Markina Basque. Combination of optional DOM and a low dative is unavailable:

(39)   a.   Martak   Aneri   eraman dio   ikastolara.
           Marta.ERG Ane.DAT carry   DTRN (3sgD-3sgE) school.D.to
           'Marta carried Ane to school.'

---

[24] We do not know to what extent we are dealing with syntactic ungrammaticality versus pragmatic issues, and to what extent with dialectal versus individual characteristics. Trask (1981: 294) contrasts variation in causativizing ditransitives in Milafranga and Oñati as a matter of dialect difference, while Ortiz de Urbina (2003b) highlights the role of factors like object position in speaker variation.

b. *Martak   Aneri   eraman dio   amonari.
   Marta.ERG Ane.DAT carry   DTRN (3sgD-3sgE) grandma.D.to
   'Marta carried Ane to (her) grandma.'

<div align="right">(Albizu and Fernández 2006)</div>

Instead, DOM is avoided, or the goal is marked allative (we gloss it 'to'):

(40) a. Martak   Aneri   eraman dio   amonarengana.
          Marta.ERG Ane.DAT carry   DTRN (3sgD-3sgE) grandma.D.to
          'Marta carried Ane to (her) grandma.'

      b. Martak   Ane   eraman dio
          Marta.ERG Ane.ABS carry   DTRN (3sgA-3sgD-3sgE)
          amonari.
          grandma.D.DAT
          'Marta carried Ane to (her) grandma.'

<div align="right">(Albizu and Fernández 2006)</div>

Both options are independently available: they are not 'repair' strategies that exist only in the context of an agreement constraint, such as the Person Case Constraint, but independently available structures, as in English *I brough (grandma) a book (to/for grandma)*. Similar behavior has been found for Lekeitio Basque (Fernández and Rezac 2010).

The following example from Dima Basque differs in having obligatory DOM for $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person. The DOM dative must agree, and an allative replaces the low dative:

(41) *Medikuari   / Medikugana   eroan dotzu.
       doctor.D.DAT / doctor.D.ALL   carry DTRN (2sgDAT-3sgERG)
       '(S)he carried you to the doctor.'

Araitz-Betelu Basque, studied in Fernández and Rezac (2010) and Arraztio (2010), has obligatory DOM for 1st, 2nd and 3rd person humans. This is so even if a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person DOM dative combines with a low dative. However, the low dative has an option not seen above: it can simply not agree, (43a), though it can also be replaced by an allative (43b, c):

(43) a. Deabruak   nei   saldu diate   etsaiai.
          demons.ERG I.DAT sell   DTRN (1sgDAT-3plERG) enemy.DAT
          'The demons have sold me to the enemy.'

      b. Martak   nei   eaman dit   zugana.
          Marta.ERG I.DAT carry   DTRN (1sgDAT-3sgERG) you.to

<div align="right">30</div>

'Marta have brought me to you.'

c. Martak   eaman dizu   zui   nigana.
   Marta.ERG carry   DTRN (1sgDAT-3sgERG) you.DAT me.to
   'Marta have brought you to me.'

The data so far converge on the need of DOM datives to agree when combining with a low dative, with variation in whether a nonagreeing low dative is available. This fits the assimilation of DOM dative to structural Case like the absolutive: +person elements of both must control person agreement.

However, the same speakers also have another phenomenon that relativizes this conclusion. In the following Araitz-Betelu example, a 3rd person DOM dative combines with a 1st/2nd person indirect object dative, and it is the latter that agrees. This example involves an understudied phenomenon, the doubling of dative agreement by the allative *zugana*. Such datives are arguably high datives of interest/affectedness.

(44)   Martak   Anei   ekarri dizu   zugana.
       Marta.ERG Ane.DAT carry   DTRN (2sgDAT-3sgERG) you.to
       'Marta have carried Ane to you.'

Generalizing somewhat beyond the data, DOM datives need agreement when combining with low datives, but DOM datives combining with high datives may cede it to the latter. The paradigms are not complete and more study is needed to ascertain the role of dative height and of person.

If the generalization is on the right track, it partly converges with results reached for Spanish DOM, which themselves leave much to be understood. Ormazabal and Romero (2013) find that while DOM is usually obligatory if its conditions are met, it can be suspended precisely when combining with an obligatorily-agreeing/cliticized high dative. In (45a), DOM is obligatory as *a*-marking for most of Spanish and as leísmo in Basque Country Spanish. In (45b), a high dative is added, identifiable by clitic doubling. As consequence, neither *a*-marking nor leísmo DOM is available, and instead otherwise obligatory DOM is absent. The examples involve 3rd person DOM, but they extend to 1st/2nd person DOM in the presence of a 1st/2nd person dative for some speakers (Bonet 1991: 203, Rezac 2011: 184 note 4).

(45)   a. Enviaron *(a) los enfermos a la doctora.
          sent.they   P   the sick   P the doctor
          'They sent the sick to the doctor.'
          [Basque Country leísmo: Les/*los enviaron a la doctora.]

       b. Le   enviaron (*a) los enfermos a la doctora.
          CL.DAT sent.they   P   the sick   P the doctor

'They sent the sick to the doctor.'
[Basque Country leísmo: *Se los/*les enviaron a la doctora.*]

The existence of an otherwise unavailable syntactic coding of an argument is widespread cross-linguistically to avoid the Person Case Constraint, such as a nonagreeing low dative in western Basque where all datives must agree otherwise (Bonet 1991, Albizu 1997, Rezac 2011). However, by and large, +person direct objects cannot suspend agreement to avoid the constraint if accusative or absolutive, as seen earlier for Basque in (38b) above; such suspension only seems available, sometimes, in systems where they are coded in the same way as indirect objects, as in Spanish (45b) above (Rezac 2011 generally and 184 note 4, 252 specifically). It is not clear what this entails for the hypothesis that DOM objects are like +person absolutives in needing Agree for licensing. As if this were not mysterious enough, Araitz-Betelu (44) is not quite reducible to Spanish (45b): in Spanish both *a*-marking of the object and leísmo on the verb are suspended, while in Araitz-Betelu the object fails to control dative agreement but remains dative in case. We leave this subject in this presently unsettled state.[25]

4.4 Dative-absolutive alternations: The role of clausal properties

Our results so far suggest systematic parallelism between DOM datives and canonical absolutives in interpretation, configuration, and Agree/Case. In this section, we look at clausal properties that influence the availability of DOM: tense and finiteness/agreement. They lead to alternations between DOM datives and canonical absolutives that have no counterpart with indirect object datives. We draw two conclusions. One, the DOM dative is a again structural Case, one that must be able to alternate with the structural absolutive. Second, the alternation must be modulable by properties on high clausal heads. One way to work this out is for both the DOM dative and the

---

[25] We might simply suppose that in Araitz-Betelu the DOM dative agrees using the zero otherwise found for 3rd person singular absolutives. There are isolated data suggesting such a possibility: a different Araitz-Betelu speaker lets a DOM dative do this for 2nd person, (i). Possibly to be related is Albizu's (1997) report of a PCC repair, whereby the 1st/2nd direct object is absolutive in case but dative in agreement, (ii). We have not encountered this phenomenon.

(i) Martak   zui   negana ekarri zattu.
     Marta.ERG you.DAT me.to carry TRN (2sgABS-3sgERG)
     'Marta brought you to me.'

(ii) Azpisapoek ni   etsaiari   saldu *naute / didate.
     traitors.D.ERG me.ABS enemy.D.DAT sell   TRN (1sgA-3plE) / DTRN (1sgD-3plE)
     'Traitors sold me to the enemy.'

canonical absolutive to reflect a structural Agree/Case relations sensitive to properties of the entire agreement complex hosting the probe.

We begin with tense. In some varieties, DOM is present or obligatory in the past but absent or optional in the present. This is a revealing condition, for there is nothing like it for indirect object datives, nor for similar DOM elsewhere as in Spanish. Tense may condition DOM in Iranian languages like Zazaki, but there it is contingent on an overall alignment split between present and past (Haig 2008). In Basque past and present are equally ergative morphologically and equally accusative in syntax.[26]

One fairly clear conclusion to draw is that the DOM dative is not inherent Case, one that depends on the selectional relationship between an argument and its predicate. Argument coding in virtue of selection is not affected by tense, at least not for internal arguments: *speak to* does not lose or change its preposition according to tense, only in virtue of argument structure operations that give *bespeak*. This follows from the locality of selection, which occurs under phrase-structural sisterhood, too limited to encompass an influence of T on V (see recently Shlonsky 2006 for cartographic frameworks). Structural Case, on the other hand, reflects the phrase-structurally unbounded Agree relation, so the DOM dative could be sensitive to properties of T. Less clear is what to make of the absence of tense conditioning on comparable DOM outside Basque.

A second conclusion to draw is that the mechanism assigning DOM dative must cede to the absolutive if its conditions are not met. In Basque, the absolutive is an assigned structural Case rather than a freely available default, since Basque has the same Case Filter effects as English in analogues of *I am afraid *(of) his arrival* (Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). Yet alternations between the DOM dative and the canonical absolutive do have the character of the absolutive emerging whenever the dative is not available, under finely parametrizable conditions such as DOM for 1st/2nd person in past tense and absolutive otherwise. They do not resemble voice-based nominative-accusative alternations, where each case is tied to a distinct functional item, T versus active *v*.

A similar conclusion may be reached from the sensitivity of DOM to finiteness or agreement. Basque finite clauses agree with absolutives, ergatives, and datives, while nonfinite ones do not. The difference between the two clause types can affect DOM; DOM is less available in nonfinite/nonagreeing clauses. Again, this factor never affects the dative marking of indirect objects, nor, as far as we know, DOM in languages like Spanish.

---

[26] The Basque past tense does exhibits the *ergative displacement* phenomenon in person agreement (not in case nor in number agreement), which has been viewed as a morphological relic of split ergativity (see Gómez and Sainz 1995 and references there). Even if this is so, it belongs to the prehistoric development of the language with no effect on synchronic alignment, whereas DOM is a recent development.

In some varieties, DOM occurs under the same conditions in both clause types, as in Araitz Betelu Basque (Arraztio 2011). In (46a), the DOM dative is the object of the participle immediately associated with the agreeing auxiliary, and the auxiliary agrees with the dative. In (46b), it is the object of the infinitival complement of the progressive *ari* and the matrix auxiliary associated with *ari* does not agree with arguments of the infinitive (cf. Ortiz de Urbina 2003a).

(46) a. (Nik)   Jonei   ikusi   diot.
          I.ERG   Jon.DAT   see   DTRN (3sgDAT-1sgERG)
          'I saw John.'

      b. Jon   Mikeli   ikusten ai   da.
          Jon.ABS   Mikel.DAT   see   PROG INTRN (3sgABS)
          'Jon is seeing Mikel.'

                                        (Arraztio 2011, 3rd speaker)

Others varieties like Dima Basque diminish the extent of DOM in nonagreeing/nonfinite clauses. DOM is obligatory for 1st/2nd person in agreeing clauses, so that a 1st/2nd person object can only be dative. In the gerund complements of *come*, however, a 1st/2nd person object can be dative or absolutive. These gerund complements are full clauses without restructuring or transparency for agreement (Artiagoitia 2003).

(47) Seu/Seuri   ikusten   etorri nes.
      you.ABS/DAT   seeing   come INTRN (1sgABS)
      'I have come to see you.'

DOM in Dima remains obligatory in the participial complements of *gura* 'want', but these are transparent to agreement and have other properties of full restructuring (Ortiz de Urbina 2003b). They thus form a single clausal architecture with the finite, agreeing auxiliary, which agrees with the DOM dative.

(48) Seuri   eroan gure dotzut.
      you.DAT carry want DTRN (2sgDAT-1sgERG)
      'I want to carry you.'

It is not yet clear which of finiteness or agreement, or which subcomponent of them, is relevant to DOM. Attributing it to agreement would converge with a traditional perspective: dialectal descriptions often neglect argument marking and speak of DOM as a phenomenon affecting auxiliary agreement patterns. Further insight might be had through a wider range of restructuring configurations, where agreement and finiteness partly divorce (cf. Ortiz de Urbina 2003b, Arregi and Molina-Azaola 2004).

The sensitivity of DOM to finiteness/agreement leads to the same conclusion as its sensitivity to tense. First, the DOM dative must reflect a structural Case, since inherent Case is determined too low in the clause for its finiteness/agreement to be taken into account.[27] Second, the structural Case mechanism resulting in the DOM dative must cede to the absolutive when its conditions are not met. We propose an account of these findings in the next section.

5   A theory of DOM

We have reached the following conclusions for the syntax of Basque DOM:

(A)   The DOM dative occurs in a configuration akin to canonically absolutive direct objects but not applicative or prepositional dative indirect objects.

(B)   The DOM dative is a structural Case like the absolutive.

(C)   The DOM dative is parametrisable by properties of both the goal and the clausal architecture, at least transitivity (v) and tense (T) as well as being in a finite/agreeing or nonfinite/nonagreeing clause.

(D)   The DOM dative alternates with the absolutive so that the absolutive emerges when conditions for the DOM dative are not met.

One way to unify these desiderata is to take the DOM dative to be a variant of the canonical absolutive: the same Agree/Case mechanism underlies both, but its outcome is modulated by additional features, which result in dative instead of absolutive and potentially in other consequences like object shift.

Let us make the following assumptions:

(i)   Following analyses of Basque ergativity, the Agree/Case locus for absolutive objects is a probe on v (Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014 and references).

(ii)   Functional architecture from v to Fin amalgamates in a single agreement complex in Basque, surfacing as the agreement complex with ergative, dative, absolutive agreement, mood, tense, and complementizers, but separate from the lexical verb and aspect (Laka 1993, Haddican 2005 and references).

To model DOM, we now propose:

---

[27] The sensitivity of DOM to finiteness/agreement must be kept distinct from the use of different argument coding in virtue of the verbal-nominal difference, which is determined lower (roots or their v vs. n categorizers), and does affect aspects of coding like preposition choice: *I greet you* vs. *My greeting to you*.

(iii)   DOM dative and canonical absolute case and agreement reflect Agree by the same head, *v*, differentiated according to the presence or absence of a feature P on *v*. The presence of P is reflected as dative case and agreement.

The way P results in dative case and agreement might be a simple featural matter, whereby *v* with P values the [*u*Case] of its goal to a value spelled out as dative, and on *v* with P valued [*u*phi] is spelled as dative agreement morphology. However, we also need to make DOM sensitive to properties of the goal, animacy and referentiality. These are typical conditions on object shift (Diesing and Jelinek 1995, Holmberg 1999, Chomsky 2001), and analyses of similar DOM elsewhere do reduce it to object shift or a similar A-movement with respect to canonically marked objects (Torrego 1998, Bhatt 2007, Ormazabal and Romero 2013). Therefore, tentatively:

(iv)   P is a trigger for object shift, associated with interpretive conditions in the way as has been discussed for other types of object shift.

This construal of P is agnostic about whether and how it relates to dative agreement. Recent work has argued that Basque dative agreement is clitic doubling of dative arguments in the applicative construction, distinct from absolute agreement that is the result of phi-Agree perhaps partly accompanied by clitic doubling (Arregi and Nevins 2011, Etxepare 2012, Preminger 2011, Rezac 2011 for overviews). The distinctive agreement morphology (clitics), dative flag (perhaps Appl), and root allomorphy (root + Appl) of dative agreement have been attributed to this mechanism. We have seen that DOM datives do not involve the applicative structures of any indirect object datives, so they cannot themselves have an Appl to be realised as the dative flag or condition root allomorphy. Yet a rapprochement might be achieved through object shift, if both applicative and object shift structures can be unified as providing a higher A-position for the objects that participate in them, perhaps licensed by a feature like P on *v*, perhaps by a special head hosting this feature in the agreement complex. This comes close to the unification of DOM and high dative coding in Spanish by Ormazabal and Romero (2013), with the difference that in Spanish +person objects always participate in this structure and so participation in this structure seems to be require for +person, whereas in Basque they only do so under DOM.

Finally, we need to capture the effect of clausal properties on DOM:

(v)   The presence of P on *v* can be sensitive to any properties in the agreement complex that hosts it, including those of Fin and T.

There are various options for the mechanism by which properties like tense on T can affect the presence of P on *v* thanks to formation of the agreement complex. Local selection might suffice, between say [past] and P, if formation of the complex creates a single minimal domain for all the heads involved (Chomsky 1995). Morphological conditions on well-formedness of feature combinations in the complex might be invoked, as seen in other complex units like clitic clusters (Bonet 1991). More radically, we might extend Agree from being sensitive to features of the terminal that hosts the probe (so that Agree by [*u*phi] can assign [*i*Case:ACC] if on agentive *v*) to sensitivity to features of the entire derived X° hosting the terminal, namely the Basque agreement complex (for related discussion, see Keine 2010). The formation of the agreement complex is essential in all these options, and might be used to distinguish Basque from other languages where DOM is not sensitive to high clausal material. We might suppose, for instance, that the Basque agreement complex is formed in syntax, whereas in Spanish *v* and T only amalgamate in morphology (on syntactic versus morphological head movement, see Embick and Noyer 2001).[28]

Each element of our proposal above is only one in an array of possibilities. We have spelled out one set of choices concretely to illustrate a possible approach to Basque DOM that seems to us to advance in deriving its properties. However, the choices are highly tentative: in many cases further work is needed to understand the phenomena we have discussed, as in the interaction of DOM and dative agreement, in others diagnostics still remain to be developed if possible, as for height of the object with and without DOM. Even so, our results circumscribe the hypothesis space, eliminating options such as the assimilation of DOM datives to indirect object datives, and revealing conditions on DOM like tense that are remarkable among most nearly comparable phenomena.

6 Conclusions

In this chapter, we have explored the nature of Basque DOM. DOM dative coding of transitive objects has the same morphology as the coding of indirect objects, as does DOM in Spanish, possibly with mutual influence between the two languages, and frequently cross-linguistically, as in Hindi-Urdu. Yet our investigation of the syntax of DOM reveals that the syntax of DOM dative objects is much like that of DOM absolutive objects, without being fully identifiable, and leaves only narrow scope for similarities to the syntax of indirect objects. Many aspects of Basque DOM remain to be

---

[28] In the Germanic languages, there are correlations between finiteness and object shift, but due to a factor that cannot play a role in Basque DOM: the height of the verb, which in some systems permits object shift by moving out of its way (Holmberg and Platzack 1995), while in others simply permits it to be seen by staying low (Fischer et al. 2004).

understood, but contributions as Odria's (in progress) or ours are beginning to circumscribe a phenomenon whose study is only at its beginning.

7   Appendix: Dialectal grammars

Aezkoa: Camino, Iñaki. 1997. *Aezkoako euskararen azterketa dialektologikoa.* Iruñea: Nafarroako Gobernua.

Ahetze: Cabodevilla, Josu. 1991. *Aetzen Uskara.* Iruñea: Nafarroako Gobernua.

Amaiur: N'Diaye, Genevieve. 1970. *Structure du dialect basque de Maya.* Mouton: The Hague.

Antzuola: Larrañaga, Jone. 1998. *Antzuolako hizkera.* Antzuola: Antzuolako Udala.

Arrasate: Elortza, Jerardo, Garro, Eneritz, Garai, Jesus M., Ormaetxea, José Luis and Plazaola, Esteban. 1999. *Arrasateko euskara.* Arrasate: Arrasateko Udala.

Baztan: Salaburu, Pello and Lakar, Maite. 2005. *Baztango mintzoa: gramatika eta hiztegia.* Iruñea / Bilbo: Nafarroako Gobernua / Euskaltzaindia.

Basauri: Arretxe, Jon. 1993. *Basauriko euskara.* Basauri: Basauriko Udala.

Bortzerriak: Zelaieta, Edu. 2005. "Bortzerrietako euskara, herriz herri (ez)berdintasunetan barrena II." *FLV* 37-99: 287-306.

Bergara: Elexpuru, Juan Martin. 1988. *Bergarako Euskara.* Bergara: UNED.

Bermeo:
   Egaña, Aitzane. 1984. "Bermeoko aditzaren azterketa lorratzak." *Bermeo* 4: 13-43.

   Laka, Enara, Leire Olondo, and Iñaki Gaminde. 2012. "Bermeoko gazteen euskararen aditz morfologiaz." *Euskalingua* 13: 27-36.

   Gaminde, Iñaki, Asier Romero and Hiart Legarra. 2012. *Gramatika eta hizkuntz bariazioa Bermeon.* Bermeoko Udala eta Campos Hegaluzea.

Beskoitze: Duhau, Henri. 1993. *Hasian hasi: Beskoitzeko Euskara.* Donibane Lohitzune: Irkus.

Deba:
   Zuazo, Koldo. 1999. *Deba Ibarreko Euskeria.* Antzuola: Antzuolako Udala.

   Zuazo, Koldo. 2002. *Deba ibarretik euskararen herrira.* Eibar: Badihardugu Euskera Alkartia.

Eibar:
   Eibarko Euskara Mintegia. 1998. *Eibarko aditza.* Eibarko Udala.

   Etxebarria, Toribio. 1998. *Flexiones verbales y lexicon del euskera dialectal de Eibar.* Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia.

Elgoibar: Makatzaga, Jesus Mari. 2007. *Elgoibarko Euskara. Elgoibarko berbak, egiturak eta irakurgaiak.* Elgoibar: Elgoibarko Udala.

Ermua: Aranberri, Fernando. 1996. *Ermua eta Eitzako Euskara.* Ermua: Ermuko Udala.

Erroibar: Ibarra, Orreaga. 2000. *Erroibarko eta Esteribarko hizkera.* Iruñea: Nafarroako Unibertsitate Publikoa

Erronkari: Angos, Alberto. 2005. *Erronkariera I: Gramatika.* Donostia: Hiria.

Forua: Gaminde, Iñaki. 1992. *Foruko euskararen morfosintaxiaz.* Forua: Foruko Udala.

Hondarribia/Irun: Sagarzazu, Txomin. 2005. *Hondarribiko eta Irungo euskara.* Irun: Alberdania.

Igorre: Iglesias, Aitor. 2005. *Igorreko hizkeraren azterketa dialektologikoa.* manuscript, UPV-EHU.

Imoz: Apalauza, Amaia. 2008. *Imozko euskara.* Iruñea: Nafarroako Gobernua.

Lasarte-Oria: Lakaba, Ana, Azurza, Maria Eugenia and Bereziartu, Juan Inazio. 1996. *Lasarte-Oriako euskararen azterketa.* Lasarte-Oria: Lasarte-Oriako udala.

Laudio: Urkijo Orueta, Natxu. 1994 *Zenbait apunte Laudioko euskaraz.* Bilbo: Udako Euskal Unibertsitatea.

Lazkao: Hurtado, Irene. 2001. *Goierriko eta Tolosalde hegoaldeko hizkerak.* Tolosa: Goierriko Euskal Eskola Kultur Elkartea, Maizpide Euskaltegia eta Lazkaoko Udala.

Leioa: Gaminde, Iñaki. 1989. *Leioako euskararen gramatikaz.* Leioa: Leioako udala.

Lekeitio: Hualde, José Ignacio, Elordieta, Gorka and Elordieta, Arantzazu. 1994 *The Basque dialect of Lequeitio*, Supplements of ASJU XXXIV. Bilbo and Donostia: UPV-EHU / Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.

Mallabi: Mugarza, Pello 2006. *Mallabiko euskara.* Mallabiko Udala.

Marquina: Rollo, William. 1925. *The Basque dialect of Marquina.* Amsterdam: H. J. Paris.

Oiartzun: Fraile Ugalde, Idoia and Fraile Ugalde, Ainhoa. 1996. *Oiartzungo hizkera.* Oiartzun: Oiartzungo Udala.

Oñati: Badihardugu. 2005. *Deba ibarreko aditz-taulak: Oñati.*

Ondarroa:

   Rotaetxe, Karmele. 1977. *Estudio estructural del euskera de Ondarroa.* Durango: Leopoldo Zugaza.

   Arregi, Karlos and Nevins, Andrew. 2011. *Morphotactics.* Springer: Dordrecht.

Ordizia: Garmendia, Larraitz and Etxabe, Karmele. 2004. *Ordiziako euskara: garai bateko bizimodua eta gaurko hizkuntza-egoera.* Ordizia: Ordiziako Udala.

Orio: Iturain, Iñaki and Loida, Loren. 1995. *Orioko euskara.* Orio: Orioko Udala.

Otxandio: Burguete, Xabier and Gaminde, Iñaki. 1991. *Otxandioko euskaraz*. Otxandio: Otxandioko Udala / Bizkaiko Foru Aldundia.

Pasaia: Agirretxe, Joxe Luix, Lersundi, Mikel and Olaetxea, Ortzuri. 1998. *Pasaiako hizkera*. Pasaia: Pasaiko Udala.

Sakana: Erdozia, Jose Luis. 2001. *Sakana erdialdeko euskara*. Doctoral dissertation, UPV-EHU.

Sopela: Gaminde, Iñaki, Markaida, Bene and Markaida, Eukene. 1993. *Sopelako euskaraz*.

Ugao: Salazar, Belene. 2001. *Ugaoko euskara. Ugaoko euskararen azterketa etnolinguistikoa*. Bilbo: Ediciones Beta.

Ultzama: Ibarra, Orreaga. 1995. *Ultzamako hizkera. Inguruko euskalkiekiko harremanak*. Iruñea: Nafarroako Gobernua.

Zaldibia: Etxabe, Karmele and Garmendia, Larraitz. 2003 *Zaldibiako euskara: Bertako bizimodua, ohiturak, eta pasadizoak*. Zaldibia: Zaldibiako Udala.

Zamudio: Gaminde, Iñaki. 2000. *Zamudio berbarik berba*. Bilbo: Labayru Ikastegia.

Zeberio: Etxebarria, Juan Manuel. 1996. *Zeberio haraneko euskararen azterketa etno-inguistikoa*. Bilbo: Deustuko Unibertsitatea.

Zegama: Azurmendi, Joxe Migel. 1998. *Zegamako euskara*. Lazkao: Goierriko Euskal Eskola Kultur Elkartea.

References

Abney, Steven. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Aissen, Judith. 2003. "Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. Economy." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 435-483.

Albizu, Pablo. 1997. "The syntax of person agreement." Ms., University of Southern California.

Albizu, Pablo. 1998. "Generalized Person-Case Constraint: A Case for a Syntax-Driven Inflectional Morphology." In *Theoretical Issues on the Morphology-Syntax Interface*. [Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Lingustics and Philology (ASJU) XL], Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Amaia Mendikoetxea (eds.), 1-33. Donostia / Bilbo: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia / UPV-EHU.

Albizu, Pablo. 2001. "Datibo sintagmen izaera sintaktikoaren inguruan: eztabaidarako oinarrizko zenbait datu." In *Kasu eta komunztaduraren gainean. On Case and agreement*. Beatriz Fernández and Pablo Albizu (eds.), 49-69. Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Albizu, Pablo. 2002. "Basque verbal morphology: Redefining cases." In *Erramu boneta: Festchrift for Rudolf P. G. de Rijk*. Xabier Artiagoitia, Patxi Goenaga and Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), 1-19. Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Albizu, Pablo. 2011. "Micro-variación en las construcciones inacusativas de dativo posesivo del vasco / Unaccusative predicates with possessor datives in Basque." Handout from Wedisyn's 2nd Workshop on Syntactic Variation, February 17-18, 2011, Universitat de Barcelona.

Albizu, Pablo, and Beatriz Fernández. 2006. Licit and illicit ERG-DAT pairings. In *Andolin gogoan*, Beatriz Fernández and Itziar Laka (eds.), 69–96. Bilbao: UPV-EHU.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: Evidence from clitics*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Apalauza, Amaia. 2008. "Nafarroako Ipar-mendebaleko euskara: Imotz, Basaburu Nagusia, Larraun, eta Araitz-Betelu." *Fontes Linguae Vasconum* 107: 63-104.

Arregi, Karlos and Molina-Azaola, Gainko. 2004. "Reestructuring in Basque and the Theory of Agreement." In *Proceedings of WCFFL* 23, G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds.), 101-114.

Arregi, Karlos and Nevins, Andrew. 2011. *Morphotactics*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Arteatx, Iñigo. 2007. "Euskarazko oharmen-aditzen osagarrietako perpaus jokatugabeak." *Uztaro* 63: 31-63.

Arteatx, Iñigo. 2012. Euskarazko egitura jokatugabeak : -t(z)en morfemadun perpaus osagarrien azterketa sintaktikoa. Doctoral dissertation, UPV-EHU.

Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2003. "Subordination." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 634-752. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2012. "Genitive case and multiple checking in Basque." In *Noun phrases and nominalization in Basque,* Urtzi Etxeberria, Ricardo Etxepare and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), 209-242. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Artola, Fernando ("Bordari"). 1981. "Hondarribiko mintzairan bertako berri." *Euskera* XXVI. 295-303.

Aurrekoetxea, Gotzon and Txillardegi. 1983. *Euskal dialektologiaren hastapenak*. Bilbo: UEU.

Austin, Jane. 2006. "Dative overmarking in Basque." *Euskalingua* 9: 136-145.

Beavers, John. 2011. "On affectedness." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29: 335-370.

Béjar, Susana and Rezac, Milan. 2009. "Cyclic Agree." *Linguistic Inquiry* 40-1: 35-73.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 2007. "Unaccusativity and Case Licensing." Handout available at: http://people.umass.edu/bhatt/papers/mcgill-may2007-handout1.pdf.

Bleam, Tonia. 2003. "Properties of the Double Object Construction in Spanish." In *Romance perspective on language knowledge and use,*

Rafael Núñez-Cedeño, Luís López and Richard Cameron (eds.), 233-252. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bonaparte, Luis Luciano. 1869. *Le verbe basque en tableaux*. Reprinted in: *Opera omnia vasconice*, vol. 1, 221-242, 1991. Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia.

Bossong, Georg 1991. "Differential object marking in Romance and beyond." In *New analyses in Romance linguistics,* Dieter Wanner and Douglas A. Kibee (eds.), 143-170. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bossong, Georg. 1998. "Le marquage differential de l'object dans les langues d'Europe." In *Actance et valence dans les langues d'Europe*, Jack Feuillet (ed.), 193-258. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Butt, Miriam. 1993. "Object specificity and agreement in Hindi/Urdu." In *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* Katharine Beals et al. (eds.), 89-103. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origins and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. "Minimalist inquiries." In *Step by step*, Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka (eds.), Cambridge: MIT Press. 89-155.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by phase." In *Ken Hale: A life in language,* Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), 1-52. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Couquaux, Daniel. 1982. "French predication and linguistic theory." In *Levels of syntactic representation*, Ken Hale and Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), 33-64. Dordrecht: Foris.

Diesing, Molly and Jelinek, Eloise. 1995. "Distributing arguments." *Natural Language Semantics* 3: 123-176.

Duguine, Maia. 2012. "Basque nominalizations and the role of structural case in the licensing of null arguments." In *Noun phrases and nominalization in Basque*, Urtzi Etxeberria, Ricardo Etxepare and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), 333-374.Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eguren, Luis. 2012. "Predication markers in Basque." In *Noun phrases and nominalization in Basque*, Urtzi Etxeberria, Ricardo Etxepare and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), 243-266. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Elordieta, Arantzazu. 2001. "Double Object Constructions and Neutral Order in Basque." *Verb movement and constituent permutation in Basque.* Utrecht: LOT.

Embick, David and Noyer, Rolf. 2001. "Movement operations after syntax." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 32-4: 555-595.

Enç, Mürvet. 1991. "The semantics of specificity." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 1: 1-25.

Etxepare, Ricardo. 2003. "Valency and argument structure in the Baque Verb." In *A grammar of Basque,* José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 363-425.

Etxepare, Ricardo. 2012. *Agreement configurations in Basque: Lessons from distance*. Habilitation thesis, CNRS-IKER UMR 5478.

Etxepare, Ricardo and Uribe-Etxebarria, Myriam. 2012. *Denominal necessity modals in Basque*. In *Noun phrases and nominalization in Basque,* Urtzi Etxeberria, Ricardo Etxepare and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), 283-330. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Etxepare, Ricardo and Oyharçabal, Bernard. 2013. "Datives and adpositions in northeastern Basque." In *Variation in datives: A micro-comparative perspective,* Beatriz Fernández and Ricardo Etxepare (eds.), 50-95. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fernández, Beatriz. 2001. "Absolutibo komunztaduradun ergatiboak, absolutibo komunztaduradun datiboak: Ergatiboaren Lekualdatzetik Datiboaren Lekualdatzera." In *On Case and Agreement. Kasu eta Komunztaduraren gainean*, Beatriz Fernández and Pablo Albizu (eds.), 87-112. Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Fernández, Beatriz. 2004. "*Gustatzen nau gustatzen dizu*: aditz laguntzaile eta komunztadura bitxiak perpaus ez-akusatiboetan." In *Euskal gramatika XXI. mendearen atarian*: *arazo zaharrak, azterbide berriak.* Pablo Albizu and Beatriz Fernández (eds.), 89-112. Gasteiz: UPV-EHU / Arabako Foru Aldundia.

Fernández, Beatriz. 2008. "Quirky dative objects in Basque." Paper presented at *European Dialect Syntax Meeting III*, September, 18-21, 2008, Venice.

Fernández, Beatriz. 2011. "Goi- eta behe-datiboak eta Datibo-komunztaduraren murriztapena: ipar-ekialdeko hizkerak eta euskara estandarra." In *Euskal dialektologia: lehena eta oraina.* [Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology (ASJU), LXIX], Irantzu Epelde (ed.), 37-63. Bilbao: UPV-EHU.

Fernández, Beatriz. 2013. "-*(k)i* hiztegian, eta hiztegiaz harantzago." *International Journal of Basque Lingustics and Philology (ASJU)* 47 (2): 1-26.

Fernández, Beatriz. 2015. "The syntax of -*(k)i,* a Basque preposition." In *Syntactic variation in Western European languages: From the noun phrase to clause structure,* special issue V of *Dialectologia,* Xulio Sousa, Carlota de Benito and Víctor Lara (eds.), 81-107. On-line: http://www.publicacions.ub.edu/revistes/dialectologiaSP2015/.

Fernández, Beatriz and Ezeizabarrena, Marijose. 2001. "Itsasaldeko solezismoa, Datiboaren Lekualdatzearen argipean." In *Euskal gramatikari eta literaturari buruzko ikerketak XXI. mendearen atarian: Gramatika gaiak, Iker,* 14-1, Jose María Makazaga and Bernard Oyharçabal (eds.), 255-278. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.

Fernández, Beatriz and Landa, Josu. 2009. "Datibo komunztadura beti zaindu, inoiz zaindu ez eta batzuetan baino zaintzen ez denean. Hiru ahoko aldagaia, datu iturri bi, eta erreminta bat: Corsintax." *Lapurdum* 13: 159-181.

Fernández, Beatriz and Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2010. *Datiboa hiztegian.* Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Fernández, Beatriz and Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2012. "Dative (first) complements in Basque." In *Syntactic microvariation in westmost European Languages.* Special issue of *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 11 (1), Ernestina Carrilho and Beatriz Fernández (eds.), 83-98. Lisboa: Ediçoes Colibrí - Universidade de Lisboa.

Fernández, Beatriz and Rezac, Milan. 2010. "Datibo osagarri bitxiak eta Datiboaren Lekualdatzea: *ari nai diyot* eta *kanta egin nazu* bidegurutzean." In *Euskara eta euskarak: aldakortasun sintaktikoa aztergai.* [Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Lingustics and Philology (ASJU) LII], Beatriz Fernández, Pablo Albizu and Ricardo Etxepare (eds.), 113-149. Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Fernández-Ordoñez, Inés. 1999. "Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo." In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española I,* Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds.), 1317-1394. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Fischer, Olga, van Kemenade, Hans, Koopman, Willem and van der Wurff, Wim. 2004. *The syntax of early English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaminde, Iñaki. 2007. "Datibodun adizkiak jakin eta eduki aditzekin Bizkaian." *Euskalingua* 10: 53-62.

Gómez, Ricardo and Sainz, Koldo. 1995. "On the origin of the finite forms of the Basque verb." In *Towards a history of the Basque language,* José Ignacio Hualde, Joseba A. Lakarra and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 235-274. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier. 2000. "The formal semantics of clitic doubling." *Journal of Semantics* 16: 315-380.

Haig, Geoffrey. 2008. *Alignment change in Iranian languages: A construction grammar approach.* New York: Mounton de Gruyter.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. and Schultze-Berndt, Eva. 2005. "Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: an introduction." In *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: The typology of depictives,* Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-68.

Holmberg, Anders. 1999. "Remarks on 'Holmberg's Generalization'." *Studia Linguistica* 53: 1-39.

Holmberg, Anders and Platzack, Christer. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hualde, José Ignacio. 2003. "Verbs: Finite forms." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 205-246. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Keine, Stefan. 2010. *Case and agreement from fringe to core*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish.* London: Routledge.

Jelinek, Eloise and Carnie, Andrew. 2003. "Argument hierarchies and the mapping principle." In *Formal approaches to function,* Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley and Mary A. Willie (eds.), 265-296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lambton, Ann K.S. 1993. *Persian grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Landa, Alazne. 1995. Conditions on null objects in Basque Spanish and their relation to leísmo and clitic doubling. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Laka, Itziar. 1993. "The structure of inflection: A case study in X^0 syntax." In *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 21-70. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lazard, Gilbert. 2001. "Le marquage différential de l´object." In *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook.* Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard Köning, Wulf Oesterreicher and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), 873-885. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Masica, Colin P. 1982. "Identified object marking in Hindi and other languages." In *Topics in Hindi linguistics*, vol. 2, Omkar N. Koul (ed.), 16-50. Delhi: Bahri Publications.

McFadden, Thomas. 2003. "The underlying structures of German inherent case." Ms., University of Pennsylvania.

McFadden, Thomas. 2004. The position of morphological case in the derivation: A study on the syntax-morphology interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Mendikoetxea, Amaya. "Construcciones con SE: medias, pasivas e impersonales." In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. II, Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds.), 1631-1722. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Mohanan, Tara. 1995. *Argument structure in Hindi.* Stanford (CA): CSLI Publications.

Moulton, Keir. 2013. "Raising from the dead." *Linguistic Inquiry* 44: 157-167.

Mounole, Céline. 2012. "Evolution of the transitive verbs in Basque and apparition of datively marked patients." In *Ergativity and voice,* Gilles Authier and Katharina Haude (eds.), Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Odria, Ane. 2012. *What lies behind Differential Object Marking: a Basque dialect survey.* Master Thesis, UPV-EHU. In *Sareko Euskal Gramatika*, Pello Salaburu, Patxi Goenaga and Ibon Sarasola (eds.)*.* On-line: http://www.ehu.eus/seg/_media/morf/5/2/1/9/sak/.

Odria, Ane. 2014. "Differential Object Marking and the nature of dative case in Basque varieties." *Linguistic Variation* 14: 289-317.

Odria, Ane. in progress. *Differential Object Marking in Basque syntax: A microcomparative survey.* Doctoral dissertation, UPV-EHU.

Oyharçabal, Bernard. 2007. *Basque ditransitives.* Ms., CNRS-IKER.

Ormazabal, Javier and Romero, Juan. 2007. "Object agreement restrictions." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 315-347.

Ormazabal, Javier and Romero, Juan. 2013. "Object clitics, agreement and dialectal variation." *Probus* 20: 33-66.

Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 1989. *Parameters in the grammar of Basque.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2003a. "Semiauxiliary verbs." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) 300-321. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2003b. "Causatives." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 592-607. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2003c. "Impersonal clauses." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 572-691. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002/2008. *Introducing arguments.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Preminger, Omer. 2011. Agreement as a fallible operation. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Raz, Shlomo. 1980. "Tigre syntax and Semitic Ethiopian." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (2): 235-250.

Rebuschi, Georgés. 1984. *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*. Paris: SELAF.

Rezac, Milan. 2006. *Agreement displacement in Basque: Derivational principles and lexical parameters.* Ms, UPV-EHU. On-line: www.umr7023.cnrs.fr/spip.php?article675.

Rezac, Milan. 2008a. "The forms of dative displacement: From Basauri to Itelmen." In G*ramatika jaietan: Patxi Goenagaren omenez.* [Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Lingustics and Philology (ASJU) LI], Xabier Artiagoitia and Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), 709-724. Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Rezac, Milan. 2008b. "The syntax of eccentric agreement: The Person Case Constraint and Absolutive Displacement in Basque." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 61-106.

Rezac, Milan. 2010. "On the unifiability of repairs of the Person Case Constraint: French, Basque, Georgian, and Chinook." In *Beñat Oihartzabali gorazarre.* [Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Lingustics and Philology (ASJU) XLIII: 1-2], Ricardo Etxepare, Ricardo Gómez and Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), 769-790. Bilbo: UPV-EHU.

Rezac, Milan. 2011. *Phi-features and the modular architecture of language*. Springer: Dordrecht.

Rezac, Milan, Albizu, Pablo and Etxepare, Ricardo. 2014. The structural ergative of Basque and the theory of Case. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32: 1273-1330.

Rezac, Milan and Fernández, Beatriz. 2013. "Dative Displacement in Basque." In *Variation in datives: A micro-comparative perspective,* Beatriz Fernández and Ricardo Etxepare (eds.), 256-282. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ritter, Elizabeth and Rosen, Sara T. 1997. "The function of *have*." *Lingua* 101: 295-321.

Sæbø, Kjell J. 2009. "Possession and pertinence: the meaning of *have*." *Natural Language Semantics* 17: 369-397.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. "Hierarchy of features and ergativity." In *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, Robert M.W. Dixon (ed.), 112-171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Shain, Cory. 2008. *Differential object marking in Paraguayan Guaraní.* BA Honors Thesis, Ohio State University.

Shlonsky, Ur. 2006. "Projection étendue et cartographie de SC." *Nouveaux cahiers de linguistique française* 2: 83-93.

Stowell, Tim. 1978. *"What was there before there was there?"* In *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society,* D. Farkas et al. (eds.), 457-471. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Stowell, Tim. 1991. "Small clause restructuring." In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, R. Freidin (ed.), 182-218. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Torrego, Esther. 1998. *The dependencies of objects.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Trask, Robert L. 1981. "Basque Verbal Morphology." In *Iker* 1: 285-304.

Trask, Robert. L. 1995. "On the history of the non-finite forms in Basque." In *Towards a history of the Basque language,* José Ignacio Hualde, Joseba Andoni Lakarra and Robert L. Trask (eds.), 207-234. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vicente, Luis. 2005. "Licensing objects with and without movement." Manuscript, Leiden University Centre for Linguistics.

Yrizar, Pedro. 1981. *Contribución a la dialectología de la lengua vasca* (2 vols.). Donostia: Gipuzkoako Kutxa.

Yrizar, Pedro. 1991. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar guipuzcoano* (2 vols.) Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia.

Yrizar, Pedro. 1992. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar alto navarro septentrional* (2 vol.). Iruñea: Euskaltzaindia / Nafarroako Gobernua.

Yrizar, Pedro. 1997. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar labortano.* Iruñea: Euskaltzaindia / UPV-EHU.

Yrizar, Pedro. 1999. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar bajo navarro occidental.* Iruñea: Euskaltzaindia / UPV-EHU.

Zabala, Igone. 2003. "Nominal predication." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 426-447. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zuazo, Koldo. 1998. "Nafarroako euskal hizkerak." In *Nafarroako hizkerak,* Iñaki Camino (ed.), 1-22. Bilbo: UEU.

Zuazo, Koldo. 2003. *Euskalkiak, herriaren lekukoak.* Donostia: Elkar.

Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1985. *Prosody, focus and word order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.